

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages detached / pages détachées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transarence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Includes supplementary materials
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,
tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the
best possible image / Les pages totalement ou
partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,
une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de
façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Opposing pages with varying colouration or
discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best
possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des
colorations variables ou des décolorations sont
filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image
possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été filmées. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires: | | ^ Various pagings. |

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

First
FIRST SESSION—~~SIXTH~~ PARLIAMENT.

50-51^o VICTORIÆ, 1887.

VOL. XXIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE
TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF MAY, 1887.



OTTAWA :
PRINTED BY MacLEAN ROGER & Co., WELLINGTON STREET,
1887.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RT. HON. SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, G.C.B.

AT THE OPENING OF THE 1st SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

1887.

President of the Council (Premier)	Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, G.C.B., &c.
Minister of Public Works	Sir HECTOR LOUIS LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Finance	Sir CHARLES TUPPER, G.C.M.G.,
Minister of Railways and Canals	HON. JOHN HENRY POPE.
Minister of Customs	HON. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Sir J. P. R. ADOLPHE CARON, K.C.M.G.
Postmaster-General	HON. ARCHIBALD WOODBURY McLELLAN.
Minister of Agriculture	HON. JOHN CARLING.
Minister of Inland Revenue	HON. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	HON. FRANK SMITH.
Secretary of State	HON. JOSEPH A. CHAPLEAU.
Minister of Interior	HON. THOMAS WHITE.
Minister of Justice	HON. JOHN SPARROW DAVID THOMPSON.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	HON. GEORGE EULAS FOSTER.
Without Portfolio	HON. J. J. C. ABBOTT.*

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HON. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET	Speaker.
JOHN G. BOUBINOT Esq.	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq.	Sergeant-at-Arms.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq.	Clerk Assistant.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

GEORGE B. BRADLEY	} Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT	
JOSEPH C. DUGGAN	} Reporters.
GEORGE EYVEL	
ALBERT HORTON	
J. O. MARCEAU	
F. R. MARCEAU	
THOS. JNO. RICHARDSON	} Assistant to Chief Reporter.
JNO. CHAS. BOYCE	

* Appointed a Member of the Government, 13th May, 1887.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

1887.

ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—Simon J. Dawson.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Hon. John S. D. Thompson.
ARGENTEUIL—James C. Wilson.
ASSINIBOIA, East—William Dell Perley.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—Louis Joseph Riopel.
BOTHWHEEL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.*
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—Hon. Edward Blake.

CAPE BRETON — { Hector F. McDougall.
 { David McKeen.
CARDWELL—Hon. Thomas White.
CARLETON (N. B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—Rt. Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, G.C.B.
CARIBOO—James Reid.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.

CHARLEVOIX—Simon Xavier Cimon.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—Edward Holton.
CHICOUTIMI and SAGUENAY—Paul Couture.
COLCHESTER—Hon. Archibald Woodbury McLelan.
COMPTON—Hon. John Henry Pope.
CORNWALL and STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, G.C.M.G.

DIGBY—John Campbell.*
DORCHESTER—Henri J. J. Duchesnay.
DRUMMOND and ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Charles Erastus Hickey.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Henry Alfred Ward.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Hon. Edward Blake.

ELGIN, E. Riding—John H. Wilson.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—James Colebrooke Patterson.
ESSEX, S. Riding—James Brien.

FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.

GASPÉ—L. Z. Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Peter Purcell.
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—Walter Shanly.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—John A. Kirk.

HALDIMAND—Walter Humphries Montague.
HALIFAX— { Hon. Alfred G. Jones.
 { Thomas E. Kenny.

* Elected at General Election; holding Office under Crown, resigned; re-elected.

* Died 26th May, 1887.

- HALTON**—John Waldie.
HAMILTON— { Adam Brown.
 { Alexander McKay.
HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—Samuel Barton Burdett.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Alexander Robertson.
HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Robert Porter.

IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
JOLIETTE—Edouard Guibault.

KAMOURASKA—Alexis Dessaint.
KENT (N. B.)—Pierre Amand Landry.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N. B.)—Hon. George E. Foster.
KING'S (N. S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P. E. I.)— { Peter Adolphus McIntyre.
 { James Edwin Robertson.
KINGSTON—Rt. Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, G. C. B.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.
LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
LANARK, N. Riding—Joseph Jamieson.
LANARK, S. Riding—John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Cyrille Doyon.
L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.
LAVAL—Joseph Aldric Ouimet.
LEEDS and GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick
 Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN and NIAGARA—John Charles Rykert.
LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
L'ISLET—Phillipe Baby Casgrain.
LONDON—Hon. John Carling.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—James Daniel Eisenhauer.

MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.
MASKINONGÉ—Charles Jérémie Coulombe.
MÉGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Timothy Coughlin.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Frederick Roome.
MISSISQUOI—George Clayes.

MONCK—Arthur Boyle.
MONTCALM—Olaûs Thérien.
MONTMAGNY—P. Aug. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—Charles Langelier.
MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.
MONTREAL, East—Charles Joseph Coursol.
MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald A. Smith, K. C. M. G.
MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Louis Ste. Marie.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Donald Chisholm.
NICOLET—Athanasie Gaudet.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N. B.)—Hon. Peter Mitchell.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. Riding—Albert E. Mallory.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. Riding—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—William Smith.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.
OTTAWA (City)— { William Goodhue Perley.
 { Honoré Robillard.
OTTAWA (County)—Alonzo Wright.
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir R. J. Cartwright, K. C. M. G.

PEEL—William A. McCulla.
PERTH, N. Riding—Samuel Rollin Hesson.
PERTH, S. RIDING—James Trow.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.
PICTOU— { Charles H. Tupper.
 { John McDougald.
PONTIAC—John Bryson.
PORTNEUF—Joseph E. A. De St. Georges.
PRESCOTT—Simon Labrosse.
PRINCE (P. E. I.)— { Stanislaus F. Perry.
 { James Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—John Milton Platt.
PROVENCHE—Joseph Royal.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron, K. C. M. G.
QUEEN'S (N. B.)—George F. Baird.
QUEEN'S (N. S.)—Joshua Newton Freeman.
QUEEN'S (P. E. I.)— { Louis Henry Davies.
 { William Welsh.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Peter White.
RENFREW, S. Riding—Robert Campbell.*

* Died on or about 13th June, 1887.

RESTIGOUCHE— { Robert Moffat.*
George Moffat.

RICHELIEU—Jean Baptiste Labelle.

RICHMOND (N.S.)—Edmund Power Flynn.

RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—William Bullock Ives.

RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.

ROUVILLE—George Auguste Gigault.

RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.

ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—John V. Ellis.

ST. JOHN, (N.B.) City and County. { Charles N. Skinner.
Charles W. Weldon.

ST. JOHN (Q.)—François Bourassa.

ST. MAURICE—François Sévère L. Desaulniers.

SASKATCHEWAN—D. H. MacDowall.

SELKIRK—Thomas Mayne Daly.

SHEFFORD—Antoine Audet.

SHELBURNE—Thomas Robertson.

SHERBROOKE—Robert Newton Hall.

SIMCOE, E. Riding—Herman Henry Cook.

SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.

SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.

SOULANGES—James William Bain.

STANSTEAD—Charles C. Colby.

SUNBURY—Robert Duncan Wilmot, jun.

TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.

TERREBOONNE—Hon. J. A. Chapleau.

THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir H. L. Langevin, K.C.M.G.

TORONTO, Centre—George Ralph R. Cockburn.

* Died on or about 24th April; Mr. George Moffat returned 27th May, took seat 31st May, and sat for remainder of Session.

TORONTO, East—John Small.

TORONTO, West—Frederick Charles Denison.*

TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean Baptiste Daoust.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—David William Gordon.

VAUDREUIL—Hugh McMillan.

VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrion.

VICTORIA (B.C.)— { Edgar Crow Baker.
Noah Shakespeare.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.

VICTORIA (N.S.)—John Archibald McDonald.

VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—John Augustus Barron.

VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—Adam Hudspeth.*

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Isaac Erb Bowman.

WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.

WELLAND—John Ferguson.

WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.

WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.

WELLINGTON, S. Riding—James Innes.

WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.

WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Franklin Wentworth Carpenter.

WESTMORELAND—Josiah Wood.

WINNIPEG—William Bain Scarth.

YALE—John Andrew Mara.

YAMASKA—Fabien Vanasse.

YARMOUTH—John Lovitt.

YORK (N.B.)—Thomas Temple.

YORK (O.) E. Riding—Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.

YORK (O.) N. Riding—William Mulock.

YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

* Elected at General Elections; holding Office of Emolument, resigned; returned and took seat 17th May.

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

BAKER, Mr. E. Crow (*Victoria, B.C.*)
BÉCHARD, Mr. François (*Iberville*).
CHARLTON, Mr. John (*North Norfolk*).
COLBY, Mr. Charles C. (*Stanstead*).
DAVIN, Mr. N. F. (*West Assiniboia*).
DESJARDINS, Mr. Alphonse (*Hochelaga*).
INNES, Mr. James (*South Wellington*).

ROYAL, Mr. Joseph (*Provencher*).
SCRIVER, Mr. Julius (*Huntingdon*).
SOMERVILLE, Mr. James (*West Bruce*).
TAYLOR, Mr. George (*South Leeds*).
TUPPEE, Mr. Chas. H. (*Pictou*).
WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman (*Albert*).

Chairman :—Mr. ALPHONSE DESJARDINS (*Hochelaga*).

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On amendment of Mr. Thompson to motion of Mr. Skinner
re Queen's, N.B., Election, of 28th April, 1887 :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. BURDETT.

On motion of Mr. Fisher *re* Chairman of Committees and
Deputy Speaker, of 5th May :—

Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. WARD.	Mr. BARRON.
Mr. PERLEY (<i>Assiniboia</i>).	Mr. SKINNER.

On motion of Mr. Mills *re* Return of Clerk of Crown in
Chancery gazetting Members, of 9th May :—

Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. JAMIESON.	Mr. FISHER.

On motion of Mr. Watson *re* Disallowance of Manitoba Rail-
way Charters, of 26th May :—

Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. JONES.
Mr. CARGILL.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. DAVIN.	Mr. MACKENZIE.

On motion of Mr. Thompson that John R. Dunn be allowed
Counsel, of 30th May :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. LANG.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. LIVINGSTONE.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. BARRON.

On motion of Mr. Weldon (*St. John*) *re* Queen's, N.B.,
Election, of 1st June :—

Mr. POPE.	Mr. BLAKE.
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.	Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. DENISON.	Mr. McMILLAN (<i>Huron</i>).

On motion of Mr. Jamieson *re* Prohibition of Intoxicating
Liquors, of 30th June :—

Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. LISTER.

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—50 VIC.

THE FIFTH PARLIAMENT of the DOMINION, which had been prorogued from the 2nd day of June, 1886, and thence from time to time, was dissolved by Proclamation on the 15th day of January, 1887, and, Writs having been issued and returned, a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the Despatch of Business, on Wednesday, the 13th day of April, 1887, and did accordingly meet on that day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th April, 1887.

ON which day, being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the Sixth Parliament, for the Despatch of Business,—John G. Bourinot, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, Donald William Macdonell, William Wilson, and François Fortunat Rouleau, Esquires, Commissioners appointed by *Dedimus Potestatem* for administering the Oath to Members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty;—Richard Pope, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said John G. Bourinot a book containing a list of the names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

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

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

Gentlemen,

The Honorable Sir WILLIAM JOHNSTONE RITCHIE, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of this Honorable House in the Senate Chamber.

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

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

The Honorable Sir WILLIAM JOHNSTONE RITCHIE, Deputy Governor, does not see fit to declare the causes of summoning the present Parliament until a Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law, but to-morrow, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the causes of summoning this Parliament will be declared.

And the House being returned,

ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, addressing himself to the Clerk, said: Mr. Bourinot, I move that Joseph Alderic Ouimet, Esq., the member representing the Electoral District of Laval, do take the Chair as Speaker of this House. To the old members of Parliament I need say nothing in favor of the selection of Mr. Ouimet. To those who have not sat in Parliament before, I would say that Mr. Ouimet has represented his county without interruption since he was first elected. The people have shown their confidence in him by electing him on five different occasions. He is, therefore, a gentleman of parliamentary experience. He is also an advocate of high standing at

the bar, and one of Her Majesty's counsel. I am sure the House will have great pleasure in accepting this motion which I now make.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I second the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Bourinot: It is not my intention to oppose the motion. The position which it is proposed that we should fill by our unanimous vote—as I hope it will be—is one of high distinction, a worthy object of honorable ambition to the first men on the floor of this Chamber; and it requires the possession of some distinguished and some rare qualities. It requires a reasonable acquaintance with both official tongues, the power of continuous toil, the rapid comprehension of and familiarity with the rules and customs of Parliament, and the capacity to apply them on the spur of the moment. But it requires even more than these, a somewhat rare combination of qualities—patience and courtesy combined with dignity, firmness and decision, and, most of all, it requires the possession of a judicial spirit, a spirit of justice, and a determination to act justly between the majority and the minority, between friend and foe, between the highest and the humblest person on the floor of the Chamber. In 1878, the hon. gentleman who has just proposed this motion, occupying a position on this side of the House, thus expressed himself with reference to the position of the Speaker:

“The Speaker is chosen to act judicially between the parties. He is to free himself from all political connection, and therefore the rule in England—the wise rule and practice in England—has been, although we unfortunately have not introduced it into this country, and we now see more than ever the disadvantage of not following English precedent, that the Speaker is not to be nominated by a member of the Government.”

The hon. gentleman had had, before he made these observations, two or more opportunities of directing the course of procedure in the election of Speaker, in which he did not follow what he called the wise rule and practice in England that we unfortunately had not introduced into this country. Since moralizing, as we are in the habit of doing in Opposition, on the subject, he has had two more opportunities of restoring and correcting our practice by the practice of the English Parliament. I expected that at this time, perhaps, he would have adopted the views he expressed in 1878; but I observe that, like other great men, he is better at moralizing than at practice. For my part I care little about the form—I care little about the form except as an expression of a principle. It is of little consequence whether a so-called independent member proposes the Speaker, who has been the prior choice of the Administration, or whether that proposal is made by a member of the Government. But I quite agree that, as a symbol of a principle, the form is of importance, and that principle is vital—the principle, namely, of the relation of the Speaker to both sides of the House; in truth, that in order that we should properly do our business it is necessary that the House should have confidence in the impartiality of the Chair. I feel—I have always felt—that it is important that, if it be at all possible, we should avoid division on the selection of the officer who is to fill that delicate relation towards us; and, therefore, I rejoice that the occasion does not at this time arise for any such division. I may be allowed to repeat

here a suggestion which I made on the last occasion of our choice of a Speaker—a suggestion which, I am afraid, subsequent events indicate it is not altogether unnecessary to repeat, and that is, the great importance which we ought to attach to the spontaneous and prompt repressing by the Speaker of this House of disorderly language. In this particular matter I consider that the first word is the worst word, and that the higher the quarter from which the word comes the worse the word. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has set us in his position on the floor a very admirable example in this regard, and I trust that that example which he has set us during the thirteen or fourteen years now past on the floor, he will enforce by precept when he is entrusted with the authority to which I refer. I shall not expect any weakness in the discharge of this duty on his part, but rather shall hope for the best. The hon. gentleman has referred to the parliamentary career of my hon. friend. I have watched it with interest and not without sympathy. I have observed in him at times efforts which I deemed to be in the right direction in the discharge of his duty as a Canadian citizen. I have observed in him aspirations towards that interpretation of the Federal pact to which I adhere, and aspirations towards the development of our powers, for example, of dealing with our relations with other countries, in which I have entirely coincided with him. If I were disposed to be critical I might say there have been occasions upon which it appeared to me he hardly pushed his principles fully into action, that he did not carry to their full logical development the views which he entertained. But I trust that, fortified and ripened by experience in the position which he is about to occupy for the next few years, we may find—if there be that blemish—that blemish entirely removed when he retakes his place on the floor. My hon. friend has at times been rather a disturbing element in the party ranks. I recollect very well when to him was ascribed a somewhat prominent part in the extraordinary convolutions which were performed by the Figure 8 some years ago in the neighborhood of this Chamber. To him is ascribed, not the authorship indeed, but the application—as illustrative of the relations of his friends of that time in the Administration to his colleagues from his Province—of the phrase “à quat’ pattes, Canayens;” and to him is ascribed, encouraged no doubt and inspired from a quarter still higher and nearer to the Administration than himself, that resistance which resulted in the submission of the Minister—in his placing himself “à quat’ pattes before the Canayens,” and entering Room No. 8 under the Caudine forks. I hope there never may be occasion to say of him that he illustrated in his own person the application of the phrase; that it never may be said of him that he was “à quat’ pattes”—that he marched from mutiny to ministerial favor, or touched the Treasury by treason. I hope it never may be said of him that he attained, or could retain this Chair by anything approaching to base subserviency or abandonment of principle. For my part, I feel special pleasure in acceding to this particular choice on this particular occasion. We are just now come from a very severe election campaign, in which the chief Tory slogan and battle-cry against myself was my vote on the execution of Riel and my opinion of the management of North-West affairs. I was called on to express an opinion on that subject, which I did in this place about twelve months ago, when I declared that in my opinion the execution of Riel was a severe blow to the administration of criminal justice in Canada, a cruel act which I felt ought to be regretted. I knew that that opinion was unpopular. I knew that it was not shared by many of my own friends. I knew it was perilous of utterance and that it was liable to misinterpretation. I asked only that I should be allowed to be sincere and honest in the expression of my convictions. But the Tory party declined to permit that position.

Mr. BLAKE.

They declared that no honest man, no jurist, no parliamentarian, no statesman, could honestly believe that which I, as they said, professed to believe. They declared that I was setting up the French above the English, the Roman Catholics above the Protestants—that I was breaking down the sacred rule of one law for all, that I was raising the cry of race and revenge, that I was destroying the prime principle of the administration of criminal justice. They roused the Orange Tories to madness. I was insulted in the press, in the pulpit, on the platform. I was called a Rielite, a conspirator against Canadian law, a hypocrite and coward, a knave, a fool, a rebel and a traitor. And as to the Half-breeds, the Tories declared that there was no neglect, no delay, no mismanagement on the part of the Government—that, on the contrary, all was kindness, promptness, diligence and wisdom; that the accusation was false, and the accuser a calumniator. A year ago, discussing these questions here, I appealed to a later day—to the next generation—for my final verdict, and the judgment of history recorded by posterity. Who, at that time, could have believed that within these few months I should find these, my accusers, to-day laying the first stone of my vindication. What is the earliest step which they propose to this Assembly, elected largely under the influence of those cries? They propose for the first place here, for the position of Speaker and mouthpiece of the Canadian Commons, for the vindicator of our privileges, for our judicial arbiter, the gentleman who voted with me a few months ago:

“That this House feels it its duty to express its deep regret that the sentence of death passed upon Louis Riel, convicted of high treason, was allowed to be carried into execution.”

They propose for that high office the gentleman who a few months ago followed up that vote by voting with me

“That it was the duty of the Government to proceed with diligence, under the authority they obtained from Parliament in 1879, to settle the claims arising out of the Indian title of the Half-breeds of the North-West Territories, and also to settle the claims of those of the Manitoba Half-breeds who were temporarily absent during the enumeration, and that in this respect the Government has been guilty of neglect, delay and mismanagement, prejudicial to the peace, welfare and good government of Canada.”

These votes of censure on the part of the hon. member for Laval do give him a title to my support. These votes of want of confidence in the Administration do lead me to the conclusion that he possesses a soundness of judgment which I hope he will illustrate in the duties of the Chair. But what is to be said of the men who called me Rielite and conspirator—nay, even fool, hypocrite and coward, calumniator, traitor and rebel, because I so voted, and who propose to elevate to the first place in this Chamber the gentleman who shared in the votes with me? Is this the application of the principle of one law for all? Is this the administration of even-handed justice—highest honors for one, execration and contempt for the other? Are they acting thus in spite of the hon. member's votes? If so, it proves that the votes cannot have been so very bad after all. But they are not so acting; they are acting so largely because of the votes. We know, and no one knows better than the hon. member, that he largely owes his elevation at this juncture to the fact that he occupies the happy position of having voted to condemn the execution of Louis Riel and the conduct of the Government with reference to Half-breed affairs. It is because of the votes largely, and not in spite of them, that this motion is made. Tell it not, Mr. Bourinot, on the 12th of July; name it not in the lodges of the Orangemen; but so it is; and such being the situation, I extend in advance my hearty congratulations to my fellow Rielite, to my co-conspirator against Canadian law, to my brother knave and fool, my fellow-hypocrite and traitor, my associate in calumny, treason and rebellion, on being about to receive, by the unanimous vote of the Canadian Commons, the position of first commoner of Canada. Motion agreed to.

Mr. **BOURINOT**. I declare Mr. Ouimet duly chosen to occupy the Chair of this Honorable House as its Speaker.

Mr. **OUMIET** was conducted from his place to the Chair by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

Mr. **SPEAKER ELECT**, standing on the upper step, said: I beg leave to tender to this House my sincere thanks for the high honor it has conferred upon me in electing me to be its Speaker. It will be my earnest endeavor to deserve the confidence you have reposed in me, and to discharge the important duties that devolve upon me with firmness and impartiality. I know how ill-fitted I am for the position compared with others, but I trust in the co-operation of honorable gentlemen on both sides in maintaining our rules and usages, and in preserving the dignity and freedom of debate, according to well-established custom.

And the **Mace**, which before lay under the Table, was laid upon the Table.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 14th April, 1887.

The **SPEAKER ELECT** having taken the Chair,

PRAYERS.

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

Mr. **SPEAKER**,—

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber

Then the **HONORABLE JOSEPH ALDERIC OUMIET**, **SPEAKER ELECT**, said:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

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

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of Speech in their Debates, access to Your Excellency's person at all reasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from Your Excellency the most favorable consideration.

The Honorable the **SPEAKER** of the Senate then said:

Mr. **SPEAKER**,—

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

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

Then His Excellency the **GOVERNOR GENERAL** was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned,

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

privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid before the House, Judgment bearing date the eighth day of June, 1886, of the Hon. Mr. Justice Angers, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, in the matter of the election petition for the Electoral District of Beauce, by which judgment the said petition was dismissed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE.

Sir **JOHN A. MACDONALD** introduced Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.

Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I have the honor to inform this House, that when the House attended His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and, to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of the Speech, which is as follows:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is my pleasing duty on the opening of a new Parliament to congratulate you on the general prosperity of the country and on the prospect of a coming season of peace and progress.

You will, I am sure, gladly join in with the rest of the loyal subjects of the Queen in offering Her Majesty your sincere congratulations on her having reached the fiftieth anniversary of her accession to the Throne, and in giving expression to an earnest hope that she may be long spared to reign over her vast dominions.

The prominent position taken by Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, recently held in London, has made the Dominion more widely and favorably known than before, and will, I have no doubt, contribute largely to its material progress by calling attention to the advantages offered by our country to the agriculturist, and by attracting the capital necessary for the development of its great natural resources.

Negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States on the Fishery Question, with respect to which my Government has been fully informed and consulted, are still in progress, and will, we may be permitted to hope, result in an arrangement honorable and satisfactory to both nations.

Meanwhile the necessary provision has been made for the protection of our inshore fisheries. The papers on this subject will be laid before you.

Your attention will be invited to the expediency of establishing a Department of Trade and Commerce, under the supervision of a responsible Minister.

You will also be asked to consider the propriety of making such improvement in the organization of the Departments of Justice, Customs, and Inland Revenue, as will provide greater facilities for the despatch of the large and increasing volume of business with which those Departments are charged.

A measure will be submitted to you giving representation in the Senate to the North-West Territories in addition to that which they now possess in the House of Commons.

Other measures will be laid before you, and among them will be found Bills for the amendment of the Acts relating to Government Railways, for providing a better mode of Trial of Claims against the Crown, for the improvement of the Procedure in Criminal Cases, and for the further amendment of the Chinese Immigration Act.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

You will be asked, in order to provide against the possible interruption of the navigation of our great inland waters, for an appropriation in aid of the construction of a canal to connect the waters of Lakes Huron and Superior at Sault Ste. Marie.

The Accounts for the past year will be laid before you, as well as the Estimates for the ensuing year. They have been prepared with due regard to economy and the requirements of the Public Service.

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :**Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I commend these important subjects and others which may be laid before you to your best consideration, with full confidence in your earnest desire to promote the development and well-being of Canada.

On motion of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, HIS EXCELLENCY'S Speech was ordered to be taken into consideration to-morrow.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House, the Report of the Joint Librarians on the state of the Library of Parliament.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. With the permission of the House I propose to move the usual Committee for the Supervision of the Debates of this House. In selecting the names we have had particular reference to the different sections of the whole Dominion, and have therefore selected a representative from each Province. I hope the names chosen will meet with the approval of the House. I beg to move :

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time, the said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Baker, Béchard, Charlton, Colby, Davin, Desjardins, Ellis, Innes, McIntyre, Royal, Taylor, Tupper (Victou), Weldon (Albert).

Mr. BLAKE. I had rather that the hon. gentleman should move that on to-morrow, or move it as a notice for to-morrow.

Mr. BOWELL. It will stand as a notice for to-morrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I beg to call the attention of the House to the matter connected with the election in the County of Queen's, N.B. I do not propose to enter into the question until we have the requisite information before the House. I feel this is a matter which affects the dignity and privileges of the House and the electors at large, and I hope it will not be approached in any partisan spirit. Without further discussing the matter I would move :

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be ordered to attend at the opening of this House, to-morrow, with the return of the last election for the Electoral District of Queen's, in the Province of New Brunswick, together with all poll-books and all other papers, letters, documents and memoranda which may have been transmitted to him by the Returning Officer and received by him since the despatch of the Writ of Election, and copies of letters sent by him to the Returning Officer.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that a question of great importance will arise in connection with the papers moved for. I have not the slightest objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand a great deal of private legislation will come before the House this Session and it is advisable, therefore, that the Standing Committees be struck as soon as possible. I move :

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed, to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House, this day; to be composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messrs. McLellan, Bowell, Blake and Laurier.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:50 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. WELDON moved :

That the papers in possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery relating to the election in the Electoral District of Queen's, N.B., be now read

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose they may be considered as read.

Mr. BLAKE. It is believed, from what we know of the contents of these papers, that it is necessary to follow them up with an immediate motion, and for that reason the House should be put in possession of them at once. I think the hon. gentleman will see, when he hears the papers read, that a sort of interlocutory motion is necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, however, that the matter will have to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as is always done.

Motion agreed to, and the papers were read by the Clerk accordingly.

Mr. WELDON. My excuse for bringing this matter before the House is its great importance, inasmuch as it involves an infringement of the liberties of the people in general and of the electorate of Queen's, New Brunswick, in particular, and I trust that in discussing this matter we will avoid displaying any undue partisan spirit. This matter affects the rights and privileges of every elector in the Dominion, involving as it does, the decision of the question whether a returning officer can set at defiance the wishes of the majority of the electors of an electoral district by declaring, in the exercise of a jurisdiction not given to him and in defiance of the law, a party not elected to be elected a member of this House. It appears from the statements read by the clerk that the nominations were made and a poll was held, and that the court was adjourned for the purpose of receiving the return of the state of the poll. On the 28th of February the court was held, and then adjourned until the 5th of March, in consequence of some of the ballot boxes not being forthcoming, owing to

the bad state of the roads; on the 5th of March the returning officer held his court and opened the ballot boxes. He summed up the votes, but in the return which has been laid on the Table, we find he has carefully and studiously avoided stating what was the result of the voting. He has stated that he summed up the votes, and so far he was right, but beyond that there was gross dereliction of duty on his part, and I hope this House will not tolerate such conduct on the part of a returning officer where his duty is so clearly pointed out by the statute. I hold in my hand the certificate and the copy of the affidavit made by Mr. Baird, one of the candidates on that occasion, who states:

"That on the said 5th inst. the said returning officer opened his court, opened the ballot boxes, and added together the number of votes given for said George G. King and for myself, from the statement contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officers, and stated that he found by said statements that 1,191 votes had been given for said George G. King, and 1,130 votes had been given for this deponent."

If that was the case—and I state here from my place as a member of this House that I believe the statement to be correct that Mr. King, when the votes were summed up, had the majority—I say that, by the law, the duty of the returning officer was clearly laid down. What his duty might be at the nomination, it is not necessary to enquire. We find that the nomination was made, that the deposit was made, and a receipt given to Mr. King; and that, according to the requirements of the law, the names of the candidates were posted throughout the county, that a poll was held on the 22nd of February, and that the ballot boxes, certificates of return and poll books, were returned to the returning officer. What then was the duty of that officer? The law says:

"The returning officer at the place, day and hour appointed by his proclamation, and after having received all the ballot boxes, shall proceed to open them, in the presence of the election clerk, the candidates or their representatives, if present, or of at least two electors, if the candidates or their representatives are not present, and to add together the number of votes given for each candidate, from the statements contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officers of the ballot papers counted by them. The candidate who, on the summing up of the votes, is found to have a majority of votes shall be then declared elected."

The duty of the returning officer was simply ministerial, or, to use the language of an eminent judge in England, in a very late case, his duty was the arithmetical calculation of the number of votes, and that is all. Beyond that he had no power, and if any of the proceedings were irregular there is a tribunal provided in the Controverted Elections Act by which returns can be rectified. But I say, without fear of contradiction, no power exists in a returning officer to declare an election invalid, or to refuse to count up the votes, or to refuse to declare elected the candidate who had the majority of votes. Then we find, still further, that after he is to do this:

"The returning officer shall, immediately after the sixth day after the final addition by him, unless before that time he receives notice that he is required to attend before a judge for the purpose of a final addition or recount by such judge of the votes given at the election, transmit his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that the candidate having the largest number of votes has been duly elected, and shall forward to each of the respective candidates a duplicate or copy thereof, and such return shall be in the form OC in the first schedule to this Act."

"The returning officer shall accompany his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with a report of his proceedings, in which report he shall make any observation he thinks proper as to the state of the ballot boxes or ballot papers as received by him."

"The returning officer shall also transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with his return the ballot papers, the original statements of the several deputy returning officers hereinbefore referred to, together with the lists of voters and poll-books used in the several polling districts, and all other lists and documents used or required at such election or which have been transmitted to him by the deputy returning officers."

The duty of the returning officer is plain, and, with regard to his duty as to the return to the Clerk of the Crown, the law is so clear and distinct that "he who runs may read." It

requires no legal lore to decide what is his duty, and that duty this officer has entirely failed to perform. He has failed in refusing to declare the person who had the majority of votes elected, and he has also failed in refusing to return the ballot boxes. If rumor speaks true—I do not vouch for the correctness of the statement—these ballot papers are no longer in existence, and if that be so, the duty and the honor of this House require that this matter should be fully investigated. I do not care on what side the candidate may be, but justice should be done, and as far as the law can be maintained we should maintain it in every particular. In a case decided in England a short time ago, I should like to read the language of Lord Esher, as the case is very much like this one. In that case, the returning officer, after the nomination, and after the poll, undertook to declare that one of the candidates was disqualified, and that the other candidate, having the minority of votes in a municipal election, should be returned. I may also add that the language of the statute in England, the Ballot Act of 1872, and that of our own Act are almost the same. In that case, delivering the judgment of the Court of Appeal, Lord Esher said as follows:—

"It is next said that Roberts was not duly elected because the returning officer did not declare him to be elected. It is not denied that he obtained a majority of votes. We have to see, therefore, what are the powers and duties of a returning officer in a municipal election. First comes the nomination, which is to take place before the mayor, when the borough is divided into wards. It is not necessary here to decide whether the mayor could reject the nomination of a candidate not properly qualified. If he had that power, he did not exercise it in the present case, because he accepted the nomination of both candidates. Then come the powers and duties of the returning officer, which are indicated in and limited by the second section of the Ballot Act, 1872. Those powers and duties begin after the close of the poll. He is to take charge of the ballot boxes; open them in the presence of such of the agents (if any) of the candidates as may be present, 'and ascertain the result of the poll by counting the votes given to each candidate.' The result of the poll is what he is to ascertain, and he must ascertain it in the way prescribed by the Act, and in that way only. The section then proceeds: 'And shall forthwith declare to be elected the candidate or candidates to whom the majority of votes have been given.' No power is given to him to declare that candidate elected to whom the majority of votes has been legally given. The moment he has cast up the votes, he must declare the candidate elected who has the arithmetical majority. He may only adjourn for the purpose of finishing the count. The section does not entitle him to enquire whether the candidate is under any personal disability to be elected, whether the candidate be man or woman, or whether the person nominated be dead or alive. The returning officer has simply to perform the arithmetical duty of adding up the votes, and to declare the person elected who has the majority. Though it is not necessary to decide the point, I am inclined to think that his declaration is merely ministerial, and that, if he remained silent and did not make any declaration, the person who had the majority of votes would be duly elected."

I say that no language could apply more absolutely to the case I am now presenting to the House than the language of the Master of the Rolls in England, and I say that under our Act the same duties devolve upon the returning officer, and that is his only duty. It would be unfortunate for the people of this country, it would be unfortunate for the liberty of the people, that any such powers should be given to returning officers as one of them has undertaken to exercise in this case. I trust that the spirit of honor and fair play will animate every member of this House, irrespective of political leaning, so far as to see that the law is carried out, and that right and justice is done as between these parties. I beg to move:

That Mr John R. Dunn, the Returning Officer for the Electoral District of the County of Queen's, N.B., be ordered by telegraph to transmit forthwith to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the poll-books, certificate of return, ballots, and all other papers used and otherwise connected with the late election and poll held in the said Electoral District.

I trust that this motion will pass, and that immediate steps will be taken to communicate with the returning officer so as to have these papers laid before the House at as early a day as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure the House will approach this case, as they ought to approach

every case, in a judicial spirit and not in a partisan spirit. I have heard the statement of the hon. gentleman, and I have heard the particulars for the first time. My attention has not been called before to this case, but it is a very important case, and involves a very important principle. I have not the slightest objection that this motion should be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand from the hon. the leader of the Opposition that he would prefer that the name of Mr. Mills should be substituted for his own on the Striking Committee. By the universal consent of the House the change can be made.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs Baker, Béchard, Charlton, Colby, Davin, Desjardins, Ellis, Innes, McIntyre, Royal, Taylor, Tupper (Picton), and Weldon (Albert).

I may explain to the House, for the information of those who were not present yesterday, that, in increasing the number of this committee, I have selected a representative from each of the Provinces, and two or three from the larger Provinces, making the total thirteen, which I hope will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has made another attempt in the direction which I objected to on a former occasion with reference to this committee. It must be well understood by the House that this is a very special committee, and that the possibility of maintaining the institution which is presided over by the committee depends upon the very full recognition of the equal rights on both sides. That recognition was made until the year 1885. The committee, for example, for the year 1884, and I believe also for the preceding year, was composed of nine members, of whom five were from the side of the majority and four from the side of the minority. It was not unreasonable, since there must be a majority on one side or the other, and of course, it was not merely not unreasonable, but it was proper, that the majority should be on the side of those who have the majority in the House. But the hon. gentleman opposite, who had a majority in the House of about two to one, recognized through a series of years, and up to the year 1884, the special circumstances belonging to this committee, and had the committee composed as nearly as might be of an equal number of members. In the year 1885 the hon. gentleman proposed to change that, and he proposed a committee in which the number on the side of the majority should be very considerably increased. I objected. He did not propose that our number should be increased at all; he left them at four, and he put at either six or seven, the number of gentlemen who were to belong to the side of the majority. I pointed out the special circumstances which had been recognized for all these years as applying to the constitution of this committee, the practice which had been pursued, and I requested that it should be maintained. The hon. gentleman declined to maintain it in its integrity, but he agreed to add one member, a member for the minority, and thus the committee was increased to twelve, being five from the side of the Opposition and seven from the side of the Ministerialists. That, of course, did not preserve the proportion, did not keep as nearly an equality as possible, but it

Mr. WELDON.

mitigated the injustice which the hon. gentleman had designed and proposed to the House. Well, since that time, in 1886, the committee was renewed in the same way. Now, we come to a new Parliament in which there has been no circumstance which entitles the hon. gentleman to propose that the Ministerial side should be increased on the committee; but what the hon. gentleman proposes is that the Ministerial strength should be still further increased on this committee. He proposes that there should be eight Ministerialists to five members of the Opposition on that committee now. That is proceeding in the same improper direction, although the popular voice has not indicated to the hon. gentleman that he has got any right to make such an assumption at all. I, therefore, object to the constitution of the committee in these proportions. I am sorry, also, to find that the hon. gentleman should have proposed to strike off the committee, a number of gentlemen formerly, and still, members of this House, who have taken an active and intelligent interest in the discharge of the labors of the committee. I believe that there is, perhaps, none of the committees in which an acquaintance with the duties, an acquaintance with the permanent staff, and an acquaintance with the general run of the business, is more important than with reference to the Debates Committee; and for my part, and to the extent to which I may have any voice at all in the selection of the members of the committee, I shall endeavor to promote the notion that those members who have satisfactorily acted in the past should not be withdrawn from the committee in the future. I am not myself a very great admirer of the notion that there is an absolute necessity in this House, twenty years after Confederation, of each Province being represented *nominatim* upon each and every single committee we strike. It seems to me to be a very painful confession—if it is a confession we are called upon to make, and the hon. gentleman made it yesterday for himself and repeated it to-day—that we cannot trust one another sufficiently, but that, in order to remedy some apprehended injustice to each Province, each Province must always be represented on each committee. This is the proposal which the hon. gentleman makes, and by which he proposes to justify, as I understand, first, the enlargement of the committee, and secondly, the changes he makes in its number. However, I am not going to quarrel with the notion that the committee should be enlarged, to the extent of pushing my objection to a vote. I differ from the view that the business of the House requires this committee to be enlarged, and my opinion is that there will be a greater sense of responsibility, that the work will be better done by the small, than by the larger, committee. But I do most emphatically object to this alteration, this still further alteration, in the proportions of this committee to the disadvantage of the gentlemen sitting on your left, which is now proposed; and also, in so far as we are to be represented on the committee, I think we would prefer to be represented by those who have represented us in times past—to a certain extent, at any rate. My hon. friend from the Island of Prince Edward (Mr. McIntyre), who is proposed to be placed on this committee now for the first time, would, I am sure, if he were in his place, object to the view that either my hon. friend the member for the County of Huntingdon (Mr. Soriver), or my hon. friend the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), should be displaced from the position with the labors of which they have familiarized themselves, in order that, forsooth, the Island of Prince Edward should be represented for fear some injustice might be done to that Island in the preparation of the reports. I, therefore, ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider the construction of the committee, and to arrange for such a disposition of the strength of the committee from one side and the other, as has been recognized in former days, and if the members are to be increased, I should like to propose a substitution

of the name of Mr. Scriver for that of Mr. McIntyre, and the addition of the name of Mr. Somerville, the member for North Brant, to the committee. That would give us the old members, and it would give us six to eight instead of five to eight, which the hon. gentleman proposes. I do not think that is justice, but it is as near justice as I expect.

Mr. BOWELL. As the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, will be satisfied with that change, with even that measure of justice, I shall be very glad to accept his proposition. But I must at the same time dissent *in toto* from the principle he has laid down that because the members of the committee have been changed, or that because a majority of that committee may belong to this side of the House, therefore, in a matter of this kind, at least, the committee would not do that justice which has always been meted out to the Opposition by the Debates Committee. I may mention that it was not from any want of confidence, on the part of those who selected this committee, in the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), or in the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), that their names were left out; but it was necessary in forming a large committee in adopting the principle which I laid down when making the motion, that some members of the committee must be left out. Some of those who were left out belong to the Conservative party and represent constituencies in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, but certainly it was not for the reason that we had not confidence in them but because, in a committee which was to represent the whole House, in supervising the reporting of the debates, we thought that it was much better that each section of the Dominion should be represented. I have no objection to accept the proposition made by the leader of the Opposition, to substitute the name of Mr. Scriver for that of Mr. McIntyre and to add Mr. Somerville to the committee.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the performance of the simple task assigned to me upon the present occasion I would earnestly crave the indulgence of yourself, Sir, and this honorable House. Although not a young man, I am a young member, and he who for the first time addresses you, Sir, in the presence of these hon. gentlemen, must be deeply impressed with the dignity of his audience, and must feel all that trepidation of heart which a novice experiences when he first displays his raw accomplishments before those who are the masters of his art. If, therefore, I stumble or falter in that which I desire to do, I trust that you, Sir, will kindly forget that I have failed, and only remember that I have tried to do my duty. His Excellency, in the first paragraph of his Speech congratulates us upon the great prosperity of the country and upon a coming season of progress and peace. It is gratifying to us to hear that the country is thriving, quiet and prosperous, and that the prospect for the future is equally bright and cheering. However widely hon. gentlemen may differ in their opinions in regard to the best means of promoting this peace and prosperity, yet I am sure all have the same end in view, and it must be to them a source of the highest satisfaction, a most pleasing reward for their arduous labors in this House, to learn of the well-being and the well-doing of our people, and to know that peace and plenty dwell amongst them. As loyal and attached subjects of Her Majesty the Queen, we, in common with all who in other lands bear to her true allegiance, would offer our most hearty congratulations upon the near completion of the

50th year of her mild and beneficent reign. At the period of Her Majesty's accession to the Throne, a century and a quarter had nearly elapsed since a lady ruled in England. The world, and especially the British world, had changed marvellously in that time. Not only were the social, industrial and economical condition of her people altered, but the lines of political liberty had been extended, the franchise had been widened, and new and very different ideas had been introduced regarding the rights of the people and the political influence and prerogatives of the Crown. Many of Her Majesty's predecessors were sovereigns largely endowed with intellectual gifts of the highest order, yet I venture to say that none better, and few as well, apprehended and appreciated the spirit of the age, the temper of the times, as did that innocent, simple-minded, blushing maiden, Queen Victoria, fifty years ago. None have ever better or more clearly understood the wishes of the people, interfered less with the popular will, or performed more acceptably or more diligently all the onerous duties of an exemplary constitutional sovereign. And while we have the highest admiration for her political discernment and sagacity, let us not forget that her personal and private virtues as a daughter, wife and mother have illumined the Throne with a resplendent moral grandeur which shines through all the earth, and shall continue to shine long after the fame of her greatness as a monarch shall have become dim in the memories of men. We are dutiful and respectful to our most able sovereign, the Queen, but our hearts have their argument as our understandings have, and it is our love and reverence for a pure and noble woman that sing so lustily

"God Save our gracious Queen,
Long live our noble Queen,
God save the Queen."

But to us, as the representatives of the people of this Dominion, the year of Her Majesty's jubilee suggest many and varied thoughts. Fifty years ago, of the Provinces which form the Confederation some were altogether unknown and some were known by names other than those they now bear. Our people were few, scarcely one-third of their present number, our revenues were small and their sources limited and unproductive, our public improvements were insignificant, and communication between the separate Provinces was difficult and rare; our agriculture was crude and unscientific, and manufactures, in the proper acceptance of the term, had neither a local habitation nor a name. We were hewers of wood (in a literal sense) and drawers of water for the skilled workmen of other lands. Our value as a mart for commerce was but trifling, and other nations, if they thought of us at all, regarded us with indifference, if not with pity and contempt. But worse than all, fifty years ago the people of each of the older Provinces were involved in bitter dissensions amongst themselves. One branch of the Legislature was arrayed against the other, one class of society was not in sympathy with another class. We hear the ominous sounds of popular grievances, governmental scandals, bills of right and most comprehensive resolutions. We hear the shouts of fiery orators, the whisperings of ardent plotters, crimination and recrimination, till we witness the pitiable sight of the whole inflammable mass wrapped in the consuming flames of civil war. We who are today so peaceful, dutiful and loyal, had no pleasanter spectacle to exhibit to our young and inexperienced Queen fifty years ago, in the beginning of her reign, than the citizens of one common country arrayed in virulent opposition to each other, grasping each other by the throat, seeking each other's lives,—dead patriots, blazing buildings, and garments rolled in blood. Fifty years under the wise and mild government of Her Majesty the Queen have changed all that. We are an orderly, law-abiding people, and although in this period there have been outbreaks of violence, yet

these have been confined to a remote corner of our territory and to a very few of the people, and have been so deeply regretted by all classes of the community that they cannot be reckoned now as impairing the peace-loving character of Canadians. The people of this Dominion look, and wisely look, to their representatives in this House, and confide in their sense of justice, their love of fair play, their intelligence and their patriotism, to ensure that they will, as far as the constitution of our country permits, remove all sectional animosities; that they will allay all discontent, redress every grievance and right every wrong. After these fifty years our people number five millions, our revenues are buoyant and productive, showing for nine months of the current year a surplus of nearly a million and a quarter, and the end of the financial year promises to pay a very handsome compliment indeed to the careful management of the present Ministry. Our public works are magnificent and of essential utility; our agriculture, in its different branches of grain, stock and fruit, and our manufactures of every kind, aided and encouraged by a wise policy, are making rapid strides; interprovincial communication is easy, cheap and rapid; the intelligence, the thrift, the virtues and the enterprise of our people make our future sure. Fifty years hence he who stands in the same relation to the Parliament of that day as I do to this—the mover of the Address—will, I hope, be able to present a picture brighter than the one I have attempted to outline—the figures on the canvas larger, more clearly defined and suffused with a richer glow. He will, I hope, be able to speak of a people four times as numerous as now we are, of revenues productive and adequate, of vast improvements, of increased activity and remuneration in every art and labor of life. He may tell you of a Dominion not only prosperous as a whole, but every Province therein solvent and self-sustaining, and that “better terms,” from its long disease, has become an obsolete phrase; of a population patriotic, and, if not homogeneous, united, happy and contented; of Canada’s great works, her widened fame and merited glory. The display of Canadian products at the recent Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London, a display encouraged by the Government, contributed by the people and strenuously aided by our indefatigable and indomitable High Commissioner, must have a tendency to enlarge the knowledge and diffuse more correct ideas of our country and its capacities; it must drive from the common mind of Europeans that lingering dread that, after all, Canada is only a few square miles of snow. The excellence of our varied productions from the workshop, the field, the forest or the mine, will convince the intelligent observer who is looking for a wider and less crowded field for his labor and his energies, or for the investment of his small capital, that here, at least, under the British flag, is a country highly civilized and well developed, temperate in climate, productive in soil; that here there is wealth for honest labor, here a reward for toil, here a comfortable competency in age for youthful labor and a sober life. Let us hope that the many advantages which Canada possesses—and has shown so decisively that she possesses them—will attract to our country many thousands of the worthy and industrious poor from other lands. It is earnestly to be hoped that the negotiations on the fishery questions at present going on between Her Majesty’s Government and that of the United States—negotiations in which we are largely interested—may terminate in a peaceful solution of the present misunderstanding. It is the desire of every Canadian to be on amicable terms with the great Republic to the south of us, and for this reason we wish that the settlement may be in accordance with right and justice; for there can be no hearty goodwill between either individuals or nations when there is persistent aggressiveness on one side and a firm determination to resist on the other. Of this matter,

Mr. PORTER.

however, we shall be able to form a fuller and more correct judgment when the papers which are promised are carefully perused. The proposed changes and improvements in the different Departments of Justice, Customs and Inland Revenue, and the formation of a new Department of Trade and Commerce under a responsible Minister will, I have no doubt, be made in so careful and liberal a spirit that the effectiveness of each service will be much increased, and the country will derive much benefit therefrom. A very pleasing evidence of the growth and development of the North-West Territories is the presence in this House of hon. members from that portion of the Dominion—once designated the “Great Lone Land”—and the increasing importance of these great Provinces is still further attested by the proposed measure to give them representation in the Senate. Our fellow countrymen there will then feel that they are indeed citizens of this great Confederation, and that they, in concert with others, are shaping the destinies of a nation. Our intimate trade connections with our own far west will not be completed until the continuous navigation of our great inland waters is entirely in our own hands and free from foreign caprice. A trans-continental railway within our own borders will be most fittingly supplemented by uninterrupted navigation from the lower lakes to Port Arthur, at which these two great lines of Canadian trade and commerce will unite and pour their rich burdens of freight upon the country beyond. The prudence, skill and tenacity of purpose which gave to our country the Canadian Pacific Railway will find in the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal a fitting, proper, congenial and most suitable complement to that great work. I have the honor to move the Address in reply to the Speech of His Excellency.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). In reading in the columns of *Hansard* the speeches which had been made by the movers and seconders of the several Addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne, for the twenty Sessions of Parliament since the union of the Provinces, it is noteworthy that those speeches are characterised by a resolute and stubborn spirit of optimism, and that in years of leanness as in years of plenty the men who have delivered these speeches have taken a cheerful view of their country and of the capacity of its Government. Therefore the traditions of this House pledge one to that spirit of cheerfulness which the conditions of the country to-day so fully warrant. I heartily agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Porter) with regard to the paragraph of the Address congratulating Her Majesty on having reached the fiftieth anniversary of her accession to the Throne. We remember with some little humiliation that almost the very first thing that our young Queen knew of her Canadian Provinces was that they were rather troublesome and turbulent Provinces, which were causing her some anxiety; although we, who come from the Maritime Provinces, can recall with some complacency that her Provinces down by the sea were behaving themselves at that time in the most admirable manner. But counting ourselves now as one country after those fifty years have gone by, we are glad to tell her that we have a united Canadian people who have amply atoned for their turbulence of that time; that we are in the habit of giving something better than smooth words of loyalty—that we have done a heroic act in consolidating her Empire—that we have given to her, by a great sacrifice, a strong, secure military route, over which the Queen can send her soldiers from the British Islands to her possessions in the far East without ever touching a foreign land. In approaching the so-called fishery question between Her Majesty’s Government and that of the United States, we are pleased to learn that the resources of diplomacy for the settlement of that question have not yet been

exhausted, and we hope that up to the present hour they have not even been seriously taxed. It is so delicate a question that we approach it with a feeling of restraint, as if we were walking over fires concealed under treacherous ashes. It has been said by an eminent statesman that diplomacy has her triumphs, not less renowned than the triumphs of war. Certainly the history of the fishery question during the last hundred years, between the two great powers who rule over this continent, does not record any great diplomatic triumphs. The history of that question we cannot now enter upon. It is enough to say that the rights and duties of those two nations in respect of the fisheries are to-day governed by what is known as the Convention of London, entered into in 1818—that whatever our rights are in this matter, they rest on that treaty, and are not determined by any earlier treaty, nor by the rules of public law; and if that treaty is clear, our rights and duties are clear. That treaty simply says, with respect to the rights of the two parties to the fisheries along the Canadian coast, that the Americans have hereby renounced forever the liberty to take fish in what are known as the territorial Canadian waters, and also the liberty to enter the bays and harbors of Her Britannic Majesty's possessions in North America for any purpose whatever, except for the single purpose of asylum—for the purpose of shelter and repairs, wood and water. It is true, during the 70 years which have elapsed since that treaty was entered into, the conditions under which American fishermen made use of the deep-sea fisheries have greatly changed. Arrangements which in 1818 did not press heavily on American fishermen are to-day very burdensome. The mackerel, the herring, and the other fish which were found abundantly along their own coasts at that time, have, in the intervening years, migrated eastward and northward, and are now found chiefly along the Canadian coasts; and so the migration of the fish, the changed conditions under which they are taken by the fishermen, and the development of railway and steam communication from the provincial ports to the American markets—all these things have made a treaty that was not found oppressive 70 years ago most oppressive to-day. Therefore, we can sympathize with our neighbors, and can understand their desire to enter our harbors and ports, either for the renewal of supplies, for the purchase of fresh bait, and to tranship their cargoes from their fishing schooners in order that they may be carried by rail and steamship to the American ports. It is very natural that they should desire—for they have a strong commercial interest in doing so—to have a basis of supply near their fishing grounds. But under the plain wording of the treaty they have no right to enter our waters, except for the one single purpose of refuge; and if the Convention of 1818 had been drafted last night by an officer of the Fishery Department of Canada, with the view of governing and protecting Canadian fishermen, I do not know how the terms could be more clearly drawn. Our American neighbors complain that we have been harsh and niggardly and technical in the construction of that great instrument. There is a sentiment of justice under that complaint, namely, that it is not right on the part of any great people to construe a treaty harshly, niggardly, and in a technical spirit. But there are no two interpretations of that treaty possible in regard to the subject-matter in dispute. Its terms are clear and unambiguous, and when we say that we rest on our treaty rights, it is no answer for our American friends to say: "Oh, we are sixty millions of people." If we were disposed, Sir, to reflect upon the way in which our neighbors have construed treaties, we could show, I think, in respect to a much more recent treaty than the London Convention of 1818—in respect to the Treaty of Washington of 1871—that our neighbors have been somewhat technical and narrow in the construction of that treaty. In the first article of the Treaty of Washington a

provision was made for the free admission to American ports for 12 years of fish the produce of Canadian fisheries, and within five years after that contract was entered into, the American Government placed a duty of something like 125 per cent. on the cans carrying the fish. Another provision of that treaty was that Canadians should have free access for 12 years to American ports for fish oils the produce of our fisheries, and not long afterwards their Government decided that seal oil was not fish oil, and a duty of 20 per cent. was imposed on seal oil entering their ports from Canada. It is a matter of pride, I think, to all of us in this House, that our own Administration has not seen fit to adopt that method of construing these instruments. The Canadian Government have not sought to harass American fishermen. They have had no desire to put any compulsion on them with the view of securing a re-opening or settlement of the fishery question, or with the view of forcing our neighbors to enter into new trade relations with us. I think nothing has been farther from the thoughts of our people. But, Mr. Speaker, when we come to rest upon our exact rights, when we read the treaty and find that its words are clear and distinct, we are justified in saying that although the 60,000,000 of Americans to the south of us are conscious of their strength, we are 5,000,000 of Canadians in the north who are equally conscious of our rights. We are children of two great historical races in the Old World who over the sea in times past were not wont under a threat to abate one jot or tittle of their claim to their own property or their rights. We do, nevertheless, anticipate with the Administration that the negotiations which are in progress will result in an arrangement favorable and satisfactory to both nations; and our hopes rest not alone on the clearness of our rights, not alone on the military strength of the Empire to which we belong, and the consciousness of its support, but very largely on the common sense and fair-mindedness of the great body of the American people. In that country there exists a public opinion, somewhat inert, somewhat slow to move, yet with as keen a regard for law and as high a sense of honor as we could have, and when this fishery question has moved along, if unhappily it does, to a more acute stage, when it will cease to be the clamor of a small section of the country whose interests are seriously affected, when it seems to touch the national honor, then the whole American people will consider this question, ascertain their legal position, enquire into their rights and cheerfully accord to us all we are entitled to. That great country has, I am sure, no desire to stain its honor with the unpardonable crime of perfidy. We are glad, therefore, to learn that the necessary provision has been made for the protection of our inshore fisheries, not by way of menace or bad temper, but in simple and manly self-respect. The establishment of a Department of Trade and Commerce, under the supervision of a special Minister, is a proper subject for congratulation. If, unhappily, our trade relations with our neighbors, which are menaced, should be in any way adversely interfered with by any action on their part, it will be our imperative duty to seek other outlets for the produce of our farms, fisheries, mines, mills and factories, and by the establishment of this Department of Trade and Commerce the Government will show that they are fully alive to the interests of the people and to the necessity of making the strongest possible efforts to extend our trade in every direction. I ask to be allowed now to thank the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government for the honor he has done the county which I have the honor to represent in inviting me to second this Address, and I desire to thank him and the other hon. members of this House for the patience with which they have listened to my remarks. May I be permitted also to express, on behalf of the new members, the feeling of pride we all share in finding ourselves sitting here for the first time in this legislative chamber, along with illustrious statesmen on both sides of

the House whom I was taught to reverence years ago, and who are held in high honor by the people for the patriotism and courage and political capacity and eloquence which they have brought to the administration of public affairs and to the influencing of public opinion.

On paragraph 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Upon former occasions similar to this, I have felt it my duty to enter at some little length into a review of the political events and developments of the year, as the year has passed from one Session to the other without any appeal to the people; and the hon. gentleman who leads the Government has more than once objected to the somewhat exhaustive, and, I suppose I may say, to some people, perhaps to the majority of the House, the somewhat exhaustive review which I felt it my duty to make; but the character of the Speech which was read the other day and the character of the Address which we are asked to make in answer to that Speech are both so harmless, so entirely innocuous—there is so very little indeed in them—that I think they may, conjoined with the other circumstances to which I am about to refer, induce me upon this occasion to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and to delay for a much shorter period even than I have formerly done our progress to the real business of the Session. I am glad to be able to congratulate the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the answer to the Speech from the Throne on both the manner and the matter of their addresses. They certainly did themselves credit, if for nothing more than this: that there was no word used by them calculated to promote an acrimonious discussion or protracted debate, so that the Speech itself, being of the character to which I referred, and the hon. gentleman who proposed the reply having addressed us in these tones, there is the less need or occasion for engaging in lengthy discussion. Not having had the satisfaction of having met on former occasions these hon. gentlemen or being able to gauge their respective qualities for the discharge of such an important duty, I, of course, was not aware of the special qualifications which they have shown to-day; and, in ignorance of those special qualifications, I confess that I had myself made a forecast of two other hon. gentlemen as perhaps, upon reviewing the situation, the fittest persons to present the case of the Government on this occasion. I refer to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird). I quite agree, after having heard these hon. gentlemen, that my view was arrived at in ignorance of those special qualifications which they had for the discharge of the duty. Now, the hon. gentleman adverted in grateful and graceful terms to the happy circumstances that we are asked to day to express at an early stage, what I dare say we shall be asked in some more formal manner at a future time to express, our feelings upon the subject of this being the jubilee year of the Queen, and I was glad to be able to notice that the general sentiments with which they regarded that happy event were such as can be shared by us all. There is no doubt that the British Empire during those fifty years has developed in the most extraordinary manner. To us, who are interested in the development of this particular portion of the Empire, enormous in area if not in population as yet—to us, amongst the most interesting circumstances which are recalled to our mind by the occurrence of this jubilee year, are not our material progress, not our increasing population, not even the conjunction of the various Provinces, but the fact that under the rule of the Queen the principles of self-government, of popular government, may be said to have almost begun and received that high degree of development which they have received within the area of British North America. I do not share, perhaps it is natural that I should not, coming from the Province of Ontario, the sentiments of humiliation with which the hon.

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) seemed to recur to a portion of the events of fifty years ago. I quite agree that there were circumstances which then occurred which had better not have occurred, but I would tell him that amongst the most honored men on both sides of politics in the old Province of Canada, and since the Canadian Confederation was formed, have been found men who were active and prominent in the events to which he looks back with humiliation, and that not least amongst their titles to the sympathy and confidence of their fellow-countrymen in these latter years has been the recollection of the prominent and outspoken, if imprudent and reckless, part which they took in vindication of that which now all acknowledge was the essence of popular liberty. Nor, although that agitation which culminated in unhappy risings in Upper Canada and in Lower Canada in 1837 did not reach the same head in the Provinces from one of which the hon. gentleman comes, can I forget that the man whose name was for many years most loved and most venerated in the whole region of the Maritime Provinces, and whose reputation and power extended even in those old days of difficult communication—of absence of communication—far beyond the Maritime Provinces, and reached the west, was Joseph Howe, who took a prominent and active part in that constitutional agitation which brought Nova Scotia happily not through bloodshed or open insurrection, because it was not necessary, but brought Nova Scotia also to the front in the struggle for responsible government. I rejoice then that we have reached the recognition so long ago of the vital principle of self-government, and that the principle—the exceptions to its operation growing less from year to year—has been from year to year more and more recognized that we do control our own concerns; and the happy condition of loyalty to the British Crown and to the noble lady whose head is surmounted by that Crown to-day is not based merely upon tradition, not merely upon an unreasoning love for the past, but exists because it is her good fortune to have had a reign which has been commensurate with the growth and development in these Provinces of the principle of self-government, because we know that the reign of the Queen is synonymous here with the reign of the people, and therefore it is that in Canada the secure foundation of the Throne lies in the fact that it rests upon the hearts of the Queen's Canadian subjects. There is, however, a blot upon the jubilee year, and it is a blot which deeply affects us, and deeply affects us in a direction to which this Speech refers, and to which the hon. gentlemen have alluded. There is a country, there is a part of the so-called United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in which these principles of self-government and popular government, government according to the well-understood wishes of the people, have not yet been accorded to the citizens of that land; and I am sure that we shall do our duty as loyal subjects to Her Majesty, as promoting to the uttermost the peace and harmony and prosperity of her reign, if we express the opinion upon all suitable occasions that it would be a happy, a providential dispensation if the jubilee year of the Queen should see in all her vast dominions which are fitted for the application of constitutional government that principle of the government by the people, according to its well-understood wishes thoroughly applied. The hon. gentlemen have alluded, as the Speech has alluded, to the condition of the fishery question. Now, with reference to that question, the Government has, during the period which has elapsed since negotiations were opened, continuously invited abstention from discussion on the floor of this House, and I think that there never has been an occasion in which a question of such great and far-reaching consequence to a free people parliamentarily governed, has been prosecuted so long a time without parliamentary ventilation and discussion as this fishery question. I do not intend, in view of the statement

in the Speech, to depart at this day from the course which, at the request of the hon. gentleman opposite, I chalked out for myself upon previous occasions. There was a time when I thought it right that we should speak. It was a time when action of a particular description ought, in our opinion, to have been taken, and, when the Government declined to take that action, we felt it our duty to invite the House to agree that that action should be taken; but since these negotiations have been going on, we have known little and we have said less. I am told—I have not had the good fortune of seeing them—that important state papers on this subject have been distributed in the Imperial Houses and in the Congress of the neighboring country. I see by the Speech that at length we are to have some too, but as they have been published to the people of the Empire through the proceedings in the Imperial Parliament, and as I believe they have been published to the people in the United States, to a large extent, through the proceedings in Congress, I trust the promise which is made in the Speech will be redeemed at the earliest possible day, and that the papers will be laid before us, not in manuscript but in printed form, which I have no doubt the Government, according to its duty, has taken order for, even before the commencement of the Session. The rule I have just stated for myself precludes me until these papers come down from considering whether it is fit to engage in a discussion of the situation. I confess to some regret at the very faint character of the language in which we are permitted to hope for an adjustment. I observe that all that is said is that negotiations are still in progress, and will, we may be permitted to hope, result in an arrangement honorable and satisfactory. That certainly is not a very great encouragement. I hope that the results will be even stronger—well, they could not be weaker—than the statement. Nor is that statement, faintly encouraging as it is, altogether without some drawback. In another portion of the Speech, we find that, expressly with a reference to the possibility of the interruption of intercourse, and that necessarily in view of possible retaliatory measures by the United States, we are called upon to make an appropriation for the construction of a Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and so the completion of the much-despised water stretches of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Now, I said that the Speech itself contained a reference of a topic which indicated the importance of the removal of that blemish on the jubilee year of the Queen, to which I referred, and the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in the observation which he made, in many of which I am glad to be able heartily to concur, as to the conduct and character and temper of the United States, touched upon something which I think deserves the least word of supplement. He said, and I hope he was right in saying it, I believe he was right in saying it, that there was much dependence to be placed upon the common sense and just spirit of the people of the United States. But, Sir, I would wish to remind him and all of us, that independent altogether of the difficulty which is created by the local feeling and the special personal interests of the fishermen of the United States, and independent altogether of that general feeling of a disposition to assert a supposed national dignity, sometimes unnecessarily, on the part of a great power like the United States, there is always before us this, that the sore with reference to Ireland creates a body of public feeling in that country hostile not to Canada because it is Canada, but to Canada because it may be a means of humiliating and interfering with England; and, therefore, we have an additional reason for the hope which I ventured to express as earnestly entertained by one, and, I hope, by both sides of the House on this question. The hon. gentleman alluded to the additional step which we find has been for these many years designed for the promotion of trade and commerce. We have been going on since 1880 promoting our trade and commerce.

We have been told since the year 1880, Session after Session, not merely with that spirit of optimism which distinguishes speakers who move and second the address, but also with rather an extension of that spirit on the part of hon. gentlemen controlling the affairs of the country, and their supporters, that the extension and development of our trade and commerce were most satisfactory. Each year we heard the same story. But one hon. gentleman has told us that in view, once again, of possible difficulty with our neighbors, an extra effort is now required, and it seems that effort is to take the form of another department. I remember the last time when an increase in the number of the Cabinet Ministers was proposed in Parliament. It was in the fall of 1873, in the Session in the course of which you first made your appearance on the floors of this House. You had not an opportunity any more than myself of expressing an opinion upon that proposition. But circumstances, to which I hope the state of feeling and the harmony of the proceedings of to day would make it almost unmannerly to allude further, rendered that proposition the object of a premature death and of a silent burial. But at length, fourteen years later, it is revived. I hope that everything that can be done for the promotion of our trade and commerce will be done. I hope, however, that in promoting our trade and commerce it will be found possible to combine the accomplishment of that object which we have so much at heart, with the utilization of some of the existing light offices, so that we may not at the same time add still further to the taxes and the expenses of the Government. We have got a President of the Council, we have got a Secretary of State, whose official duties are very light, I think. I said official duties. There are other duties which I know the hon. gentleman who shakes his own head—and shakes his head for the hon. Secretary of State as well—performs, that are very onerous, very onerous, indeed, but I am not quite certain that the character of those duties is such as ought to induce this House to agree to the creation of a new Minister in order that the present Ministers may have more leisure to discharge those duties. Now, Sir, this appears to be the main proposition. We find some statements, more moderate than statements that I have seen on former occasions, with reference to the condition of the country, statements which we will be better able to analyze and discuss when we get the public documents which are awaiting us, and on which I need not trouble the House just now. You have also a reference to some proposed improvements, some small matters of administration, and very little else. It appears that it is intended, in so far as Government business is concerned, that we shall not have very much to trouble us this Session. I never read a Speech from the Throne which was less promising of good things. The only plum, in point of fact, that we are promised is a new Minister, who is not, I suppose to be a Plumb. But, Sir, as there is so little here, as we are met here very late, and as consequently we are all desirous of getting to the real business of the Session, I propose, as I said in opening, to follow the suggestions made some time ago on two other occasions by the First Minister and so admirably seconded, in fact, if not in words, by the mover and seconder of this Address, not further to protract my observations, in order that we may, as soon as we can, enter upon the duties which we were elected to perform.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite evident that we are a happy family, at all events to-day. Both sides are agreed, both sides are shaking hands, metaphorically, across the floor. The hon. gentleman has extended his favor to the Speech from the Throne, so far as to say that it was harmless. He joined with me—he could not help joining with me and with the House—in expressing himself favorably and eloquently as to the character of the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address. The whole

House must feel that in the accession to their number of the two hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address to-day, the House has been strengthened, and we, on this side in particular, are proud and happy that those gentlemen are reckoned among their number. The hon. gentleman worthily compliments those two gentlemen; but he cannot check himself from making an unpleasant allusion, which was altogether uncalled for. Why, Mr. Speaker, we agree with the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, that in all cases respecting seats, the members, in all cases respecting the right to sit in this House, agree that there should be no politics, there should be no partisan feeling; that we should act in a judicial spirit, and yet the hon. gentleman has shown by his sneer, in reference to two young members of this House, the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and the member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), that he has prejudged both their cases. I would ask the hon. member who moved in the case of Queen's county—when this House adjourns and when he has a private and confidential conversation with his leader—to give him a warning that it would be just as well to avoid that kind of acrimony, and not so quickly show his partisanship and desire to fight the battle too strongly. The hon. gentleman, in his recollection of the past, speaks of fifty years ago, and reproves the seconder of this motion for speaking of those days as days of humiliation. Mr. Speaker, they were days of humiliation to all parties, because it is a great humiliation for a country to see, rightly or wrongly, the people of the same race, of the same country, and subjects of the same Government, flying at each other's throats. We were all humiliated in that regard. Thank God! those days have long past. Thank God! there is no longer that war of races. Thank God! we are all loyal subjects of Her Majesty. Thank God! we can all look back and respect those men who fought on one side or on the other, for we know that there was a feeling of right and of justice on both sides, that both sides of those who were drawn up in hostile array judged they were acting rightly and conscientiously. But those days of humiliation, those days of misery, those days of conflict are now gone, and we, as the hon. gentleman who has seconded the motion has truly said, can look back with philosophy upon those unhappy days and those wretched and miserable events. The hon. gentleman spoke with some good feeling, and very proper feeling, about one of the earliest exponents of political freedom and of the earliest advocates of responsible government, and mentioned the honored name of the Hon. Joseph Howe. But we can all remember how that honored statesman, when sinking in this House under the weight of disease, and of years of unhappy circumstances, was hounded and vilified by some of the hon. gentlemen who cheered the leader of the Opposition to-day when he paid that deserved compliment to the father of responsible government in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman, referring to the fishery question, said there has been a great deal of reticence and but little ventilation of that great subject. Sir, there was but little opportunity for ventilation. The subject is well understood in this House; the subject is well understood in this country. The rights of Canada on that question were ventilated years and years ago, were understood years ago and were asserted years ago; and they were asserted in this House, asserted on the statute-book and by the protection of those lawful rights and interests along our maritime shores and coasts. The negotiations going on since must, of course, until something like a result is arrived at, be kept from the public eye. The result so far has been a series of negotiations, a series of interchange of views, and we are permitted to hope that the negotiations will result in an arrangement honorable to both nations, and fully protecting the legal rights and interests of the people of Canada. But in the present uncertainty of the negotiations, and more than all in the great uncertainty as to

whether, if a result is arrived at between the two Governments, it will be sanctioned by the legislative bodies of the two countries, especially by the Congress of the United States, it would have been unwise in the advisers of the Crown to have used stronger language than has been inserted in the Speech. I quite agree in all that has been said respecting the progress and development of our trade and commerce; but I was not prepared for the sneer of the hon. gentleman as to one of the modes which have been adopted by the Government for the development of the trade and commerce of the country. The hon. gentleman says he hopes there are some other steps to be taken than making a new departure. The hon. gentleman must know that from year to year the different Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade of Canada have been representing to the different Governments of the country, have been petitioning and applying for the establishment of such a Department as is proposed, and for the appointment of a Minister specially charged with the interests of trade and the development of the commerce of the Dominion. I have evidence of this desire from every great city in Canada and from every great commercial body formed for the purpose of aiding in the development of trade, and in obedience to this universal cry the Government have resolved to establish a Department specially devoted to those subjects. I am proud to say in this House, I am proud to say it everywhere in Canada, that the establishment of a Bureau of Trade and Commerce is not the only evidence this Government has given of its desire and of its success in developing the trade and commerce of the country. I shall not enter into all the particulars to prove that, it is not necessary in this House. The majority of this House explained that fully to their various constituents before they became their representatives, and the voice of the country has declared it in unmistakable terms. The people supported the Government at the last election because it had been true to the material interests of the Dominion, because it had forwarded all those material interests; and if Canada enjoys at this moment a great degree of prosperity, if her commerce is in a flourishing state, if her people are happy and contented and are looking forward with great hope to the future, it is in a great measure due to the judicious steps and the persistency with which the Government has pursued that which is the one great object in a new country, the development of all its material and social interests. Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more just now. The hon. gentleman has stated that the bill of fare is rather meagre. I shall not go so far as my late revered friend, Sir George Cartier, who on one occasion said in this House that he would never be satisfied till the only measure brought down by the Government of the Day would be the Supply Bill. But in consequence of the general elections taking place in the beginning of the year, which could not be brought on earlier because the rolls under the new Franchise Act had not been completed in many parts of the country, and the premature hurrying on of the elections would have excluded very many of those to whom the Franchise Bill had given the right to vote, this House has met later in the spring than usual. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will be very glad indeed, considering that we have got a good body of laws on the statute book and have got them in such a form, revised as they are, that every man can understand them, will be gratified and satisfied at very little general legislation being undertaken this year. I am glad to see, Sir, that the amount of Private Bill legislation of every form to be introduced this Session for the purpose of advancing almost every industry in Canada, and assisting in the development of our material and physical resources, affords a strong evidence of the enterprise and prosperity of the country and of the feeling in Canada that we are in a prosperous condition, and that we are entering on a

Mr. Speaker

See page 11 for record

season of great development and material prosperity and progress.

Paragraphs 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That the said resolutions be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Charles Tupper, and Messrs. Porter and Weldon (Albert).

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the committee, reported the draft of an Address, which was read the first and second time and ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the hon. the Privy Council.

SUPPLY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Right Honorable Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B., President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, the Honorable Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G., Minister of Public Works, the Honorable Sir Charles Tupper, G.C.M.G., O.B., Minister of Finance, and the Honorable Mr. Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purpose and under the provisions of the Act intitled; "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 14th April, 1887.

REPORTS.

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Annual Report of the Department of Marine for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Mr. Foster.)

Tables of Trade and Navigation for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending 31st December, 1886.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Mr. McLelan.)

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Mr. Costigan.)

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

Mr. BLAKE. I do not observe that the report of the Auditor General has been laid on the Table. I presume from the thinness of the volume presented by the Finance Minis-

ter, that the suggestion that has been made for some time past of avoiding much of the duplication of these tables has been acted upon, and that the real details are in the other report. Therefore it is the other report which we want but which we have not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has judged aright, and that accounts for the great thinness of the volume I have laid on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. Too thin.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not be considered too thin, I think, when it is supplemented by the report of the Auditor General, which will soon be laid on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely, meeting here on the 13th of April, we should have had that report long ago. My impression has been that many of these reports would be of great advantage to us, if, according to the custom of other countries, they were given to the public, or at least the substance of them, without waiting until they are nine months after date. But it is an extraordinary circumstance that on the 15th of April, the report of the Auditor General for transactions terminating on the 1st July previous, is not laid before us, and that the Minister of Finance cannot tell us when it will be.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will be quite satisfied when I tell him that the one reason why it is not laid on the Table, is that it may give him the information down to the latest possible period. I have no doubt that on Monday it will be laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:50.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th April, 1887.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on the 14th inst., reported lists.

Mr. BLAKE. There are a great many new members in the House, and I think the House should have an opportunity of seeing the selections made, so as to save trouble afterwards. There may be some changes required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say it is understood among the members that I should not move the adoption of this report to day, and I find there are one or two mistakes which we will correct quietly to-morrow.

REPORTS.

Report of the Auditor-General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works, for the fiscal year 1885-86, on the works under his control.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, for the year ending 1886.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DAVIN moved first reading of Bill (No. 2) to establish full representative government in the North-

West Territories. He said: I hope the House will permit me to alter the title of the Bill. The title here is rather more descriptive of the Bill than I intended. The title is "An Act respecting Local Government in the North-West Territories."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. Some hon. gentlemen desire that I should explain. I do not know that there is anything to explain. I may say this, that we want complete representative government, but not full representative government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the gross public debt of Canada on April 1st, 1887; also, the net public debt, April 1st, 1887?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The gross debt on the 31st March, 1887, was \$270,340,146.80. The net debt on the same date was \$225,865,831.09.

LIABILITIES FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount of liabilities for subsidies to Railways and other purposes under existing Statutes?

Mr. POPE. I would ask my hon. friend to let that stand, as it will take a little time to get that up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad if the hon. Minister of Railways would call the attention of his Department to it, and get it in two or three days. These statements are all statutory, so there should not be much difficulty about them. I also beg to enquire of the Minister of Finance, or whatever other Minister it concerns, what is the estimated amount required to complete public works now in progress chargeable to capital?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The estimated amount required to complete public works now in progress chargeable to capital is \$594,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for the current year, I suppose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman wants the details I can give them now. There is \$124,000 for Cape Tormentine, and then there are the other works; \$300,000 for the new public buildings here, and the rest for smaller works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that include the Welland Canal appropriation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; that is not in my Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that my question goes a good deal further. It refers to all public works now in progress chargeable to capital, which would include all the expenditure on canals, &c.

Mr. POPE. I will give that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you give it now?

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will understand that what I want to get at is a rough estimate of the sum total which it is expected to expend on the Welland Canal and on similar works of magnitude in which we are engaged.

Mr. POPE. It must be a rough estimate, especially in regard to the railways, because subsidies are granted and in a good many cases are expired or are not called for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they are expired you can deduct it.

Mr. POPE. Yes.

NORTH-WEST LAND SALES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sums have been received for the sale of lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories during the ordinary year 1886? How much from the 1st January, 1887, to the 1st April, 1887?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The revenue received was for homesteads, pre-emptions and sales, \$509,341.71; for leases, \$136,618.29. The revenue from sales for the present year, from the 1st January to the 1st April, was for homesteads, pre-emptions and sales, \$93,873.81, and for leases, &c., \$26,179.66.

MANITOBA WHITE POPULATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the actual resident white population of Manitoba, according to the recent census?

Mr. CARLING. According to the recent census in Manitoba, the white population was 95,455.

BOURINOT'S PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish to the new members of this House, copies of M. Bourinot's work on Parliamentary Procedure?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not.

CLOTH SUPPLIED TO PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. BAKER asked, What is the contract price or prices per yard paid by the Government for white flannel and brown and yellow cloth supplied the Penitentiaries of the Dominion; the name or names of the contractor or contractors, duration of contract or contracts, and date and expiry of same?

Mr. THOMPSON. At Kingston Penitentiary the price paid for white flannel is 44½ cents per yard; brown and yellow cloth, 48 cents. Mr. John Lazier has two contracts which expire on the 30th June next. At the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 40 cents per yard is paid for white flannel, and 50 cents for brown and yellow cloth. Lamallice Bros., Montreal, have the contract, which expires on the 30th June next. At the Dorchester Penitentiary the price paid for white flannel is 48 cents per yard, and for brown and yellow cloth 64 cents. Thomas R. Jones, St. John, has the contract, which expires on the 30th June next. At the British Columbia Penitentiary, cloth and flannel is not furnished by contract. The white flannel was furnished by Messrs. Lamallice Bros., the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary contractors, at 53 cents per yard. No brown or yellow cloth was furnished this year (fiscal year) to this penitentiary. In 1885-86 this cloth was supplied by the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary at 74½ cents per yard. It was furnished by the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary owing to the fact that the cloth was wanted in a hurry and before it could be procured by Lamallice Bros. At the Manitoba Penitentiary, 60 cents per yard is paid for white flannel and 44 cents for brown and yellow cloth. The Hudson Bay Company have the contract, which expires the 30th June next.

FLOODS ON THE RIDEAU RIVER.

Mr. EDWARDS asked, Have the Government taken any steps to enquire into the causes of the floods on the

Rideau River, between the city of Ottawa and the Township of Gloucester, with a view of preventing a recurrence of the same. If not, is it the intention of the Government to direct the making of such an enquiry?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department was, last fall, directed to institute enquires into the causes of the flooding of the Rideau. A careful survey has been made, and notes have been taken respecting the breaking up of the ice, the area of the flooded district, &c., and a report will be furnished in a very short time.

REPRINTING BRITISH COPYRIGHT WORKS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay before this House this Session any measure of legislation for placing Canadian publishers upon the same footing as American publishers in regard to the reprinting of British copyright works, or whether it is proposed to invite this House to address Her Majesty upon the subject of modifying any Imperial legislation which is restrictive of the powers of the Canadian Parliament respecting copyright in Canada?

Mr. THOMPSON. The matter is still being considered.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

The Order being called for resolutions on the subject of the granting of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland—(Mr. Curran),

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend, seeing there are a good many members away, who desired to be present when this question comes up, to fix another and an early day for the discussion of this matter. I would suggest Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. CURRAN. Thursday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the said Resolutions be the first Order of the Day on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

FRANCHISE ACT—COSTS OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

A return giving the total cost of the preparation of the voters's list under the Electoral Franchise Act in Canada; together with a detailed statement of the cost in each electoral division for salaries of revising officer, clerk and bailiff, and travelling allowance to each, if any; giving also amount paid for printing lists, and showing to whom paid in each division; the amount paid for advertising, rent of halls, and for every other service connected therewith in each electoral division in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that he will find almost all the information asked for in this motion in the report of the Auditor General, which has just been laid upon the Table of the House and I would ask him to allow this motion to stand until he has examined that report, and then he may move for anything in addition he requires. The great bulk of the information will be found in that report.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I dare say that will be satisfactory. I hope that the information is given in detail, so that it will be in a convenient form—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And that we can get at it without much search and examination. It appears to be the order of the House that these papers stand, and I suppose I must follow the example. Coercion stands too.

Motion allowed to stand.

PRINTING OF THE VOTERS' LISTS.

The Order being called for notice of motion (Mr. Innes) respecting amounts paid for printing the voters' lists, and amounts paid to officials connected therewith,

Mr. INNES. As the design of this motion is similar to that of the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), which has just been allowed to stand, with the consent of the House I beg to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return of the receipts and expenditure, in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of July, 1886, to the 1st day of April, 1887.

He said: By a clerical error the 1st April has been given for the 10th. What I want is what is usually known as the ten days statement. I also wish to add what seems to have been omitted in the printed notice, that I want the usual printed estimates of receipts and expenditure. The hon. Minister will understand that I want the ordinary ten days statement which is usually laid before us.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the exports and imports from the 1st day of July, 1886, to the 1st day of April, 1887, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return in detail showing the description and values of grain and animal products exported from the Dominion of Canada from 1st July, 1886, to 1st April, 1887.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 19th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Mr. Pope.)

Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the year ending 30th June, 1886.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

LIABILITIES FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the hon. gentlemen ready now to give the information asked for by my motion yesterday: The total amount of liabilities for subsidies to railways and other purposes under existing Statutes? The estimated amount required to complete public works now in progress chargeable to capital?

Mr. POPE. I cannot give it very clearly or exactly, because a good deal of this depends on whether they go on with the work. We have assumed obligations, by entering into contracts, to the amount of \$3,268,000.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the amount for which you have contracted, I understand?

Mr. POPE. Yes. Then there is besides that an annual subsidy of about \$250,000. Then with respect to the canals, the amount required to complete works on canals now in progress will be about \$2,000,000.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session providing that members of the North-West Mounted Police shall, after certain terms of service, be entitled to pensions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is under consideration.

NORTH-WEST EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish Experimental Farms in the North-West this year.

Mr. CARLING. The matter is under consideration.

WHARVES AT LONGUEUIL.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE asked, Whether the contract for the construction of the wharves at Longueuil, in the county of Chambly, for the building of which a sum of \$10,000 was voted by this House during its last Session, has been awarded? If so, to whom; and why has the work not been, as yet, begun?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for the wharves at Longueuil was given to Messrs. John Burns and A. Smith, whose tenders were the lowest. The work cannot be commenced until after the river is free from ice. It is to begin shortly.

FRANCHISE ACT—COST OF PREPARING VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

A return giving the total cost of the preparation of the voters' lists under the Electoral Franchise Act in Canada; together with a detailed statement of the cost in each electoral division for salaries of revising officer, clerk and bailiff, and travelling allowance to each, if any; giving also amount paid for printing lists, and showing to whom paid in each division; the amount paid for advertising, rent of halls, and for every other service connected therewith in each electoral division in the Dominion of Canada.

He said: I have examined the report of the Auditor General this morning, and, finding that it does not contain the information I have asked for here, I shall be very much obliged to the Minister of Finance if he will consent to the motion passing, as we could then get the information much more fully and more conveniently than in the report of the Auditor General, which does not give the particulars in the different electoral divisions.

Mr. MILLS. Before the motion is put, I would like to say that it seems to me to require some amendment, in order that the House may get all the information they need. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, perhaps, may tell us whether the Government have decided what amount they propose to pay to these revising officers. If the Government have not yet decided what amount these officers are entitled to, it would be well for us to know what these gentlemen claim, so that we may have some idea what has been the actual cost of the preparation of the voters' lists. If the Government have determined what the amount should be, then they can say so; if they have not yet determined, I think the House ought to know what claim the revising officers are making in reference to compensation. We know that these gentlemen place some value upon their services, and it would be interesting to know what value they have so placed. Now, a return asked for by the

Mr. BLAKE.

motion of the hon. gentleman would not give us that information, and that information it is most desirable the House should possess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are two notices of enquiry on the paper for to-morrow, and I think the hon. gentleman had better let the matter stand as it is.

Motion agreed to.

SCRIP FOR SERVICES IN THE REBELLION.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

A return of those, outside the regularly enrolled militia force, who have been recommended for scrip for services of whatever kind in the late rebellion, either as Volunteers, Home Guards, Scouts, or any other capacity.

He said: There are a few persons in the North-West—not very many—who are interested in the object I have in view in moving for this return, and which I propose briefly to explain to the House. If I confine my remarks to one portion of the class for whom I speak, I think the House will understand the necessity that exists for dealing with the question. It cannot involve much outlay, and it is very undesirable that there should linger any sense of grievance among even a small portion of the people of the North-West. On March 27th, 1885, Mr. D. L. Scott telegraphed to the Minister of Militia:

"Will you authorise enrolment of volunteer rifle or infantry corps, and direct equipments to be forwarded forthwith? Corps will be filled at once."

In answer to that a telegram arrived:

"Yes, authority is given to organize company at Regina. Arms and equipment on the way to Winnipeg."

On the 31st March, Mr. Scott wrote a letter to Lieut.-Col. Houghton, asking for the equipment of his force, and saying in that letter:

"I hope to be able to put them in a shape for active service by the time the arms and equipments reach here."

On 17th April, 1885, Mr. Scott again telegraphed to the Minister of Militia:

"Has my company been placed on active service? When will uniforms be forwarded?"

On the 18th April the following telegram arrived, in answer, from the Minister of Militia:—

"Yes, your company is authorized. Make requisition for equipments."

And later, from Lieut.-Col. Houghton, there came a letter to Mr. Scott telling him:

"Your service roll was duly received and forwarded to headquarters in October last."

Now, Sir, this company was duly organized under the provisions of the Militia Act. I have here, in the *Canada Gazette* of 11th April, 1885, a list of the companies duly enrolled, and I find the Regina company called for actual service. We have a battalion at Winnipeg, Manitoba, under command of Lieut.-Col. Osborne Smith, a battalion at Winnipeg, under command of Lieut.-Col. Scott, M.P., the company at Regina, Capt. David L. Scott, and I call the attention of the House particularly to this last—a company at Birtle, Capt. J. H. Wood. Well, the members of the company were duly enrolled under the provisions of that Act to serve as members of the Regina volunteer company for three years, and were duly sworn in as such. The service roll of the company is on file at this moment in the Militia Department here. The company's status as a volunteer company under the Act was afterwards recognised in the Militia General Orders, as may be seen by the *Canada Gazette* of 18th September, 1885, where, among the corps which were released from service and disbanded was the infantry company, Birtle, Captain Wood. The members of the company, we contend, are entitled to the bounty under Acts 48 and 49

Vic., chap. 73, because, although they were not in actual service, in actual conflict with the enemy, they were members of the enrolled volunteer force, and were actively engaged in bearing arms in the suppression of the rebellion. If it is contended that the company was a home guard within the meaning of the Act, 49 Vic., chap. 29, that Act is not a contracting but an enlarging Act, and is not intended to restrict or narrow the provisions of the former Act. The expressed intention, as may be seen by section 1, is to widen the scope of the original Act by extending its provisions to certain classes who would otherwise be excluded, as, for instance, the members of an irregular force. Now, if we turn to 49 Vic. we find in sub-section A, in clause 1:

"Every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of any irregular force raised by authority and actively engaged in bearing arms in the suppression of the said outbreak, other than as a home guard for the protection of property at or near their place of residence."

That clearly is intended to extend the provisions of the first Act and not to narrow them. But the Regina volunteer force is not within that section, by reason of the fact of having been duly organised and enrolled under the provisions of the Militia Act; it is not an irregular force, and the sub-section only excludes an irregular force serving as home guard. I call the attention of the House to the Birtle company. That company is found mentioned in the *Canada Gazette* of April 11. It is also found again in the *Canada Gazette* of September 18, side by side with the Regina company. But that company, the Birtle company, received the bounty, while the Regina company has not been able to obtain it. The last letter that passed between the Department and Col. Scott was a letter from the Deputy Minister, saying that bounty would not be given. Not only did the Birtle company get bounty, but—and this is the reason I have moved for these returns—it will be found that persons who did not really belong to the regular Militia got bounty, as, for instance, clerks and others engaged in the transport service. Under these circumstances I would urge on the Minister of Militia the necessity of dealing with this question in a comprehensive manner. The expense could not be much, and it is a very undesirable thing that for the sake of a small economy there should exist among any class of our population a sense of injustice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has brought before the notice of the House, in the most complete manner possible, the question of how the scrip was distributed to those who took part in the suppression of the North-West troubles. The action of the Department of Militia is altogether controlled by the Acts on the Statute-book, which the hon. gentleman has correctly quoted. The first Act which was passed authorised the Minister of Militia to recommend the issue of scrip to members of the regularly enlisted militia force of Canada. By a subsequent Act, 49 Vic., chap. 29, this was extended, and to that list of those who were entitled to scrip were added others who in the first Act had not been provided for, in so far as related to receiving the scrip which was accorded to the regularly enlisted militia force. I am quite prepared to bring down, if the hon. gentleman requires it, and to give to the House and the hon. gentleman all possible information in connection with that question. But I must draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that a return of those who under the first Act were recommended to receive scrip would be a very extensive one, and one which would take a great deal of time in preparing. I do not see how, even if such a return were brought down, it would be of any value in conveying any more information than the Act itself conveys, coupled with a list of the regularly enlisted militia who took part in the suppression of the trouble. I think that if the hon. gentleman were to alter the motion so as to ask for a return of those outside of the regularly enlisted militia who were recommended to receive scrip, then all the information which the hon. gentleman requires could be conveyed without much expense

or much loss of time. Of course it is quite impossible for the Department of Militia to travel outside of the Act under which the recommendation for scrip was granted. If it were considered that others should receive that consideration which was accorded to the regular militia force, then the law would have to be altered to cover those exceptional cases to which the hon. gentleman has drawn attention. Outside of the regularly enlisted militia we could not consider the claims of purely home guards, for the simple reason that the Minister of Militia was not authorised, under the Acts passed by Parliament, to consider such claims. However, if the hon. gentleman considers that the motion as proposed should be adopted, I will bring the return down as rapidly as possible, but I would ask him to consider whether it would not be better to amend the motion in the sense I have indicated, so that the names of those outside of regularly enlisted militia who were recommended for scrip should alone be brought down. If this course were followed all the information required would be conveyed without much labor and loss of time, and the hon. gentleman's object would be accomplished.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the suggestion of the hon. Minister is a good one, and will meet the point at which I want to arrive.

Mr. SPROULE. While this subject is under consideration I should like to say a word with respect to the Macdonald Scouts of Moose Jaw. Application was made last year and the previous year, or early and late last year, for the same recompense to be made them as had been made the regular militia. I understand the law would not allow those scouts to obtain that compensation, and to meet their case the law was amended last year. It was, however, subsequently found that it would still not meet their case, and they are now applicants for compensation. I hope, if any change is made in the law, it will be such as will enable those parties to be compensated equally with the active militia. They were engaged as police scouts, travelling all over the country and performing very important duties—duties almost as dangerous as those performed by the troops at Batoche, and those scouts are, therefore, entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Last year I brought up a matter relating to volunteers who were called out and went to great expense in that connection. I refer to the volunteers of St. Andrew's and St. John. As some hon. gentlemen have spoken on behalf of some of the battalions in the west, I hope the Minister of Militia will reconsider his decision of last Session with regard to the cases of those men who, although they were not actually engaged in the conflict, or did not proceed very far on the way, were put to great expense and privation in preparing to do their duty.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the report of the committee appointed to strike the Select Standing Committees, be adopted.

He said: I did not happen to be in the House when the motions were put, and I desire to make a few changes in the composition of these committees. By a mistake of the clerk the name of my hon. friend from Victoria, British Columbia (Mr. Shakespeare), was omitted altogether, whereas on the list as prepared his name was on several of the committees. I propose that Mr. Shakespeare shall replace Mr. Ives on the Public Accounts Committee; that the name of Mr. McDougall (Cape Breton) shall be placed on the Committee of Standing Orders; that of Mr. Montplaisir on the Committee on Railways, Canals and Tele-

graph Lines; Mr. Wilson (Argenteuil) to replace Mr. Smith (South Ontario) on the Committee on Banking and Commerce; Mr. Smith (South Ontario) to replace Mr. Wilson (Argenteuil) on the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation.

Mr. MILLS. I would also suggest the following changes: That the name of Mr. Edwards be substituted for that of Mr. Lister on the Committee for Miscellaneous Private Bills; that the names of Messrs. Langelier (Montmorency) and Turcote be substituted for those of Messrs. Innes and Livingston on the Committee on Standing Orders; that the name of Mr. Ellis be substituted for that of Mr. Trow on the Committee on Public Accounts; that the names of Messrs. Fiset, Flynn and Turcote be substituted for those of Messrs. Charlton, Innes and McMullen on the Committee on Banking and Commerce; and that the name of Mr. Innes be substituted for that of Mr. Turcote on the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I understand that it is necessary to move a separate motion in order that these amendments be made, I beg to move that the changes referred to by the right hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) be made.

Motion agreed to, the said committees being composed as follows:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Girouard,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Hall,	Moncreiff,
Beausoleil,	Ives,	Mulock,
Blake,	Kirkpatrick,	Patterson (Essex),
Caron,	Langelier (Quebec),	Préfontaine,
Casgrain,	Langévin,	Riopel,
Chapleau,	Laurier,	Royal,
Colby,	Lister,	Temple,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson,
Curran,	Mackenzie,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Davies,	McCarthy,	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (St. John), and
Desjardins,	McIntyre,	White (Cardwell).—40.
Edgar,		

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Doyon,	Livingston,
Audet,	Duchesnay,	McIntyre,
Cameron,	Freeman,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Gauthier,	Putnam,
Coughlin,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Couture,	Hale,	Ste. Marie,
Daly,	Hesson,	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Labrosse,	Ward, and
De St. Georges,	Lang,	Yeo.—27.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Fisher,	Patterson (Essex),
Armstrong,	Foster,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bain (Soulanges),	Gaudet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gauthier,	Perry,
Barron,	Geoffrion,	Pope,
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Porter,
Béchar,	Girouard,	Préfontaine,
Bergeron,	Godbout,	Purcell,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Bernier,	Granbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blake,	Guay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Borden,	Guilbault,	Robillard,
Bourassa,	Hale,	Ross,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Royal,
Bowman,	Hall,	Rykert,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Scarth,
Brown,	Hickey,	Scriven,
Bryson,	Holton,	Shakespeare,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Burdett,	Innes,	Shanly,
Burns,	Ives,	Skinner,
Cameron,	Joncas,	Small,
Campbell (Kent),	Jones,	Smith (Montreal),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kenny,	Sproule,
Cargill,	Kirkpatrick,	Stevenson,
Carling,	Labelle,	Sutherland,
Caron,	Landerkin,	Taylor,
Casey,	Landry,	Temple,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Quebec),	Thérien,
Chapleau,	Langévin,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Tisdale,
Choquette,	Lavergne,	Trow,
Cimon,	Lister,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Clayes,	Livingston,	Tupper (Picton),
Cockburn,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Colby,	Mackenzie,	Waldie,
Cook,	McCarthy,	Wallace,
Costigan,	McDougald (Picton),	Watson,
Coursol,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (Albert),
Couture,	McGreevy,	Weldon (St. John),
Curran,	McIntyre,	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	McKay,	White (Renfrew),
Davis,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
De St. Georges,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin),
Desjardins,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Lennox),
Dessaint,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wood (Brockville),
Edgar,	Mitchell,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Montague,	Wright, and
Ferguson (Welland),	Mulock,	Yeo.—147.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Eisenhauer,	McMillan (Huron),
Armstrong,	Ellis,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Audet,	Geoffrion,	Madill,
Barron,	Gillmor,	Mara,
Bell,	Girouard,	Marshall,
Borden,	Guilbault,	Moffat,
Bourassa,	Hale,	Moncreiff,
Burdett,	Hickey,	Montague,
Campbell (Digby),	Holton,	Montplaisir,
Campbell (Kent),	Ives,	Mulock,
Carpenter,	Jamieson,	Reid,
Caron,	Kenny,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Casey,	Labelle,	Robillard,
Chisholm,	Labrosse,	Scriven,
Choquette,	Landry,	Small,
Costigan,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sproule,
Coulombe,	Langelier (Quebec),	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Lavergne,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lovitt,	Ward,
Jaoust,	McCulla,	Watson,
Davin,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	McGreevy,	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Arg'teuil), and
Edwards,	McKay,	Wright.—73.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Welland),	Paterson (Bran),
Bergeron,	Gaudet,	Patterson (Essex),
Brien,	Gigault,	Perry,
Burdett,	Gillmor,	Porter,
Campbell (Digby),	Gordon,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Robertson (King's, P.E.I.),
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Roome,
Clayes,	Lavergne,	Smith (Montreal),
Coughlin,	MacDowall,	Stevenson,
Coulombe,	McKeen,	Sutherland,
Denison,	Marshall,	Thérien,
De St. Georges,	Mills (Annapolis),	Turcote,
Dessaint,	Moffat,	Wilmot,
Dupont,	Montplaisir,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	O'Brien,	Wood (Brockville).—45.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Desjardins,	Somerville,
Bergin,	Foster,	Taylor,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Tisdale,
Bowell,	Innes,	Trow, and
Charlton,	McMullen,	Vanasse.—17.
Davin,	Putnam,	

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Risfret,
Baker,	Gillmor,	Riopel,
Béchar, d,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Rykert,
Bergin,	Holton,	Scriver,
Blake,	Jones,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Langelier (Quebec),	Somerville,
Carling,	Lister,	Taylor,
Cartwright,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Cumberland),
Chapleau,	Mackenzie,	Tupper (Picton),
Charlton,	McCarthy,	Wallace,
Colby,	McDongald (Picton),	Welsh,
Costigan,	McLelan,	White (Cardwell),
Coursol,	McMullen,	White (Renfrew),
Davies,	Mitchell,	Wood (Brockville), and
Ellis,	Mulock,	Wood (West'land)—50.
Ferguson (Welland),	Pope,	

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Baker,	Haggart,	O'Brien,
Beausoleil,	Hall,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar, d,	Hesson,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bernier,	Innes,	Platt,
Blake,	Ives,	Préfontaine,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Purcell,
Bowman,	Joncas,	Reid,
Boyle,	Jones,	Riopel,
Brown,	Kenny,	Royal,
Bryson,	Kirk,	Rykert,
Burns,	Kirkpatrick,	Scarth,
Cameron,	Labelle,	Scriver,
Cargill,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Cartwright,	Landry,	Shanly,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Skinner,
Cimon,	Langelier (Quebec),	Smith (Montreal),
Clayes,	Lister,	Sutherland,
Cockburn,	Lovitt,	Temple,
Cook,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thérien,
Coursol,	Macdonald (Huron),	Thompson,
Curran,	MacDowall,	Tisdale,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Dawson,	McCarthy,	Turcot,
Desjardins,	McDonald (Victoria),	Vanasse,
Dupont,	McDongald (Picton),	Waldie,
Edwards,	McGreevy,	Wallace,
Eisenhauer,	McLelan,	Weldon (Albert),
Ellis,	McNeill,	Weldon (St. John),
Fiset,	Mallory,	Welsh,
Flynn,	Mara,	White (Cardwell),
Freeman,	Masson,	White (Renfrew),
Gigault,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Girouard,	Mitchell,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Guilbault,	Moffat,	Wright, and
Gullet,	Moncreiff,	Yeo.—105.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dawson,	Mara,
Audet,	Desaulniers,	Marshall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dessaint,	Masson,
Bain (Westworth),	Doyon,	Mitchell,
Baker,	Duchesnay,	Montplaisir,
Béchar, d,	Eisenhauer,	Paterson (Brant),
Bell,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Perley (Ottawa),
Bernier,	Fiset,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Fisher,	Platt,
Bowman,	Flynn,	Pope,
Bryson,	Gaudet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burdett,	Gauthier,	Robertson (King's),
Burns,	Godbout,	Roome,
Cameron,	Grandbois,	Ross,
Campbell (Digby),	Guay,	Royal,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Guilbault,	Ste. Marie,
Carling,	Hesson,	Semple,
Carpenter,	Innes,	Smith (Ontario),
Caron,	Kirk,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Stevenson,
Chisholm,	Landry,	Taylor,
Choquette,	Lang,	Trow,
Cimon,	Livingston,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Coughlin,	McMillan (Huron),	White (Renfrew),
Couture,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Elgin),
Daoust,	McNeil,	Wilson (Lennox),
Davis,	Madill,	Wright, and
	Mallory,	Yeo.—87.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all applications made to the Government, and of all recommendations made in relation to the position of Superintendent of the Chamby Canal; of the document appointing the present incumbent of that position; with a statement of his yearly salary and of all contingencies allowed him, and of the respective salaries paid to the two predecessors of the present Superintendent.—(Mr. Préfontaine)

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

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask when we may expect the Fishery papers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they are ready now.

Mr. BLAKE. They ought to be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, they ought to be and I believe they are ready, and will be brought down in a day or two.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock:

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Report of Weights and Measures for 1886.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the calendar year 1886.—(Mr. Carling.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: I find that on a previous occasion some of my hon. friends thought that I was not sufficiently lucid and lengthy, and I shall endeavor briefly to explain the nature of this amending Act. The first clause provides that:

"In addition to the cases already provided for by the said Act, any person claiming a patent for a homestead, or for a homestead and pre-emption, who has completed the three years' residence required by the said Act on or before the 1st day of July, 1886, shall be entitled thereto upon proving that he has erected upon his homestead a habitable dwelling, and that his family have *bona fide* resided therein and cultivated the homestead for six months of each of the three years as required by section 38 of the said Act."

That provision has reference to persons who came in and settled as *bona fide* settlers, but who found that, in consequence of the bad seasons we have had for the last two or three years, they could not remain upon their homesteads. They accordingly left their families to cultivate the homestead, and they themselves went to work in towns along the railway. This is merely a temporary provision; it arranges nothing whatever as to the future, and only does a measure of justice to persons who, through no fault of their own, have been placed in a difficult position. The next clause adds a rider to sub-clause 2 of section 43 of the Act of 1886. It provides that:

"Provided that any person who has gone into the North-West Territories at any date between 25th May, 1883, and 2nd June, 1885, shall be entitled to a second homestead, and may enter thereon on any day after he has received his recommendation for the patent."

That is only the merest measure of justice to the persons who will be affected by it. I apprehend it will be found

that it was by mistake, rather than by design, that clause 37 of the Act of 1886, section 43, as it appears in the Revised Statutes, was inserted, cutting off, as it does, a number of persons from second homesteading, who were clearly entitled to it. For what happens is this: A is entitled to a second homestead, and gets his recommendation on June 2nd. He can obtain a second homestead. B is entitled to a second homestead, but he does not get his recommendation until one day afterwards, although he may have gone into the country before A, and yet B cannot get a second homestead. It is to provide for such cases that this clause of the amending Bill has been drafted. The other provision is that:

"The extent of a homestead grant shall be identical throughout the North-West Territories."

It is intended to provide that in what is called the Mile Belt or in Hudson's Bay sections, any man entering as a homesteader shall not only have 80 acres, but shall have 160 acres. I think that this clause could probably be covered by Order in Council, but there can be no harm in the House affirming the general principle. The next clause provides that:

"Every person who is entitled to a second homestead may elect to take the land for which he holds a pre-emption entry as a second homestead."

That change will be very acceptable to a large number of people in the North-West Territories, and it might be made to apply solely to persons who came into the territories up to say July, 1886, so as to not encourage persons coming in to make arrangements respecting 320 acres of homestead instead of 160. The last clause provides that:

"Squatters who have settled prior to surveys on what proved to be school sections, or Hudson's Bay sections, or odd sections, or any sections not thrown open for homesteading, shall not be disturbed and shall be entitled to enter for homestead or for homestead and pre-emption as if the land so squatted on had been open for homesteading, and the Governor in Council shall compensate, out of other lands, the parties entitled to the sections so squatted on."

I think that this Bill, if passed, will materially improve the legislation in respect of Dominion lands, and I hope the majority of the sections, if not all of them, will meet with the acceptance of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act 49 Vic., cap. 52, "To prevent seduction and like offences, and to make further provision for the protection of women and girls."—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. McLellan.)

Bill (No. 6) to amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to establish a Department of Trade and Commerce. He said: This is a short Bill providing for the establishment of a Department of Trade and Commerce, and prescribing the duties which shall be performed by such Department. As a Bill will be brought down to provide for the reorganisation of some of the other Departments of the Government, I shall probably ask the House to discuss the whole reorganisation at the same time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Territories Real Property Act. He said: This
Mr. DAVIN.

Bill would get rid of a difficulty which is found to exist in the working of the Act, especially in regard to the town sites. At present it is a most expensive process to transfer any property in the town sites, in consequence of the number of documents which have to be copied. Those documents are in the possession of the registrar, and the direction to him is to copy all documents for himself, whereas, I think, that under the circumstances, an arrangement whereby he be directed to make search and make a minute of the results of his search—he having the documents in his custody—would answer every purpose. Such a provision might be added as a rider to one of the clauses of the Torrens Act. I call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that, in order to make the Act complete as an amending Act, it would be desirable that clauses should be introduced in it that could only come from the Government. For instance, the clause providing for an insurance fund seems to me to require too much. One-fifth might properly, I think, be changed to one-tenth, which would give an ample sum, and at the same time would not press too heavily on the people. There is one other thing provided for in this little Bill, and it is this: that an attorney in the North-West Territories may be appointed a registrar. As the Act stands at present there are, I believe, only two persons in the whole North-West Territories that could be appointed a registrar—Mr. D. L. Scott, of Regina, and myself. I do not believe that there is any other person who has been a sufficient length of time at the bar to enable him to be appointed. This is a difficulty which, I think, it is desirable to get rid of.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HER MAJESTY.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to contribute: (1) by a grant of money; (2) by a military demonstration or review, towards the celebration, in the several capitals of the Provinces of the Dominion, of the fiftieth anniversary of Her Majesty's reign?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have the honor to state that it is not the intention of the Government to contribute, by a grant of money, or by a military demonstration or review, towards the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the reign of Her Majesty in the several capitals of the Confederation; but authorisation will be given by the Government to any battalion or military corps whose desire it will be to take part in any demonstration which will take place for the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the reign of Her Majesty.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—COMPLAINT AGAINST EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant an enquiry in the matter of the complaint made by François Côté, of the Parish of St. Thomas, against James Lavery and George Larchez, both of them employed on the Intercolonial Railway, in the Parish of St. Thomas, county of Montmagny; and if so, when? Who is to be the Commissioner to make the enquiry?

Mr. POPE. It is not the intention of the Government to issue a commission to enquire into this matter. Anything of this kind we shall enquire into through our own officers.

UNLAWFUL MANUFACTURE OF WHISKEY.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government have been informed that the manufacture of whiskey is being unlawfully carried on in the vicinity of St. Sauveur, Quebec,

and whether they have taken any steps in consequence of that information; and if so, what steps?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not in the public interest that any reply should be given to this question.

WHARVES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair, during the present season, the wharf at West Point, Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to do so during the present season.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take charge of the Cascumpec Wharf, Prince Edward Island, and to repair the same during the present season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to take charge of that wharf, inasmuch as there is one not far from it which is under the charge of the Government.

WHARF AT ST. FRANÇOIS.

Mr. LANGELIER, Montmorency, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue during the present year the works already initiated for the construction of a wharf in the Parish of St. François, in the Island of Orleans?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give an affirmative answer to the hon. member to-day.

DOCUMENTS ON THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay before the House the correspondence which has taken place in relation to the Fishery question, as well between the Canadian and British Governments, and between the British Government and the Government of the United States; and if so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. The correspondence referred to will be laid before the House on Friday, I hope—on Monday at the latest.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before the House copies of instructions given to commanders of vessels for the protection of the Fisheries, as well during the past season as the present one; and if so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention that copies of these instructions, issued as well during the past season as the present one, so far as given to date, shall be brought down, and form part of the correspondence referred to in the preceding question.

SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS ON THE PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before the House the correspondence in relation to the seizure of British vessels in Behring's Sea and other places on the Pacific coast by an armed United States vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. This correspondence is being prepared, and will be laid before the House at as early a day as possible.

SALARIES OF REVISING OFFICERS.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the salary of Revising Officers yet been fixed by Order in Council? If so, when, and at what figure?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The salary has not yet been fixed.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Have any sums of money been paid to Revising Officers in advance of their salaries on work performed by them? If so, what amount up to the present date?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would refer my hon. friend to the report of the Auditor General, page 1795, I think. To the 11th April the sum of \$44,000 has been paid on account of the salaries of revising officers.

DISMISSAL OF ODIAS CARBONNEAU, EUDORE GAUMONT AND FIDÈLE PELLETIER.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all papers, documents, &c., respecting the dismissal of Odias Carbonneau, Eudore Gaumont and Fidèle Pelletier, all three employed on the Intercolonial Railway: the first as telegraph operator at the Chaudière, County of Lévis, the second as a section man at St. Thomas, County of Montmagny, and the third as station master at Cap St. Ignace, County of Montmagny.

He said: In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to make a few remarks with regard to these three dismissals, as I would like to know the circumstances under which and the reasons why they were made. These dismissals were made under rather extraordinary circumstances, some of them within a few days, others within a few weeks after the polling day during the last elections. My attention was more especially called to them by the fact that the newspapers published a correspondence containing a letter from the hon. Minister of Public Works which contradicted, to a certain extent, a letter from the Minister of Railways which I have in my possession, and which was addressed to my opponent, Mr. Landry, some time before polling day. As regards Mr. Carbonneau, I will suppose for the moment that he was dismissed for cause. If he was dismissed for cause, then I ask what was the reason which caused him to be reinstated a few days before the votation during the last elections. A few details will give you a better idea of the long and short of these dismissals. In the first place, I see in *Le Canadien* of the 11th of April instant, under the signature of P. Landry, a correspondence mentioning a letter from Mr. McDonald dismissing Mr. Carbonneau, and bearing date the 31st of July, 1886, the reason stated in that letter being that he had absented himself from his office for a few hours and that he had previously been guilty of offences of the same nature. Later on, Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of November, 1886, I see a letter from Mr. Pottinger addressed to my opponent, Mr. Philippe Landry, and containing the following words:

"As regards O. Carbonneau, telegraph operator, concerning whom you wrote to me quite a while ago, it is impossible for me to do anything for him, for the simple reason that he was dismissed after a minute investigation of his case, referred to me by Mr. McDonald, and then by me to the Department. The neglect for which he was dismissed was not his first fault."

Now, on the 6th of December, 1886, I find a letter signed "Hector L. Langevin" which is, I suppose, the signature of the Hon. Minister of Public Works, in answer to Mr. Landry, and containing the following:—

"I have received your letter of the 2nd December transmitting to me the letter of Mr. O. Carbonneau, of Montmagny, and requesting me to interfere in order to have him reinstated. If I thought Mr. Carbonneau would stand any chance of being reinstated, I would speak about it to the Minister of Railways, but really I do not see any chance in that quarter. It is true there has been no accidents, but the operator was doubly at fault. He should not have left his post, or if he left it he should have made sure that somebody was left in his place.

"I do not like to suppose that the reason why he absented himself is not the reason given by him, but all appearances are against him, and I know that in a similar case the Minister of Railways refused to re-appoint the operator."

Here then, Mr. Speaker, are three letters dated before the elections, in 1886, stating that Mr. Carbonneau was dis-

missed for cause, that he was not a good operator, and refusing to re-appoint him. I presume that at that time there was no signs of general elections, for when it was thought that we should have general elections in January last, Mr. Carbonneau wrote to Mr. Landry, in my office, telling him that unless employment was found for him before polling day, he and his family, who gave, I believe, six votes, always on the Conservative side, would vote against Mr. Landry. Now, Mr. Landry transmitted this letter to the hon. Minister of Railways who, on the 27th of January, not long before the election, as will be seen, gave Mr. Landry the following answer:—

“As requested by your letter of the 8th instant, I have much pleasure in stating that upon enquiry of my chief officers, I find that Mr. Odias Carbonneau is considered to be a very fair telegraph operator, and I should be much pleased to hear of his obtaining suitable employment.”

Thus, Mr. Speaker, on the 27th of January last, the Department of Railways said that they were informed that Mr. Carbonneau was a good operator, that he was an excellent officer, although before the elections during the months of November and December last, Mr. Carbonneau was a bad operator, had been dismissed for cause and nothing could be done for him. Well, Mr. Speaker, for this change of opinion I see no reason, except political reasons on the 27th of January, 1887. But what do we see next? On the 10th of February, 1887, a few days after this letter was written, Mr. McDonald, the Superintendent of the Intercolonial, gave Mr. Carbonneau leave to go to Chaudière where he was employed by the Government, and naturally his vote and the votes of his family were given to the candidate of the Government. And what do we see next? After the election he was discharged, and the reason given for this dismissal is the following, which I find in *Le Canadien* of the 11th of April, 1887:—

“The Chief Superintendent has refused to ratify your appointment at Ohaudière Curve, and I am obliged to say your services are no longer required.”

Mr. Speaker, the elections were over, the Government had received his vote and the votes of his family relations, and his usefulness was gone. Well, I have yet to learn that the Intercolonial Railway, which is a public property, the property of the Government, should be turned into a political engine, and used on the eve of elections to create offices and to obtain votes. In the first place, this appointment was very extraordinary. One of two things: either Mr. Carbonneau was dismissed for cause, or he was dismissed without cause. If he was dismissed for cause, it was exceedingly dangerous to re-appoint this man, who was not a good employé, who had already failed to do his duty on a previous occasion, for this incompetent officer might have been the cause of collisions, might have been the cause of endangering the lives of passengers. Consequently, he should not have been re-appointed, if he was not a good officer. On the other hand, if he was dismissed without cause after the elections, the Government were still wrong, because they had simply done an act of justice in re-appointing him, for I find his rehabilitation in the letter from the Minister of Railways, and I say the Government have wronged this man by dismissing him after securing his support and that of his family. Consequently, I desire to have all the papers and documents which are in the possession of the Department, in order to see whether, in the first place, this appointment was a political appointment, and, secondly, whether his dismissal was a political dismissal and was contrary to justice. As regards the case of Mr. Pelletier, I do not know the reason of his dismissal; but the reason given was the following: It is that that gentleman, who has not even the right to vote, has the misfortune of belonging to an essentially Liberal family. I desire that the documents concerning him should also be brought before the House. The dismissal of Mr. Gaumont is equally extraordinary. This

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

man has always been a friend to the Government; he had always supported my opponent until the last contest which took place in that county. He understood then, I suppose, that it was in the interest of the country that he should alter his opinion, and he expressed his opinion against the candidate of the Government. He was threatened at once and was told that if he persisted in his determination he would be dismissed. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, he voted against the Government. In order to find a reason to dismiss him, the revising officer, with the foreman of the St. Thomas section, called upon Mr. Gaumont and asked him to go and see some of his political friends in order to obtain from them declarations to the effect that they might have received money for their votes. Mr. Gaumont answered that he was neither a traitor nor a spy, and he refused to stoop to the low work which he was asked to do. Two days after the voting there was a report of insubordination against him and he was dismissed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I again ask whether the Intercolonial Railway is a political engine, or if it ought to be managed according to justice and in the interests of the public? I move that these papers be brought down, and when they are before the House we will be enabled to see what were the reasons which have brought about these dismissals, which, at the present, certainly appear unjust and arbitrary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must tell the hon. gentleman that it would probably have been better for him to have waited until the papers were brought before the House before discussing the question. The papers not being before the House, it is impossible to appreciate the position in which were placed the three individuals whose names were given by the hon. gentleman in his motion. Consequently I will not now discuss the question whether any one of these gentlemen has been dismissed without sufficient cause, and I am satisfied that the House will withhold their judgment on this question until the papers are laid on the Table. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we have no objection to bring down these papers and they will be laid before the House as soon as copied.

Motion agreed to.

FOREIGN REPRINTS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Statement showing all sums collected since 1st October, 1868, under the provisions of Statutes and Orders in Council in that behalf, as duty on foreign reprints of British copyright works, giving the amounts so collected upon each copyright work, and showing the amounts remitted in each year to the Imperial Government for payment out to those beneficially interested in the copyright of such works.

He said: As I was informed the other day by the hon. the Minister of Justice, in reply to a question I put in the House, that the question of legislation on the subject of copyright laws was still under the consideration of the Government, I think it but right to try and get, for the information of the House, all the papers I can upon that important question. There is no doubt that a great boon was conferred upon the Canadian public—or, at least, the Canadian reading public—when the Imperial Government arranged some years ago that American or foreign reprints could be introduced and sold in Canada upon paying an author's tax of 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*. I am very much afraid that the authors have not appreciated that to a large extent, and have received, so far, very little recompense from the large number of American reprints of British copyright works that come into Canada every year. I am sure that nobody advocates, and that the people would not tolerate, any proposal to do away with the right of introducing into Canada reprints of English copyright works, but I am sure that no interest would suffer if the Canadian publishers were put upon the same footing as American publishers in the publishing and selling of English copy-

right works. It seems an extraordinary anomaly that the law should stand as it has for so many years, and that Canadian publishers cannot publish in Canada what Americans can publish and send to Canada to be sold here. If the law should be altered, as I hope it will be this Session, so as to make the change I suggest, it would be greatly in the interest of the Canadian public and of the Canadian publishers. The former would have competition with the American reprints, and the latter the opportunity of doing a very large business which they are now debarred from doing. It would also be very advantageous to the English authors, who would get more of the author's tax than they are now getting for their works.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the adoption of the motion. I may point out that some of the information it is impossible for us to give. We can bring down the amount collected upon these copyrights, and the amount transmitted to the Imperial Government to be paid to the different authors, but there are no records in the Department to show the names of the works, or of the authors of the works, upon which these duties have been paid. The practice in the past has been that each port makes a return to the Department of the amount collected, with the names of the works upon which it has been collected, and these returns are, with the amount collected, transmitted to the Imperial Government. Such information as we can give, we will bring down as early as possible.

Motion agreed to.

TEA FROM CHINA AND JAPAN.

Mr. BOWMAN moved for :

Return of the quantity and value of tea imported from China and Japan, and entered at ports or outports of British Columbia, either for home consumption or in transit, from the 1st July, 1885, to the 1st April, 1887.

Mr. BOWELL. A portion of the information asked for by this motion it is impossible to furnish to the House. There is no record of the quantity of tea which passes in transit through the country. The other information will be brought down. Cars containing goods passing through the country, upon most occasions, are simply manifested as merchandise; a car may, therefore, be filled with a variety of articles which are simply passing through, of which no record is kept. I make this explanation merely to show why the record of all articles passing in transit through the Dominion cannot be kept in the Department.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—ELECTION RETURNS.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter of privilege of which I think it is not necessary that I should give any notice, because I believe it is always in order to bring under the attention of Parliament a question affecting the constitution of the Parliament itself or anything affecting the privileges of this House, or of members of this House. I think it is only necessary to look at what has transpired during the recent elections to see that the privileges of the House have been invaded by some of the officers who have been appointed by the Government as returning officers, or by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, either at the instance of the Government or upon their own motion. It is clear that we are having revived again, in a new form, difficulties and abuses that we supposed had been corrected by legislation in former years. There is no principle better settled in the United Kingdom than this: that it is a breach of duty on the part of any Minister of the Crown to interfere with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the discharge of his duties in the issue of the writs.

When the Crown dissolves Parliament, and an appeal is made to the country, the duties of the advisers of the Crown are in that respect at an end, and the issue of the writs is solely under the control of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, without any interference on the part of the Government or any member of the Government. It was found necessary in this country a few years ago, in order to put an end to the abuses—to the undue influence, which was being exercised by the Government upon the people in holding a general election—to adopt the law of simultaneous elections. If Ministers in this country had acted as they do in England, if they had refrained from exercising an improper interference with a public officer in the discharge of his duties, legislation upon that subject would have been altogether unnecessary. But those of us who remember the elections of 1867, and again in 1872, know how those elections were extended over several weeks, how the elections in those constituencies that were thought to be most favorable for the Government were brought on first, how the writs were issued to the parties authorised to hold elections in those constituencies before they were issued in cases where it was supposed the popular sentiment was less favorable to the Administration. Now, that abuse was terminated by the adoption of the law of simultaneous elections. The power improperly to interfere in such matters was taken away from the Administration; but we find, either by the improper influence of the Government, or by a notorious dereliction of duty on the part of public officers, either in the constituencies or at the Capital, that other abuses, scarcely less serious than those intended to be remedied by that Act, are again perpetrated. We know that the hon. gentlemen who are now on the Treasury benches repealed the law which gave to this country, to some extent, the protection which exists in the United Kingdom. The officers under whom elections are held in the United Kingdom are not named by the Administration. Anciently, the mayors of boroughs and towns were the parties to whom the writs were sent, and the sheriffs to whom the writs were sent in the shires were not appointed by the Administration; and to-day the parties are designated by law to whom the writs are issued, and under whose direction the elections are held. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman repealed, or, through his influence, Parliament repealed, the law which designated certain officers as the parties by whom elections were to be held, and he has taken into his own hands their appointment. If there ever was a case where it was necessary that great care should be exercised, it was in the case when the Government undertook to assume an authority which might give it an undue influence, or power to exercise an undue authority, in the appointment of those officers. So far as I remember, there were no abuses existing in this country under the elections held by official appointees. In 1878, so far as I am aware, there was not a single complaint with regard to irregular elections. In the elections that have been held where the writs have been sent to the sheriffs and to registrars, no complaint has been made. These officers are responsible to the public; they have other responsible duties to discharge besides those with which they are entrusted in holding elections. They are men who are trained, in some degree, to the discharge of official duties; they are not liable to fall into the mistakes or to commit the blunders that are committed by men who are appointed for particular purposes, without any official experience, who are drawn from obscurity for the discharge of those duties which the Government imposes on them, and who go back into private life the moment the elections are over, to disappear as officials. Well, Sir, the Government has appointed, in many cases, extreme partisans for the purpose of holding the elections—men who were only known for their connection with the Tory party, men who held offices as members of

political organisations, and whose partisanship was the only thing to recommend them to the Government for appointment to those particular places. Now, Sir, we know that grave irregularities have occurred; we know that serious abuses have been committed; we know that the law has been scandalously, flagrantly, violated by many of these parties in the discharge of their official duties. But the mistakes and wrongs that have been done, and the illegal practices, are all on one side. The offences that have been committed, were committed in favor of the Administration and against those on this side of the House. It would be impossible to instance a case where the rights and privileges of Parliament have been more grossly violated than in many instances connected with these elections. One would have supposed that the scandalous conduct of some returning officers in the elections of 1882 would have warned the Government against the wrong they would commit in persisting in the course which they had then marked out. But, Sir, we find the same course has been persisted in, the same abuses are continued; the same mistakes in the interests of the Administration that were committed before are repeated again. We find that the returning officers in many cases are simply political janissaries who were employed by the Administration to strangle those who were supposed to be opposed to the Government. In fact, the process of strangulation is carried on in the interest of the Administration to a sufficient extent to give the Government a certain amount of security, and the hon. gentlemen, perhaps, occupy at present their seats on the Treasury benches rather more owing to the abuses that have been committed in carrying on the elections, than to any confidence that the public at large may have in them. Now, I hold in my hand, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, the dates when certain members of this House were gazetted. We know that by the Act relating to contested elections, section 9, the electors have thirty days after the gazettement of a member to contest his election, if they think proper. Now, what do we find? Why, we find these gentlemen making haste to be gazetted. We find the names of members on the Reform side of the House withheld. Why, Sir, if there were gentlemen on both sides of the House mingled together, in this long protraction of the gazettement of members, we might suppose that it had no political significance. But we know right well when we find that, in the first instance, members on that side of the House are exclusively gazetted, and members on this side of the House are excluded from the *Gazette*, that it is done for a purpose, and it is the duty of this House to enquire into the irregularities of the proceedings in this particular. Sir, I find that on the 5th of March there were gazetted: West Hastings, Alexander Robertson, Tory; West York, N. C. Wallace, Tory; North Renfrew, Robert Campbell, Reformer; Frontenac, G. A. Kirkpatrick, Tory; Hamilton, Adam Brown, Tory; Alex. McKay, Tory; Ottawa, W. G. Perley, Tory; H. Robillard, Tory; Kingston, Sir John A. Macdonald, Tory. So on 5th March there were gazetted eight Tories and one Liberal. Then on 12th March: South Simcoe, R. Tyrwhitt, Tory; West Northumberland, Geo. Guillet, Tory; Welland, J. Ferguson, Tory; Carleton, Sir John A. Macdonald, Tory;—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I am not a Tory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Liberal-Conservative.

Mr. MILLS—North Middlesex, T. Coughlin, Tory; North Renfrew, P. White, Tory; North Oxford, J. Sutherland, Reformer; Centre Toronto, G. R. R. Cockburn, Tory; East Bruce, Henry Cargill, Tory; North Bruce, A. McNeill, Tory; North Victoria, J. A. Barron, Reformer; Lincoln, J. C. Rykert, Tory; London, J. Carling, Tory; South Grenville, W. Shanly, Tory; South Lanark, J. G. Haggart, Tory; South Wentworth, F. W. Carpenter, Tory; West Huron, Robert Porter, Tory; Stormont, D. Bergin, Tory; West

Mr. MILLS.

Middlesex, W. F. Roome, Tory; North Lanark, J. Jamieson, Tory; West Durham, Edward Blake, Reformer; Dundas, C. E. Hickey, Tory; East Middlesex, J. H. Marshall, Tory; North Essex, J. C. Patterson, Tory; North Ontario, Frank Madill, Tory; South Ontario, Wm. Smith, Tory; West Lambton, J. F. Lister, Reformer; East Lambton, George Moncrieff, Tory; North Simcoe, D. McCarthy, Tory; Brockville, J. F. Wood, Tory; Cardwell, Thomas White, Tory; Peel, W. A. McCulla, Tory; West Bruce, Edward Blake, Reformer. So on 12th March there were twenty-eight Tories and five Reformers gazetted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Too many.

Mr. MILLS. On 19th March there were gazetted: North Perth, S. R. Hesson, Tory; North Grey, James Masson, Tory; Lennox, N. Wilson, Tory; East Hastings, S. B. Burdett, Reformer; West Toronto, F. C. Denison, Tory; South Victoria, D. Hudspeth, Tory; East Durham, H. A. Ward, Tory; North York, Wm. Mulock, Reformer; Addington, John W. Bell, Tory; South Waterloo, James Livingston, Reformer; Monck, A. Boyle, Tory; South Leeds, George Taylor, Tory; South Norfolk, D. Tisdale, Tory; East Toronto, John Small, Tory; North Hastings, Mackenzie Bowell, Tory; East Grey, Thomas Sproule, Tory; Haldimand, W. H. Montague, Tory;—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that hon. gentlemen opposite are delighted with that name. I regard that case as another instance of breach of privilege, and there will be another opportunity of considering the propriety of that return. So there were on 19th March fourteen Tories and three Reformers gazetted. On 26th March the following were gazetted: East Simcoe, H. H. Cook, Reformer; Russell, W. C. Edwards, Reformer; North Leeds, C. F. Ferguson, Tory; Glengarry, P. Purcell, Reformer; North Waterloo, J. E. Bowman, Reformer; West Ontario, J. D. Edgar, Reformer; South Perth, James Trow, Reformer; North Wentworth, Thomas Bain, Reformer; Halton, John Waldie, Reformer; South Oxford, Sir Richard Cartwright, Reformer; South Grey, George Landerkin, Reformer; North Brant, James Somerville, Reformer; South Huron, J. McMillan, Reformer; North Norfolk, J. Charlton, Reformer; South Wellington, J. Innes, Reformer; South Middlesex, James Armstrong, Reformer; Prescott, S. Labrosse, Reformer; Centre Wellington, A. Semple, Reformer; West Elgin, G. E. Casey, Reformer; West Peterborough, James Stevenson, Tory. So there were two Tories and eighteen Reformers gazetted on the 26th March. On 2nd April there were gazetted: North Wellington, J. McMullen, Reformer; East Peterborough, John Lang, Reformer; Kent, A. Campbell, Reformer; South Essex, James Brien, Reformer; Bothwell, D. Mills, Reformer; Muskoka, W. E. O'Brien, Tory; East Huron, P. Macdonald, Reformer. So there were six Reformers and one Tory gazetted on that day. On 9th April there were gazetted: for East Elgin, J. H. Wilson, Reformer; East Northumberland, A. E. Mallory, Reformer; East York, A. Mackenzie, Reformer; Prince Edward, J. M. Platt, Reformer; South Brant, W. Paterson, Reformer; Algoma, S. J. Dawson, Tory; East Bruce, H. Cargill, Tory. This was the second time Mr. Cargill had been elected. So, although the hon. member for East York, Mr. Mackenzie, was elected on the same day as Mr. Cargill, he was not gazetted until Mr. Cargill had resigned his seat, been appointed to an office, vacated his seat, if he held the seat, and ran a second election, if he was entitled to run again, and again elected. I find in my own case that the returning officer made a return in my election in Bothwell, on 8th March, and I was not gazetted until twenty-five days afterwards. In Kent the sheriff of the county returned Mr. Campbell as the member-elect on 9th March, but he was not gazetted until 2nd April. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell)

informs me that he was returned by the returning officer on 4th March, but he was not gazetted until 26th March. I think the conduct of some parties connected with the elections was so highly irregular, so partisan like, and so utterly inconsistent with everything like equality in election contests, that it is most desirable the House should enquire into the conduct of the various persons connected with the elections; and with this object I beg to move:

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be ordered to attend at the Table of the House forthwith with all the papers necessary to show in each electoral district the date of the return made to the writ by the returning officer in such electoral district, the date at which such return reached his office, the date at which such return was gazetted, and all correspondence between himself and returning officers in reference to the said returns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that this being a matter of privilege he can bring it up without notice. Well, perhaps he can, but, at the same time, he ought to have given notice. The rule, as generally used, is applied to matters of privilege which are of urgency—to matters which require the immediate action of the House. I do not think that there is any urgency in this matter, and, therefore, I think the hon. gentleman ought to have followed the usual practice and given the usual notice, because I do not think any man has been deprived of his seat in this House by any action, or want of action, on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. We are all here, I think, in our seats in this House; if there has been any irregularity it can be brought before this House—if it comes within the competency of this House—or it can be rectified through other tribunals, if they are the proper tribunals, and the persons can be punished, so that I think the hon. gentleman ought to have given notice. The hon. gentleman is not in a very good temper. He has been abusing the returning officers, the revising officers, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the Government, and everybody else. Well, I am not surprised at his being a little out of temper, because if there ever was a disappointed body of men in the world, if there ever was a body of men who thought they had got us at last, a body of men who were deceived as to the feeling of the public with regard to them, it is hon. gentlemen opposite; and I take it that no one of them was more disappointed at being relegated for—I do not say how many years—to the cool atmosphere which he is now occupying, it is my hon. friend from Bothwell. And so it was necessary to abuse everybody. As I have said before on one occasion, when the sailor is tied up to the gangway and is receiving the lash, he is allowed to use what language he likes to the captain. He can abuse him as much as he likes in consideration of his taking the lash. The hon. gentleman is not taking the lash here, but he took it with his political friends at the hands of that potent master—the great electorate of the Dominion of Canada. The returning officers, the hon. gentleman says, are partisans. Well, they are partisan because they returned us on this side; the revising officers have hounded the lists, because there was not a strong enough body in the various lists in the Dominion of Canada to change the minority of last Parliament into a majority in this Parliament. Therefore, we can quite understand the attacks and the want of the usual amenity of the hon. gentleman, in his speech on this occasion. But the hon. gentleman says there was a great abuse in our altering the law; that before the law was altered the sheriffs and registrars were the officials, that they were responsible men, holding high offices, and that, therefore, they were the right men to be returning officers. Well, they were responsible men, certainly, but not responsible to this House, nor to the Government of the Dominion. He states that in England the sheriffs were usually returning officers, and that they were not appointed by the Crown. Yes; but they were not appointed by any hostile bodies—hostile to the

Government of the day. They were picked in the usual way by the old and well-known process—the sheriff of the county was selected and he and certain other persons were the returning officers. The hon. gentleman says that before the alteration was made there was no complaint. I deny that altogether. I say that when the sheriffs and registrars were the returning officers, responsible to the Provincial Governments, there was no security for any member—I do not care on which side—if the Provincial Government happened to be of opposite politics to a particular candidate. I have no hesitation to say that there has been a most hostile spirit shown, especially in the Province of Ontario, and I believe also in the Province of Nova Scotia—a most hostile spirit to the Government, who are Her Majesty's advisers, sitting on this side. I say it has always been so, and never more so than during the late elections. I say that the hostility of the Provincial Governments was marked, that every individual composing the Provincial Governments worked as he never worked before, in order to defeat the Administration. I say that it was as much as the office of either a registrar or a sheriff was worth in the Province of Ontario if, being a returning officer, the incumbent of that office dared to be impartial. I say that the most open threats were made by every member of the Administration in the Province of Ontario against their officials—that they were threatened openly and boldly, if they did not work locally for the Provincial Government, and, in the Dominion elections, against the Conservative party. It was notorious that it was so, from the Premier down to the bailiffs of the Division Courts and the license inspectors and commissioners. I know how that was—that a Conservative licensed victualler could not get his license, or was threatened with the loss of it, unless he voted against the present Government. It was a matter of self-protection that we altered the law and took away from the hostile Provincial Governments the right of selecting the returning officer who was of necessity, for fear of losing his office, bound to act against us. If we appointed the returning officers, it was from the necessity of the case. The Dominion Government are responsible to Parliament for the propriety of their appointments of returning officers, as of all other officers; but the Dominion Parliament have no control whatever over the provincial officers, who have acted with such glaring impropriety that no defence for them could possibly be offered. I say, also, that the returning officers in the last elections were a body of respectable men. I believe they have performed their duties impartially, and if they have not performed those duties there is a recognised tribunal fixed by law to punish them and to report to this House the misconduct of any returning officer—aye, and of any revising officer—who has committed any breach of his duty. If the hon. gentleman will alter the word “forthwith” to “to-morrow,” I have no objection to bringing down the papers. I have only this to say, that I do not see what difference it makes whether an hon. member is gazetted first or last.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see any difference.

Mr. MILLS. How came the hon. gentleman and all his colleagues to be gazetted first?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No matter whether it is first or last, the parties opposed to the return had thirty days to petition against the member, and if he is last in the *Gazette* there are still those thirty days. The hon. gentleman says I was gazetted early. I was gazetted first, I think, for Carleton—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, for Kingston.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I have a petition against me there. I was not in any way protected by being

early in the *Gazette*; here I am to stand my trial, and so it will be with the last gentleman in the list. And so it will be with the last gentleman in the last *Gazette*; he will have his thirty days of anxiety. I suppose the only difference is that my anxious thirty days are over, and the others' are only beginning. However, I have not the slightest objection that all these papers should be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). As my name was the first mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell as having been returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I wish to say that the returning officer of my riding is the registrar, a Reformer.

Mr. JONES. The hon. member who made this motion alluded to the Province from which he comes—the Province of Ontario. The right hon. leader of the Government, in the course of his observations, thought proper to refer to the hostility that he assumed was shown towards the General Government, not only by the Local Government, but by the officials under their control, in the Province of Nova Scotia. The right hon. gentleman must have a very short memory. Does he not remember that only last summer, while the Local elections were in progress in that Province, we had a visit from the hon. Minister of Marine, the hon. Minister of Finance of that day, and the hon. Minister of the Interior, who held public meetings throughout the Province, and what for?—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The elections were over long before.

Mr. JONES—They were there to endeavor to persuade the electors of Nova Scotia to vote against the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia; but, despite all their efforts, that Government was triumphantly sustained on that occasion. Therefore, when the right hon. gentleman says that the Administration were indebted to the Local Administration of Nova Scotia for their hostility, we can point to that occasion; and we can go further back, because there has scarcely ever been a Local election in the Province of Nova Scotia, but we have been favored with visits from members of the Dominion Ministry. The right hon. gentleman said they also had the open hostility of the returning officers. On that point, so far as my own county is concerned, I beg most respectfully to differ from him. In the county of Halifax, in the Local election, the sheriff, who was returning officer by virtue of his office, appointed one-half of the deputy returning officers from the Tory side of politics; and so fair was his conduct on that occasion, that when the Dominion elections came on last year, the General Government thought they could not place the election in fairer hands, and they sought to make a bargain with him. They sent down and said to him: "If you will give us one-half of the deputy returning officers in the county of Halifax, and submit a list of the Liberal deputy returning officers to a number of our friends, we will make you returning officer for the county of Halifax." The sheriff said that while he was a friend of ours, he purposed to carry out the law fairly, and he would give them one half of the deputy returning officers, but he would not submit the names of the Liberal deputy returning officers to them for their approval. Under these circumstances the election was conducted there; and that case goes to show that the contention of the right hon. gentleman is not borne out by the fact. But the subject my hon. friend has brought to the notice of the House was more strongly exemplified in the Province from which I come than possibly in any other part of this Dominion. The Minister of Finance, the Postmaster General, and Minister of Justice, I believe, had their elections at the same time as myself and all the other candidates in Nova Scotia; but, Sir, they had the good fortune to have sympathisers either in the returning officers or in some of the officials here—which I

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

leave to be decided when the papers are brought before the House. Their elections were gazetted on the 12th of March. The certificate of my election was sent from Halifax on the 4th of March, and I was not gazetted until fifteen days afterwards. Now, everybody must admit, that the circumstances hardly justified those hon. gentlemen in being gazetted so early. The elections were held on the 22nd of February, the declaration is usually filed six days subsequently, and the ballots are required to be kept four days longer in the event of recount being demanded; so that it was barely possible for those hon. gentlemen to be returned before that time. But it is easy to understand why they were gazetted so early; because their friends supposed they would have that much advantage over the other members, some of whom were not gazetted until the 2nd of April. They would have all that length of time to look over the field of action, and decide what course they would adopt. Therefore, I think the motion of my hon. friend is a very proper one. That a grave liberty has been taken with this House is evident. That the returns have been kept back cannot be denied, for the *Gazette* proves that hon. gentlemen who happened to be on the Government side of the House were gazetted far in advance of those who happened to be in Opposition. Such a state of things is simply unbearable. The hon. gentleman boasts of having been returned to the Treasury benches again. Well, perhaps, that may form the subject of debate at a later stage of the Session. Perhaps it would not be in order to-day to refer to the various causes which have contributed to the success of the hon. gentleman and his friends; but from the influences that were brought to bear in the Province of Nova Scotia, and which we shall expose before the Session is over, the public will be able to see whether the honest opinion of this country was fairly expressed, or whether their return was not secured by means which all honest electors in this country should condemn.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member for Halifax speaks of gentlemen on this side of the House having very short memories. I am afraid my hon. friend's recollection is slightly confused, owing, no doubt, to the excitement under which he seems to labor in consequence of the petitions to which he referred having been filed in some of the counties of Nova Scotia, notably in the county of Halifax. Now, I may point out to him and the House as well, that this supposed interference of the three Ministers with the provincial interests of Nova Scotia and the Government of that Province happened, strange to say, long after the so-called victory for repeal in June last. I should say my hon. friend ought to have recollected that fact, because, before they came to that Province—

Mr. JONES. Did not the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Justice speak in Halifax previous to the Local elections?

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friend cannot get away in that manner. I speak of the reference to the visit of the three Ministers whom he named, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Foster), the Minister of Interior (Mr. White), and the late hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. A. W. McLellan), and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman well recollects their visit and its consequences. Before their visit, the city of Halifax, by a large majority, voted confidence in the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) and the party with which he is identified; while, after their visit, the city of Halifax repudiated the hon. gentleman and showed by their votes that, on second thoughts, they believed the views of the three Ministers to be sound, and those of the hon. gentleman and his friends to be unsound and unworthy of trust. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Local Government is childlike and bland in all these Dominion elections, that these elections would be fairly carried out under the direction and management of officials acting under

its orders. Let me point out a strong evidence to the contrary, in which the facts are already transpiring on the floor of the Local House. So excited are the friends of the hon. gentleman from Halifax in the Local House of Nova Scotia over the recent victory of this Government in that Province, that, not content with having disfranchised many Dominion officials, they have introduced a Bill, and have succeeded in carrying it through nearly all its important stages, disfranchising, in connection with municipal elections, all Dominion officials and preventing them exercising any municipal rights. That is an evidence of the friendship and impartiality of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and by it we can judge of the way in which they would be inclined to carry out the law in reference to Dominion elections. Further than that, a short time before the Local elections in Nova Scotia in June last, the hon. gentleman's liberal-minded friends took from the judges the power they previously had in regulating the appointment of sheriffs and assumed that power to themselves. They appointed their most bitter partisans, and at present their friends in some parts of the Province are quarrelling over the distribution of that patronage. The hon. gentleman has not quite fairly stated this question, as it affects the administration of the election law in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I think the people in that Province will be rather surprised to hear that there is no necessity for this House to guard against an attempt on the part of the Local Administration of Nova Scotia to interfere, and improperly interfere, in the elections for the Dominion House of Commons.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. the leader of the House was good enough to tell us that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was out of temper because he was disappointed as to the attitude of public opinion towards the party of which we form a part, and that for the same reason we all appear to be out of temper; and he gave us the liberty of being out of temper, because we were so badly beaten. Now, if we were to judge from the tone of the hon. member for Bothwell and that of the right hon. the leader of the House, if we are to judge by the temper expressed in the two speeches, we must come to the conclusion, did we not know which side has the majority, that the gentleman who felt himself in the minority must be the right hon. gentleman, since his speech was the worse tempered of the two. He launched out in a most unmeasured strain against the officials of the Local Government; he said they were all men hostile to the Dominion Government, and therefore not to be trusted to conduct the Dominion elections. Yet, to correct this partisanship of the provincial officials, what does he propose to do? Does he propose to appoint impartial men? By no means. He proposes instead to appoint men specially for the occasion, who, he knows, will be partial to himself. He could not trust his candidates before the country unless he appointed revising barristers and returning officers known to be partial to himself and his Government. On what does he base his argument? He bases it on a very strong assertion. He is in the habit of making strong assertions. He declares that open and undisguised threats have been used against sheriffs and registrars to prevent them from acting impartially as returning officers. That is a sweeping assertion; but I challenge the right hon. gentleman to name a single instance, in Ontario at all events, where any threat, open and undisguised, or covert or hidden, was used towards a registrar or sheriff to induce him to act partially as returning officer. The hon. gentleman has traded for years in assertions without bringing proofs to sustain them, and it is time for him to bring forward some instance to bear out his present statement, or retract what appears to be on its face, as far as we have any evidence to show, a purely gratuitous assertion. He denies that we were free from complaint in regard to the action of returning officers, when registrars and sheriffs were

the only returning officers. I do not say that we were absolutely free from complaint, but I do not remember any complaint being made that a registrar or sheriff had favored the Local Government at the expense of the Dominion Government during the time registrars and sheriffs were the returning officers. The right hon. gentleman would create a case for himself, which he has not at present, if he would bring forward an instance of a sheriff or registrar under the old law having acted partially against the Government of the Dominion and in favor of the opposite party, at all events in Ontario; but, Sir, after all these sweeping assertions, after all this assumption of universal knowledge in regard to the motives of sheriffs, of registrars, of local governments and of local officials, he wound up his speech by displaying the most childlike simplicity in regard to the action of which we are complaining to-day. He said he could not see that it made any difference whether a man was gazetted first or last, that there were thirty days to intervene in any case. Of course in the case of a young member of the House like the right hon. gentleman, the suggestion may be pardoned, but to the numerous gentlemen who sit behind him and have so much longer experience than he has, it will be clear that, the longer the time that elapses between the election and the gazetting, the longer time there is for the opponents of a member to collect evidence against him in order to apply it against his return.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, of course, my hon. friends laugh; but the conduct of every candidate will be investigated by his opponents in order to see if there is any case for a petition, and, if you give them plenty of time, they may find something against him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. And that is why we believe the right hon. member secured his being gazetted for Kingston at the earliest possible moment, while he postponed his being gazetted for Carleton to the latest moment. In Carleton he did not fear the result so much, and it did not matter very much, but having been unseated for Kingston before, he thought it might happen again, and therefore he secured that he should be gazetted for Kingston at the earliest date. If you take the time between the election and the gazetting, and add the thirty days, you will find it is a long purgatory through which every member will have to pass to expiate the consequence of his misdeeds.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh!

Mr. CASEY. I take that back. I know that word is not pleasing to the ears of the hon. Minister. I will say the period of probation. I withdraw the word purgatory. In this case, the right hon. gentleman has had to endure a much shorter period of probation than the hon. member for Halifax and many other hon. members of this House, and so he has reason to thank the returning officer, or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—I do not know which—perhaps both—who, perhaps without any instruction, shortened his period of probation in that very risky constituency of Kingston. I think, under all the circumstances, the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is justified, and I hope the House will pass it.

Mr. IVES. I was disappointed that the hon. member in his speech did not take up the Quebec list. I should have been interested to hear him use the words Tory and Reformer in regard to a large number of the members from that Province. Is it possible that the hon. gentleman has not yet been able to come to an exact conclusion as to how some of the members from the Province of Quebec are to be classified, and is that the reason why he has not favored us with a classification. He might have been able to give a

fairer parallel in that Province where the disparity between Tories and Reformers is not so great, unfortunately, as it is in Ontario, than he did. I do not think it is much to be wondered at that, in the Province of Ontario, where the difference is so great there should be so many more Conservatives gazetted than Liberals. If the hon. gentleman had classified the members from the Province of Quebec where there is less disparity, I think he would have found that the number of supporters of the hon. gentleman and those of the right hon. gentleman are more evenly divided in each issue of the *Gazette*. In almost all cases in that Province, as far as I know, the sheriffs and registrars were appointed returning officers. In my own constituency, one of the registrars was appointed returning officer. He is a friend of my party and a friend of my own, and, notwithstanding that fact, my name did not appear in the first list or in the second list. I was not gazetted until the 19th March, and it must be apparent to everyone that to have a friend in the returning officer did not ensure a prompt publication of my name in the Official *Gazette*.

Mr. BLAKE. It made an election.

Mr. IVES. The people decided who should be elected. Reference has been made to the partisan action in Nova Scotia and other Provinces. We have had an experience in the Province of Quebec which is something unique, and my object in rising is to give the House the benefit of an entirely new wrinkle, because I feel that it may be of use to hon. gentlemen opposite if they have to work the oracle again. The Premier of the Province of Quebec issued a circular to all office-holders instructing them to be perfectly impartial, and not to take part in any election for the Dominion. That was sent to every office-holder in the Province of Quebec, but, strange to say, partiality was shown in regard to a certain number of office-holders. When it was made to appear to Mr. Mercier that a second letter would be of use, informing certain office-holders that they might forget the previous letter, that letter was written, and those office-holders became the most efficient workers and canvassers in the constituency in which they lived. I had several of them in my own constituency, and they all received that letter. The friends of my hon. friends opposite said it would be well to advise Mr. Mercier to notify certain office-holders that they would not be discharged if they did interfere, and they did receive that notification. I thought it well to inform the House of this, because the Attorney General of Ontario may not have been in the habit of sending notices of this kind to one class of his officers and not to the other.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I am surprised that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) should have referred to the list of members from Quebec, because, if it is looked into, it will be found to be more outrageous even than the Ontario list. On the 12th March the *Gazette* contained the names of eighteen supporters of the Government from that Province, and only four Opposition. On the 19th March it contained the names of nine supporters of the Government, and three gentlemen who have been acting in the past with the hon. gentlemen on the other side but have cut loose from them, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Amyot and Mr. Gaudet. So that, out of thirty-four who are gazetted, we have twenty-seven supporting the Government straight, four Liberals and three Nationalists, and I would like to know if there is any fairness in that. On the 26th March fourteen Liberals were gazetted and two Conservatives; on the 2nd April we find eight Liberals and no Conservatives gazetted; on the 9th April one Conservative, Mr. Joncas, was gazetted. So those gentlemen had two weeks the start over their Liberal opponents to make the contestation. Now, Sir, I am not surprised that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) should be so pleased

Mr. Ives.

with the returning officer in his constituency. We know that there is a provision in the law that only one representative can hold a certificate and vote at one poll, and that one representative should be the *bona fide* agent of the candidate. It appears that the returning officer was pleased to give to the member for Richmond and Wolfe something over 200 blank certificates, so that 200 strangers were registered in two polls. Of course an officer so accommodating with the law cannot but be satisfactory to the member for Richmond and Wolfe. But I suppose that his opponent, Mr. Greenshields, who was deprived of his right, has no reason to be satisfied with the returning officer, nor the Government who appointed him. The hon. member says that the Local Government of Quebec interfered to a great extent with the Dominion elections. Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know a little more about that than the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and I can state as a fact that the policy of the Quebec Government has been to prevent the interference of its officers with Dominion politics. I know for a fact that a gentleman holding office in the Quebec Legislative Assembly, and who ran as a candidate, against the order of his chief, was discharged. I know that during the last contest in Gaspé there was a pressing demand made upon Mr. Mercier to allow some of the officers of the Local Government to take part in the election against the present member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), and the answer was that they were not to interfere, that the rule was absolute, and applied to Liberals as well as Conservatives. Now, fault has been found with the returning officers who were registrars or sheriffs. In my county a Conservative registrar has been acting as returning officer for the last ten or fifteen years, and no complaint was made against him, but he was discharged and another gentleman appointed to his place who held no other public position. I do not complain, because I do not think that I was ill-treated. In the neighboring county of Richelieu, where the sheriff was also a Conservative, he was commissioned to act as returning officer and discharged his duty to the satisfaction of both parties. It is a wonder to me why the Government disregarded a good Conservative registrar in Berthier, who had experience, and who had given satisfaction to both parties, and took a man new to the duty, while they followed a different course in Richelieu. Certainly I think that gentlemen already holding official positions are better fitted to be returning officers, whatever may be their politics, than any partisan officer that the Government may select outside of a responsible public officer.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend, the senior member for the county of Halifax (Mr. Jones), referred to the recent elections in that constituency, and the appointment of the returning officer. I may say that he is much more familiar than I am with all that took place on that very interesting occasion. I only arrived in the constituency some three weeks before the elections, and was much surprised that I had been nominated as one of the candidates of the Liberal-Conservative party. As regards the arrangements which were made with the sheriff as returning officer, I do not know what they were. I can only say that I have no personal knowledge of any such arrangements as those referred to by my hon. colleague. As regards the returning officer, it is true he was a political friend of the hon. member opposite, but he was also one of the sheriffs who was appointed by the judge, as explained by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper). The hon. member for Halifax has also referred to the presence of certain members of the present Dominion Government in the local elections which took place in June last. My hon. friend must not forget that those gentlemen were electors of the Province of Nova Scotia, and that it was no ordinary question which the people of that Province had been called to pronounce upon. I think the gentlemen who sur-

round my hon. friend will not be pleased when they find he attempted to associate them with a certain section of the party in Nova Scotia, or the whole party in Nova Scotia, which assailed the very integrity of our Dominion. When such a disloyal cry as repeal was raised, it was the duty of every man who had a vote in Nova Scotia, whether he was in the Dominion Cabinet or not, to go to his native Province and do what he could to quell that disloyal and dishonest cry. My hon. friend has intimated that on a later occasions he will instruct this House as to the cause which led to, at least, one member of the Liberal-Conservative party being returned for that constituency. I have no doubt it was a great surprise to my hon. friend—perhaps it was, to use another form of words, a bitter disappointment to him. But I must remind him that a few months previously, in June, in the Local elections, that constituency was carried—I will not say by the Reform party, I decline to associate them with the repeal party in Nova Scotia; it was carried by the party that supported my hon. friend by a large majority. Now, as regards the appeal to the people of the county of Halifax—and I will confine my remarks exclusively to a majority of over 1,000 of the county of Halifax, because I have not been so long in public life as my hon. friend, and I do not pretend to occupy the position in Nova Scotia politics that he does—but I would say this, that I owe my position here to-day to the popularity of, and the confidence which the people of Halifax have in, the present Dominion Government. I want no better cry for an electoral canvass in my constituency than that of the National Policy and opposition to repeal of the Union. I did not intend to address the House at this time, and I almost regret that on the first occasion I have the honor to address it I should be obliged to differ with my friend and colleague opposite, for, in Nova Scotia—I do not know how it is in the rest of Canada—we call each other friends although we differ politically, and we never allow political differences to interfere with private and personal friendship. Although my colleague and myself sit on different sides of the House, that is the position we occupy, and it is one which I hope will be maintained. But it would be doing an injustice to my constituency if I allowed the House to rise to-night without mentioning the cause to which I attribute my presence here—I attribute it to the fact of my being a supporter of the Liberal-Conservative Government of to-day.

Mr. MADILL. The action of the revising barrister for North Ontario gave great satisfaction, not only to the Conservatives, but also to the Reformers. So much was that the case, that after the various sittings for the revision of the voters' lists, counsel on the Reform side moved resolutions thanking the revising officer for his impartiality, making the statement that not a single decision given by Judge Dartnell had been questioned. So far as the appointment of the returning officer is concerned, that was deemed, not only by the press on both sides of politics, but also by the leader of the Reform party, to be a satisfactory one. I am one of those whose names were gazetted on 12th March, and yet my political opponents in the north riding have had every opportunity of ascertaining whether bribery was committed on our side or not. My opponents, during the thirty days that elapsed subsequent to my being gazetted, held no less than two conventions of the party in the riding, and after the second convention its chairman stated to me that they could find no evidence of bribery or corruption on the Conservative side in the riding; that if they protested the election it would simply be to refer the matter to the leaders of the Reform party in this House, because they imagined that the party might use a petition against me for the purpose of assisting the party in other constituencies, although there was nothing substantial against my action or that of my party. So both revising

officer and returning officer were declared satisfactory by the Reformers.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. member for Halifax, who has just spoken (Mr. Kenny), is somewhat in the position which I occupied in the last Parliament—his constituency is divided against itself. My hon. friend near me (Mr. Jones) is the senior member, he having obtained the largest number of votes. I am happy to say the anomaly which existed in regard to the constituency I have the honor to represent has now been removed, and the constituency possesses a solid Liberal representation in this House. Our returning officer was the sheriff of the county. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) spoke about the disfranchisement of Dominion officials. Possibly the enfranchisement of the Dominion officials in Dominion elections was the cause of the present junior member for Halifax possessing a seat in this House, for I believe every one connected with the Lower Provinces, and aware of the positions of Dominion officials there, knows that the pressure put upon them to support the Government is pushed to the greatest extreme, and that applies not only to ordinary Dominion officials, but to the large number of officials connected with the railways and the railway works belonging to the Dominion. So far as the Local Government is concerned, it is felt that Dominion officials should be disfranchised with respect to the Local elections, because they do not pay taxes but are relieved of a large portion of local taxation and have really no right to have a voice in provincial affairs. A good deal has been said about Local Governments and their interference in Dominion elections. I can say with respect to the Government of New Brunswick that its members occupy a peculiar position. As regards myself and my colleagues we had the support of some members of the Local Government, but the hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) had a member of that Government canvassing the county against him, and my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) no doubt owes his position to the assistance of members of the Local Government. In all of the sixteen districts of our Province, with the exception of three, the sheriffs were appointed returning officers, and I believe there has not been a breath of complaint against their conduct. In Westmoreland the sheriff was not appointed, but a gentleman who was a strong partisan was made returning officer. But I will say, in justice to that gentleman, that I have not heard any complaint as to the manner in which he conducted the election. In Sunbury the sheriff was passed over and a violent and bitter personal opponent of the late member was appointed returning officer in that county. In Queen's, of which I do not wish to speak further, because to a certain extent the case is under the judgment of the House, the gentleman appointed returning officer was secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association. Wherever a person takes such an active part as to become the officer of a political association, I do not care whether it is Tory or Reform, he should not be appointed returning officer. In regard to the gazetting of members from our Province, we find some rather peculiar facts. The *Gazette* of March 12th contains the return of the Minister of Marine, whose county is in the interior of the Province; also those of the Minister of Inland Revenue, whose county is on the upper St. John, and at that time almost inaccessible from the state of the roads; also that of the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Moffat), whose constituency is on the extreme border of the Province, near Gaspé, and that of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry). I am informed by the sheriff of my county that immediately on the expiration of the six days allowed he sent his return to Ottawa. The returns from King's could not have been sent earlier than was the return from St. John, and yet we find the return of the Minister of Marine gazetted on the 12th, while that of

myself and colleagues was not gazetted until the 19th. We find that while the Minister of Inland Revenue was gazetted on the 12th March, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., was not gazetted till the 2nd April, and the hon. member for Charlotte is in the same position. Again, we find the hon. member for Northumberland not gazetted till 26th March. The local position of the counties does not account for the discrepancy, and unless the returning officers held back the returns—and I do not believe those officers failed to do their duty—they must all have been mailed pretty nearly at the same time and arrived here on or about the same day. Then the question is, by what right were they withheld from the *Gazette*? It is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on receipt of the return, immediately to have the member elect gazetted. Every hon. member must feel that we are all mighty glad when the term of probation—as the hon. member for Elgin called it—is over, and the longer it continues the longer we remain in a state of anxiety. For that reason I think it is only fair that the returns should be gazetted as early as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as the hon. member for North Ontario is concerned, for my part I readily accept his statement—as I am bound to do—that he does not owe his return, at any rate, to any corrupt influences. My recollection of the mode in which that gentleman's return was secured is that, like not a few hon. members on that side of the House, he owes his return to a certain Act—facetiously entitled: An Act for the better representation of the people—passed in 1842, under which my constituency disappeared altogether, and many others, represented by members on this side, were altered in a very remarkable way. As for the kindness manifested by the right hon. gentleman towards the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) it speaks for itself, while as to the contention of his friend the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who does not appear to be able to understand that it is any detriment whatever to members of the Opposition that sixty days should be given to their opponents wherein to collect evidence against their return, as against thirty days, or thereabouts, in the case of favored members on the other side, all I can say is that the argument did not strike me as particularly logical. As I understand the intent of the law, it is this: that there should be thirty days and no more given fairly and equally, during which, if evidence of corruption or improper practices can be obtained against any member, a petition can be presented; and it is not just or right or fair play in any sense of the term that by some hocus-pocus, whether practiced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or by partisan returning officers, under any instigation, that members on one side of the House should be subjected to a much longer period of scrutiny than members on the other side. Doubtless, Sir, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) can give wrinkles not merely to members of the Local Governments, but, I dare say, to members of the Government here, and if it be true as suggested by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beau-soleil) that he owes his election largely to intelligent American sympathisers who swarmed across the border on his behalf, I have no doubt we shall have an opportunity of deciding how far those worthy persons are entitled to act as agents for a Canadian member of Parliament. As to those *Gazette* returns the matter lies in a nutshell. Here are the facts in brief. On the 5th, 12th and 19th of March you have fifty Conservative members of Parliament from Ontario gazetted and nine members gazetted on the Opposition side. Pure accident, no doubt—a just proportion, no doubt. The other day—I suppose I may be pardoned for mentioning it—the hon. gentleman on the other side did not claim, I think, that he had a majority of more than some twelve or fourteen in Ontario, and I do not think that the proportion of fifty to nine, gazetted in three

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

weeks, entirely corresponds to the majority which even he claims, no matter how obtained. On the other side, for the other three weeks—March 26th and April 2nd and 9th, the result was that twenty-nine Liberal members for Ontario were gazetted against four on the other side, which seems to me a rather extraordinary proportion. If this result has arisen from any act of the officer of the Government here—the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—this House has abundant right to know and investigate the facts. Practically a very gross unfairness has been committed, as is apparent, I think, to every hon. gentleman in this House. I know perfectly well that it is a very serious injustice that one man should be kept for sixty days or more exposed to the penalties of an election petition, while another should only have thirty days. Why, Sir, my hon. friend who has just left his seat (Mr. Mackenzie) informs me that the return from the returning officer of East York was dated on the 3rd of March. My hon. friend was gazetted on the 9th of April, the return being in on the 3rd of March in the case of Alexander Mackenzie. At the same date was gazetted Mr. Dawson, of Algoma, whose recount, if my memory serves, was closed somewhere about the 2nd of April. At the same time was gazetted Mr. Cargill, of Bruce, who had time to run two elections and get gazetted twice while my hon. friend was being gazetted once. Now, these things may be the result of accident. It may have come to pass by some mysterious fatality these fifty returning officers appointed by the Government in these fifty constituencies were so much more expeditious than the twenty-nine returning officers who returned Liberal members in making their returns. If they did, it is a remarkable coincidence and it sheds some light on the desire of the First Minister to act impartially and to give us the benefit of returning officers who will do justice between man and man. The hon. gentleman declares that it was impossible for his Government to allow these officers to be appointed by hostile bodies. I would like to know if the Government of Quebec, until a recent date, was a hostile body? Was the Government of Manitoba, until a recent date, a hostile body? I do not know whether they are now or not; they are taking issue with the hon. gentleman on some questions. And then he, of all men in the world, declaims in bitter language against the hostility of the Local Government of Ontario. Why was he with his friends the Minister of Marine, the Minister of Interior the late Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice, travelling about Ontario in palatial style, from one end to the other, for a period of six months preceding the local elections? What were they doing? Unless I greatly misrecollect his statements, there was hardly an audience he addressed to whom he did not lay down the position, with great emphasis, that the interests of the country were bound up in the defeat of the Mowat Administration; he did his best to put them out, and if he did not succeed the reason was that the Mowat election was conducted under an honest voters' list, without a Gerrymander Act, without being bedeviled by partisan revising officers. If the truth were known it would be found to be this: that the difference between the votes recorded on behalf of my hon. friend here, and those recorded on behalf of the right hon. gentleman, does not represent honestly and fairly the balance of political opinion among the people of Ontario, but that they represent the extent to which, by means of the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Bill and partisan returning officers, it was possible to disguise and conceal the true sentiments of the people of Canada. Why, Sir, I know of a case myself in which in one single county there was a difference of thirteen or fourteen hundred between the vote on which the election was conducted in Mr. Mowat's case, and the vote under which it was conducted in the Dominion elections; six hundred or seven hundred left off in one case and

six hundred or seven hundred put on in the other. In the one case the voters' lists were made by the people, without the interference of Government, in the other case by men who were appointed at huge cost to us—a cost of many hundreds of thousands of dollars—for the purpose of producing a list which, rightly or wrongly, by fair means or foul, might enable those gentlemen to continue their career of misgovernment. Sir, there is another reason, and a very grave reason, why it is highly derogatory to Parliament and to the interests of the people that a longer time should be given in the case of making out the return for the one side or for the other. There is no doubt that the Government, when they appoint men who, as my hon. friend has said, have been in some instances officers of Liberal-Conservative Associations, are exposed to very great temptation to approach, or to cause to be approached, these men to induce them to do injustice to Liberal candidates when there is a doubt about the extent of the majority; and, Sir, unless I am greatly misinformed, nothing saved my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), although he had a majority of 354, from being most unjustly deprived of his seat, except the fortunate circumstance that among the supporters of the Government there were one or two hon. gentlemen who warned the Government that they would withdraw their support if that iniquity were perpetrated. Now, Sir, is it by accident that fifty men are returned in two or three weeks for the Government side and nine for this side? Is it also by accident that the Government cannot point to one single mishap which has befallen any one of their supporters by reason of the action of a returning officer? I think, Sir, the country will know how to judge both of the way in which these *Gazette* returns were made, and the reasons why they were made. They were delayed for the double purpose, as I judge, first, of giving an unfair advantage in the promotion of election petitions, and next, in the case of many parties, of giving time to manipulate the returns, which, according to the statements made to us, there is only too much reason to believe has been done in other cases than those referred to by my hon. friend. You might as well tell us that it was by pure accident, after we had been told on the floor of this House last Session that it was impossible for the Government to have an election for Haldimand because they had to see that it was held under the new voters' list, that within ten days, I believe, after the seat for Chambly was vacated by the then member, we found that same Government—which kept the Haldimand election back for six months or more, in order that the revising officer might do his work there, and include the Indians of that county in the list—hurrying on the election for Chambly without waiting for the revising officer there to complete his list at all. These are the reasons why we say gross injustice, if not deliberate fraud, has been attempted to be perpetrated by some parties in the Government interest; and these are the reasons which have, most justly, in my opinion, caused my hon. friend from Bothwell to bring this matter to the attention of the House, and demand that reasonable investigation should be had. Of course there can be no objection to the suggestion of the First Minister that this matter should be delayed until to-morrow; that will not interfere with the object of my hon. friend.

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

After Recess.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the hon. member who had the floor before recess would take part in the discussion which was raised by the hon. member sitting behind me. I think the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has been rather unfortunate in the comparison which he has made between the Ontario members and the hon. members from

the Province of Quebec, on the manner in which their names have been inserted in the *Official Gazette*. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) furnished him with documentary evidence to the effect that if the Ontario members had been unfairly treated the members from the Province of Quebec were still more unfairly treated. With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, I will give the names of the hon. members which were published at various times in the *Official Gazette*. To begin with, in the Province of Quebec, six members were elected by acclamation, and it is easy to understand why their names were the first published in the *Official Gazette*. I may be allowed to give their names, they are Messrs. Coursol, Dupont, Lagergne, Scriver, Béchard and Girault. Now, here are the names published on the 12th of March, we will see to which category they belong. They are Messrs. Buin, Hall, the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, Messrs. Bryson, McGreevey, McMillan, Ouimet, Wright, Desaulniers, Guilbault, Audet, Daoust, Desjardins—here, Mr. Speaker, I may be in error, and I hope the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) will pardon me if I place him among the out-and-out supporters of the Administration; he is said to be a Nationalist—Montplaisir, Riopel, Pope, Girouard and the Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron. I may remark here, with regard to my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) that this hon. member represents a county which is further down than the county of Rimouski, and that consequently the report of the returning officer had to travel a longer distance from there to Ottawa, than the report of the returning officer of the county of Rimouski. Well, on the 12th of March, eighteen Conservatives, with the exception of the hon. member for Hochelaga—whom, although he is a Conservative, I would not dare to class among the Ministerialists, for he might be vexed at me if I should class him as belonging to that denomination—were published in the *Official Gazette*. In all, four Liberals, eighteen Ministerialists, and say one Nationalist. How many Liberals, or rather, how many members of the Opposition? Four; the Hon. Mr. Langelier, Mr. Holton, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and Mr. Ste. Marie. Now, on the 19th of March, the names of Ministerialists published in the *Official Gazette* were the following: My hon. friend the member for Témiscouata, (Mr. Grandbois) will not be vexed with me for we have been friends for a long time. The county of Témiscouata is bordering upon the county of Rimouski, and we live at a short distance from one another, and I will explain in a few minutes how it comes that the name of my hon. friend from Témiscouata was published in the *Official Gazette* before the name of the member for Rimouski. Messrs. Grandbois, Labelle, Ives, Chapleau, Colby, Wilson, Curran, Smith and Vanasse. How many members of the Opposition here? I say members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but, although the Government will be very glad to-day to have the support of the Nationalists, when their names were to be published in the *Official Gazette* they were classed with the Liberals, and, accordingly, gazetted as late as we were. They are Messrs. Bergeron, Amyot, and Gaudet. In all nine Ministerialists and three Oppositionists. Who are those who were gazetted on the 26th of March? Here the Liberals are in greater number. Here are the names: Messrs. Préfontaine, Choquette, Langelier, Bernier, Turcotte, Des-saint, Doyon, Beausoleil, Claves, Gauthier, Geoffrion, Fiset, De St. Georges, Bourassa. In all, fourteen Liberals and two Ministerialists—Messrs. Thérien and Coulombe. On the 2nd of April, here are the names of the Oppositionists who were published in the *Official Gazette*: Messrs. Fisher, Rinfret, Cimon, Guay, Duchesnay, Godbout, Couture, Cas-grain, or eight Oppositionists. As to my hon. friend, the member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who is a Conservative, I have no doubt, was the last whose name was published, and this is owing to the fact that his election took place a month after the others. Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to call your attention to a particular fact, which will enable

the House to judge whether, as regards the publication of the names of hon. members in the *Official Gazette*, the Government have really wished to deal fairly with us. I refer to the publication of the election of the county of Témiscouata, and the hon. member for that county will allow me to use his county for the purpose of comparison with the county of Rimouski. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the elections took place on the 22nd of February throughout the Province, with the exception of the county of Gaspé. In the county of Témiscouata the votes were counted on the 2nd of March; a recount having been demanded before the judge, the votes were recounted on the 9th of March. Let us suppose that it took two days for the report of the returning officer to reach Ottawa. Well, for all that, eight or ten days after, my hon. friend was gazetted, for his name appears in the *Official Gazette* of the 19th of March. Far different from this was the case of the county of Rimouski. This county, which I represent, is situated between the counties of Bonaventure and Témiscouata. As I said before, the report from the county of Bonaventure was one of the first to reach Ottawa and the publication took place on the 12th of March. In the county of Rimouski the votes were counted on the 28th of February; suppose it took three days to send in the report; let us extend until the 2nd of March the delay in which it could reach Ottawa; at all events the report which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery must make before the House will give us the exact date of its reception at Ottawa. Be that as it may, my certificate bears the date of the 28th of February. How does it happen, if there has been no show of party feeling, if the intention has been to deal with us in all fairness, how does it happen that the name of one of my two hon. friends, who lives farther than me, appears first in the *Official Gazette*, and that the name of the other who lives as far as me and who had to go through the ordeal of a recount before the judge, is still published before mine? The poor member for Rimouski was only gazetted on the 26th of March. Well, Mr. Speaker, looking at it in the light of common sense, I cannot believe that there has been no partiality. As regards the election itself the Government have chosen as deputy returning officer the man who had acted as such during the preceding election. Personally I do not wish to complain of this, leaving all my complaints to my supporters—and I do not wish to ventilate mine here, but I may be allowed to say that out of forty-four polls held in thirty parishes in the county of Rimouski, not one deputy returning officer belongs to my party, and that good care was taken to choose them in the other party. This is no occasion, Mr. Speaker, to speak about the Franchise Act, but I think that when the proper time comes we will have occasion to point out that grave wrongs have been the result of the application of that Act in the county of Rimouski. For the present I will only state as the hon. members on this side of the House have stated with respect to other counties, that in this publication of our names in the *Official Gazette* the county of Rimouski has been treated in the same manner as all the other Liberal counties in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MADILL. I desire to make an explanation with reference to the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I was elected because of the Redistribution Bill. After the Re-distribution Bill was passed—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has any personal explanation to make on some point of his speech which has been misunderstood he has a right to make it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the explanation is simply this: The hon. member for South Oxford said my Mr. FISKE.

hon. friend owed his election to the Gerrymander. My hon. friend wishes to say it was not so.

Mr. MADILL. It is not so, because since the Redistribution Bill was passed, the ex-member for North Ontario was elected to support the Opposition by a majority of 59. There has been no change since and he has been defeated by 129, which shows that I was not elected by the Gerrymander, because I support the policy of the present Administration, and not the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the explanation of the hon. gentleman is concerned, I think no person will deny that if it were not for the Gerrymander he would not be here to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it were not for the Gerrymander the hon. Member for South Oxford would not be here to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my constituency had not been destroyed in 1882, I would not be here to-night?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is most ungrateful of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very.

Mr. LISTER. It appears to me that many of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-night on the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell have travelled out of the record. The question, I apprehend, is whether the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery properly gazetted the returns as they came in. If those returns were not gazetted as they were made by the returning officers, he did not properly perform his duty, and he must have had some motive for acting as he did. Whether he was guilty of a wrong to the hon. members of this House from his own motion, or whether he acted at the instance of the Administration or any member of it, is a matter we have to enquire into, and comes properly within the purview of the resolution before the House. The hon. leader of the Government, as he always does when he gets into a tight place, got up this evening for the purpose of exciting a feeling of sympathy in the minds of the members of this House by saying that everybody was attacking him. Why, Sir, the Government of Ontario has been attacking him; the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of New Brunswick have been attacking him; every Government in this Dominion has been attacking him, until he has to get up to-night and cry out for sympathy. What are the facts of this matter? That hon. gentleman, ever since Confederation took place, has been assailing the Provincial Governments from one end of this country to the other; he has disregarded every right the Provinces possess, and he has done all that man can do for the purpose of destroying the Confederation to which he professes to be so loyal. I would not give a pin for his loyalty if it stood in the way of his ambition. Now, let us go back a little, although it does not pertain to this issue. But the hon. gentleman, in order to get away from the real issue, tried to draw a herring across the path, and we will follow it up. Did he not travel this country from one end to the other trying to oust from office that little tyrant, Mowat? Did he not, surrounded by his friends, remain in the city of Toronto, waiting to receive news by wire of a glorious victory? And when the news came that Mowat was not defeated, but had gone out of the fight stronger than ever, where were he and his friends? They got away mighty quick. Where did we find him again in 1887? He was in the pay car "Jamaica," with his friends the Minister of the Interior (Mr. White), and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Thompson), on his way into my constituency. Much good he did there. He gave me 250 extra of a majority. I did not ask for a

better canvassers than the Minister of Interior and the leader of the Government himself, that old Tory of Tories, as he called himself in Sarnia, the other night—the father of all Tories. All I can say is, when another election comes on, let them come again into my county, even if it is at the expense of the country they travel. We had the Minister of Agriculture there also, telling us how the savings banks deposits had grown within the last few years. The hon. gentleman says we feel dejected. Not at all; we have come here to fight, and are going to fight; and we will see the day when the Government will be driven ignominiously out of office. That day may be nearer than the hon. gentlemen opposite think, for they cannot go on for all time doing as they have done in the past. The elections they have just gained is due mainly to their law for the appointing of partisan returning officers, as in 1882 they gained the elections by gerrymandering the Province from one end to the other. They would not have ventured to go to the country in 1887 had they not passed the Franchise Act, by which they took power to disfranchise thousands of voters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is traveling over a pretty wide range, but I suppose the example had been given him.

Mr. LISTER. The example has been given me by a very high authority, the leader of the Government. In conclusion I have to say that the simplicity of the First Minister is assumed and not real. No one could pretend to think for a moment that he is the Simple Simon he would have us believe he is. He knows very well that the sooner the Government members get gazetted, the less the chances will be of petitions being filed against them. But when the time has expired for petitions against their side, they will begin to send in their petitions against our side of the House. That is the little game, and it should receive the condemnation of every hon. member of this House.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). The style of speech with which we have just been favored by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) is a fair specimen of the accuracy in dealing with political questions which the hon. gentlemen opposite have exhibited during some months past in the Province of Ontario, and the other Provinces as well. I do not intend to follow the example set by the hon. member. I do not see the object of importing the bitterness of a political contest into our methods of conducting public business in this House; and I think if we are to choose between the style of debate as set by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and that of the junior member for Halifax, all men who desire to see public business conducted in this House in the proper spirit will prefer the spirit in which the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) dealt with the question before us to that which prompted the remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton. I cannot for the life of me understand why so great importance should be given this question. As regards the returning officers of Ontario, in my part of the country we have always employed either the registrars or sheriffs as returning officers, and although these officials are the appointees of the Ontario Government, I must do them the justice to say that they have always acted impartially, and I would be ashamed to recommend any other gentlemen in my section of the country than those officials for the position. There may be constituencies where returning officers have made themselves notorious by partisanship, but I do not know of any; and I am sure my hon. friend who moved the resolution does not complain of the conduct of the returning officer in his constituency during the recent election. He may have some recollection of bygone wrongs, but wrongs in the past should not cause him to do injustice to the gentleman

who acted as returning officer in his constituency during the recent election. I know of no place throughout the whole of western Ontario where there is the slightest ground for complaint as regards the sending in of returns to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, though probably some hon. members did not give sufficient attention to the sending in of their election returns. As soon as the recount was made in my constituency I asked the returning officer to send in the returns, and he did so because I knew the sooner the papers would be sent in the sooner my election would be gazetted.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). In South Essex, as in other places, there was a recount, and this recount caused delay in that riding. In other places, as I have seen it stated in the press, the returning officers did not furnish the papers necessary to enable the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make his return. It is surprising to me that hon. gentlemen opposite should be so anxious to have their election speedily gazetted. It looks as if they had something to conceal, as if they were afraid of a free and full investigation. Surely, whatever others might have done, hon. gentlemen opposite have done nothing that they should wish to conceal from the country or from investigation before an election court. If they have nothing to fear, whence their complaints? They have raised a great tempest in a tea-pot this afternoon to no purpose, unless indeed they are favoring us with their first instalment of the Opposition commission, and the vigorous policy of attack to be exhibited by this commission, formed of leading gentlemen from the several Provinces. However much we may regret the cause which may have led to that arrangement for putting the Opposition leadership into commission, and I sincerely regret there should be any physical cause, on the part of the leader of the Opposition that compels him to relax his efforts and seek the aid of a commission, still I think if we are to have onsets from the various provincial deputy assistant leaders of the Opposition in the style of to-day, the sooner they are discontinued the better it will be for the country. I do not come here to attack and insult anybody, nor am I disposed to remain silent while such unfair and unjust attacks as the present are being made on the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Although I have been read out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as a Tory, I call myself an independent member of the House, and am ready to promote any measure in accord with the best interests of the country; but I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can use the word Tory as a term of reproach when the hon. member for St. John, the senior member for Halifax, and my hon. friend the gallant knight from Oxford are as finished specimens of the Tory gentleman as you can find in the country. The subject of the interference of the Provinces having been brought into this debate, I must say that I did not hear the Premier or any gentleman on this side find fault with the action of the Government of New Brunswick in reference to Dominion matters. I think the example set by the Provincial Government of New Brunswick is one which might be copied by all the other Provincial Governments with great advantage to the country. They combined for local purposes just in the same manner as the people of a county in Ontario would deal with affairs in a county council, but, in Dominion politics, those members who sat side by side in the Provincial Cabinet took their sides as they chose, and, when the fight was over, went back to attend to their provincial affairs again. Although the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), when he was leading the Government of Ontario, said he did not approve of the spirit of hostility, but that the spirit of neutrality was the one which should be indulged in towards the Dominion Government, still his satellite in that Government,

the man whom he placed there as Premier, has followed out a policy of the bitterest hostility to the Dominion Government on each and every occasion. In the west, I know I was favored with many visitors during the late campaign, amongst others two or three officials of the Ontario Government who were sent to speak and to canvass against me, and to appeal to the passions and prejudice of the people of my riding, and to prejudice me with them by false representations. On every occasion, at every General election since the present Government obtained power in Ontario, they have unceasingly striven to persecute the Government of which the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald is the chief. I think that such conduct has been a more serious injury to Confederation, and to the interests of this country, than anything which has occurred in this Dominion since the establishment of the confederacy. One word more. I think the gentlemen who had their gazetting delayed are in a more favorable position than those who were gazetted earlier, because I think sober second thoughts may enable gentlemen to pull through when people find there is not all this ground for attack which there is sometimes rumored to be immediately after an election is over. Just after an election we find all sorts of rumors floating about in constituencies. In my own constituency the warden of the county is now awaiting his trial, but, although the warden is awaiting his trial for bribery on my behalf, they have done me the honor to refrain from petitioning against my return. I think that if the Premier or his friends had not been in such a hurry to have him gazetted, early for Kingston, possibly the sober second thoughts of the people of that borough might have saved them from perpetuating Kingston's shame, and that attack—particularly that personal attack—would not have been made upon a man who had served the city of Kingston for forty years, and had given his whole life to the service of the country. The bitterness which inspired the hon. gentlemen opposite during the campaign, which inspires them to-day, finds its foundation in this, that they had not one question of principle at stake when they went to the country; that there was not one great reform demanded and denied; that there was not one single section of the country suffering under any injustice, and, therefore, having no policy on which to go to the country, having accepted the policy of this Government in all its details and having nothing whatever to offer in exchange, they were compelled to fall back upon personal abuse and the slander of private character—slander in which defenceless women and invalid children were compelled to take their share. I think that is the secret, and, if these gentlemen think we are afraid of them, and that they can carry on the onslaught against us here, and that we will quietly sit down and let them put their feet upon our necks, they mistake our temper on this side towards them. We do not forget—I do not forget for one—the manner in which we have been treated by hon. gentlemen opposite, the way in which courtesy, fair play and gentlemanly good-feeling towards them have been reciprocated by them, but they must understand that, just as they deal out to us their attempts to intimidate us in carrying on the affairs of this House, we will deal with them and will give back blow for blow. This Government has deserved the confidence of this country, and possesses the confidence of the country, and while it deserves that confidence it will have our cordial support; but I may say for myself that I do not purpose supporting any measure or any transaction that I cannot be a party to and at the same time retain my self-respect. As far as my friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is concerned, he generally, when he rises, makes himself particularly agreeable to the hon. the Premier. That shows the ingratitude of my friend from Elgin, because the Premier in 1871 or 1872 carved out a constituency for my friend, and, when, owing to his

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

opposition to popular measures, there was a doubt of his success, he strengthened him again in 1882 and kept him there. I can understand my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) not liking the way in which my hon. friend from Elgin was strengthened, but I cannot understand the ingratitude of my friend from Elgin towards the man who has kept him in public life. I may add that I think it is the duty of gentlemen, while making these indiscriminate charges, to point out the constituencies where partisan returning officers have been appointed and the constituencies where officials, such as registrars and sheriffs, could have been selected and were not. I do not know of such constituencies. In the west we had none such. These officials were chosen all through the west, and the elections were conducted in the fairest possible manner. I, for one, am perfectly satisfied that, when the matter comes to be investigated, it will be found that the whole affair was not worth wasting the afternoon over.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should suppose that the afternoon was wasted. I want to know what else there was to do. We got through the Order paper, and we might just as well discuss this important question of public policy as for the hon. gentleman to go to his lodgings and amuse himself in whatever way he may be accustomed to amuse himself when the House is not in session. We are not wasting public time, because the time which has been devoted to this discussion would have been devoted to private affairs if it were not given to this important public question. The hon. gentleman has taken three different views with reference to this matter, and I prefer the view which he took under the influence of his own personal feelings in his own case. He told us at one time that it was really a matter of no consequence at all in what order the gazettes took place, that it was a tempest in a teapot, and that he was surprised that we said anything about it. In another part of his speech he told us that we were favored in being gazetted late, that it was the most advantageous course for us, because it was giving time for passions to cool and suspicions to vanish, and that thus petitions might be avoided. These were two of the opinions which he expressed; but he gave a third. What was it? It was the one which he acted upon himself when he went to the sheriff, when he went to the man whom he appointed returning officer and said: Please send down my return as soon as possible. There are the three opinions the hon. gentleman gave us his choice of. He chose the one which he vouched for and verified by having founded his own conduct upon it. What was the reason the hon. gentleman wanted the sheriff to get his return at once? Because he wanted to be gazetted early. Why? Because he knew that the period for the petition would elapse earlier, the earlier he was gazetted. Was there any other reason? If so, will the hon. gentleman tell us? If not, we understand perfectly that the hon. gentleman knew quite well what the advantage was which he would derive from the course he pursued. Ah! says the hon. gentleman, I understand how it is that you hon. gentlemen are so uneasy to be gazetted quickly. It must be because you are afraid. Let me retort his own action—let me retort his own conduct? What was the hon. gentleman afraid of? Was it consistent with a perfect confidence in his own return, that he should be anxious to hurry his gazetting? I do not say it was not, but if it was, why does he insinuate an improper motive and a consciousness of wrong, because we also desired our gazetting to be earlier? Is that the fair play which he has invoked on this occasion? Is that the candid, the even-handed justice, which he calls upon us to display at the peril of his displeasure, at the peril of his violating the law and the gospel, and returning blow for blow? If it is, we would like to see him give us some other sample of fair play upon which we should act. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from

Essex spoke in the line, a little bit, of the First Minister. He followed in his line when he charged the Local Government—and he repeated the old story in reference to the views that I took when I was a member of the Local Government—as to the relation I should desire to exist between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of the Province. I said that I desired the relations between the two Governments to be relations of neutrality. I desire it still. I heartily regret that circumstances have ever risen which make any other relations to exist between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of any Province, than relations of neutrality. But I never said, I never thought, I never suggested, that the relations between the Government of a Province and the Government of the Dominion ought to be those of a neutrality which should, in the slightest degree, compromise or interfere with the relations of the individuals who compose that Government as electors of the Province, to interfere with their liberty to vindicate the rights of their Province or to vindicate their politics. Why, at the very time I said so I was the First Minister of Ontario. And when I was a member of this House for the west riding of Durham, opposing the hon. gentleman, does he suppose that I purposed to sentence myself to neutrality as a representative of the west riding of Durham, when I declared that I thought the Local Government of Ontario, as a Local Government, ought to be neutral? Surely no. I intended to reserve, I did reserve, I was reserving, my full rights as an elector of Ontario, as a representative of a constituency of Ontario in the House of Commons, to act according to what my views of the interests of this country required in that capacity. Well, as Prime Minister of the Government of Ontario, I purposed to pursue a course of neutrality as far as the Dominion Government was concerned.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). What about coercion of the local officials?

Mr. BLAKE. I am going to touch coercion, which the hon. gentleman did not touch, but the First Minister did. I am going to touch it, and if the hon. gentleman will allow me I will deal with only one thing at a time. Now, the hon. gentleman declared—and here also he followed the lead of the First Minister—that the members of the Local Government whom, with that fresh instance of fair play, of moderate conduct, of the absence of vituperative epithets which he recommends to us, he called my satellites, have been engaged in the contest in Ontario. I suppose they were, I hope they were. As free men of Canada, as electors of the Province of Ontario, they had not merely the right, but the duty, to stand upon a platform and address to the people of Ontario their views as to what the interests of Canada were, although it happened to be the hon. gentleman's constituency which they invaded. But to call them my satellites is to call them by a name wholly inappropriate and wholly inaccurate. They are the members of a very strong Government, which, in despite of all the opposition of the hon. gentleman and his supporters, has succeeded in retaining the confidence of the people of Ontario for a period of fourteen or fifteen years. They are the satellites of no man, they are the trusted rulers of the Province of Ontario, to whom this power has been confided for that long period by the will of its people. Now, the First Minister has said that the members of the Local Government, from the Prime Minister to the last of them, threatened to coerce their officers to vote and work for the Opposition in the recent contest, and the observations of the member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) appeared to be in the same direction. I am not the vindicator or the defender of the Local Government, but I suppose it will be agreed by every member of this House that the honor and standing of the Local Government are subjects of concern to all the population of Canada. All I demand

is, in the interest of justice and fair play, that charges so grave as these should not be uttered wholesale, without definition, without specification, without proof. If the hon. gentleman shall show that the Government of Ontario has, as he has charged them this night with doing, coerced and threatened its employes, its officers, into taking a course contrary to their conscience and wishes, politically, I shall join that hon. gentleman in condemning that Government; but I call upon him, as he has made this statement, to give particulars and to give proof. The hon. gentleman is excellent at wholesale and general charges, he is a master at enveloping a people, a party, a Government, a population, in one mass of declamatory invective and charge. Oftentime he has charged us in like terms. But let him now come down to particulars in reference to those whom he charges, and give them an opportunity to answer, and let us see whether he has this night done them justice. I agree with the hon. member for North Essex, who said that if there were persons appointed who ought not to have been appointed, some specification ought to be given, and as this charge has been made against the Local Government, I trust the hon. gentleman will agree with me that, here also, some specification should be given, and I shall answer the hon. gentleman's demands for specifications as to the returning officers very soon. Now, Sir, the First Minister said that it was necessary to make a change in the appointment of returning officers, because the local officers who, by law, held this appointment, were under the control of a hostile Government. I do not at all pretend that it is an infallible guarantee of the fitness for the office of returning officer, or for any other trust, of a man, that he should hold the situation of a sheriff or a registrar; but I do say that no better plan has been devised, nor can any better plan be devised, for securing, upon the whole, upon the mass, good appointments, than that the persons who are appointed to these responsible offices should, during good behavior, also be returning officers. They are officials of a quasi-judicial character; they are men who are appointed practically for life; they are appointed to offices which require some training, which require them to live in the community, and which require them, if they value at all what most of us value highly, the esteem and respect of those amongst whom they live, require them so to behave in the discharge of those duties as that they shall retain that esteem and respect. The hon. gentleman says, however, it was necessary to depart from this rule because these persons were no longer servants of this Government, but were servants of other Governments, and in order to secure impartiality, in order to secure right appointments, we must take the office into our own hands, and we found that injustice was done us when we did not do so. Now, I appeal to the fair play and candor of the hon. gentlemen who have watched the conduct of elections, as far as the returning officers were concerned, for a great many years past, to say in how many cases there has been misconduct by sheriffs or registrars when they held, by law, that office in the old days. There are other cases, there may be a case or two, I do not say there is not; I do not remember one at the moment, but it is quite possible. Considering the question broadly, I ask where are the cases? I say we had a guarantee in the standing of those men, and in the fact that they held their office as returning officers not by the gift of the Government, but by the law of the land, that they were so appointed and known, and every one was aware that they held that office to act fairly and impartially between both parties, which was the best guarantee we could possess. With what does the hon. gentleman replace that system? He gives the appointments in many cases to partisans of his own party. This is a very serious question. It is a question which comes before us, after what has been said, directly upon this motion, but it is one which must obviously inte-

rest the whole country and interest, at one time or another, both sides of this House. I say that partisans have been appointed. What is the function of the returning officer? The function is, it is said, partly judicial, partly ministerial. He has to choose the deputies; he has very important duties of various descriptions to discharge. He has very great powers, very great powers indeed. Is it reasonable that the man who is to exercise those discretionary, those executive, those judicial and those ministerial powers should be chosen because he is the known, the avowed partisan of one of the two sides who are engaged in the conflict? I say that such men have been chosen, and not infrequently chosen during the recent contest. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said that in the great majority of cases in the Province of Quebec, the men chosen were sheriffs or registrars. Well, the answer is easy. Who appointed all those sheriffs or registrars? We know who they were and that they filled the bill of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that is the reason. It was not necessary to go further; in fact, hon. gentlemen might, perhaps, have gone further and fared worse. But it was not so in all respects, if I am rightly informed. At least it was not so as to the character of those officers everywhere. I will give an instance or two. Take the case of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill). The returning officer for the north riding of Ontario, if I am rightly informed, was secretary of the Conservative Association, and he also acted as clerk to the revising officer at the last revision, and he was very closely connected, before his appointment of course, with the Tory committee. That was the position of the returning officer of the north riding of Ontario. We know how this is done from the hon. member from North Essex (Mr. Patterson). He said: I would be ashamed to recommend any one but a sheriff. So we know who made the recommendations to the Government for returning officers. The hon. gentleman said: I recommended the sheriff and he was appointed. The returning officer owed his appointment to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I did not say that. I said I would be ashamed to make any recommendation except that of the sheriff or registrar.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and the sheriff got the appointment. But there are hon. gentlemen who do not possess the same fortitude as the hon. member for Essex, because I find an hon. member recommended the secretary of the Conservative Association for returning officer. There is also the case of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault). In that case the returning officer had the additional qualification of being the brother-in-law of the Conservative candidate.

Mr. MADILL. Not at all.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) is not speaking of North Ontario but of Joliette.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for North Ontario had the secretary of the Conservative Association for returning officer and the hon. member for Joliette had his brother-in-law. Then there is the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse), who smiles upon me with the knowledge as to how these matters are worked. That hon. gentleman had a returning officer taken not from the county of Yamaska at all, but from Sorel.

Mr. VANASSE. He has lived for forty years in Yamaska.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that he was from Sorel latterly; he may have come from Yamaska originally.

Mr. VANASSE. He was out of it 16 years ago for a short time.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the returning officer was a person entirely disqualified by his habits—which he

Mr. BLAKE.

exhibited during the election in the most open and disgraceful manner—from filling any office of trust whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman goes rather far in attacking such persons. I have allowed the discussion on the general ground as covered by the resolution; but if hon. gentlemen, one after another, proceed to discuss the question of any particular returning officer, I must say it is out of order. I would advise the hon. gentleman to limit himself to the general ground on which I have allowed the discussion to proceed.

Mr. BLAKE. I am surprised at your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I submit. I have here some fifteen or twenty more cases, which I am prepared to particularise, and I have been challenged to do it; but I will put them by at this time.

An hon. MEMBER. We will get them again.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, you will get them again. On the general ground, as I cannot particularise, I say there are abundant cases in which the secretaries of Liberal Conservative Associations, in which the lawyers who had been employed by the Conservatives to attend the revision of the list, in which other persons holding positions openly, intimately and ardently connected with the Conservative party, were chosen to fill the positions of returning officers; and I say that they accomplish their appointed work in many cases. I could show cases in which such persons gave appointments of agencies. Why, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) spoke on this subject, and I was surprised at his indiscretion. There were ninety men who voted on agency certificates in the hon. gentleman's own election.

Mr. IVES. That was an election *canard*. There is not the slightest truth in that statement.

Mr. BLAKE. And sixty at another poll—

Mr. IVES. That is not true.

Mr. BLAKE—and sixty at another poll, according to the information I have received.

Mr. IVES. Your information is false, entirely false.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be so; I will give my information, and we will see presently. So in Provoncher (Manitoba) there were a very large number, and a very considerable number in the county of Selkirk; and in this and in other respects the elections were conducted in a most irregular manner. In many instances, also, of which I have particulars here, the old deputy returning officers, many of whom occupied the position for a great many years, who were familiar with the duties, who had the confidence of the people generally, were not appointed on this occasion, but others, unfamiliar with the duty and known only as Tory partisans, replaced them and did their appointed work. In other cases, of which I have the particulars here, partisan returning officers put the polls in isolated districts, at points extremely remote from and inconvenient to the Liberal electors who inhabited those districts, and to the direct advantage of the Tory candidates. In many cases the result happened that there were irregularities. I never heard of an election in which there were so many irregularities on the part of deputy returning officers as in this election, and it is largely due to the fact that there never was an election in which there were so many changes in the accustomed officers, in which there were so many replacements of these officers by men inexperienced in the past and animated only by a fervent zeal to serve the party with which they were connected. And, bear in mind, that those irregularities were availed of in some cases, and attempted to be availed of in others, to alter the absolute verdict which was obtained under such difficult circumstances. So it is that I say—

when the hon. gentleman says it is quite reasonable that the Government should take this power—if it be so, I say that we ought to challenge earnestly and scrutinise diligently the manner in which this power has been exercised. It is a power the most delicate conceivable. Who are they? and what are they called upon to do? They are those in control of public affairs, appealing to the great jury of the people, and themselves making provision for the record of the verdict of that jury. They are appointing the officers who are to exercise those great powers. What more delicate position can men be placed in than that, and of what conduct ought there to be a more vigilant, determined and rigorous scrutiny than that? I am sorry that the order of the House, as interpreted by you, prevents me from entering, on this occasion, into further details as to the unhappy results of the actions, however excellently well intended by hon. gentlemen; but I think it will be shown, and I hope before very long, that their conduct in the discharge of this delicate power has not been what it ought to be, and has been directed to the maintenance of themselves in power by virtue of the exercise of the rights they have obtained from the people. The hon. gentleman says he is not at all surprised at the temper which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) exhibited in dealing with this question. Well, I did not observe that the hon. member for Bothwell exhibited any particular temper; but the hon. gentleman whose temper is so angelic, said that my hon. friend's temper was bad, that the temper of all of us was bad because of the great majority by which he was returned to this house. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has analysed that return. I have analysed it to some extent. In the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there were about 475,000 votes polled, and, as near as I can make out, out of those 475,000 the hon. gentleman succeeded in getting about four thousand more than the Liberal party, or about the return of one member. That was the popular verdict of those four great Provinces. It is quite true, that by operations which he has carried through this House, by powers which he has obtained from this House, and the exercise of those powers by his officers, that popular majority of one is represented by a Parliamentary majority of twenty-one. It is quite true that he has just twenty-one times the power in Parliament from those four Provinces that he got from the polls. But that is what the people said. It is true that one hundred and five votes turned out of those 475,000 would have taken away the hon. gentleman's twenty one; that it would have given a parliamentary return equivalent to the popular vote and balanced the return from those four Provinces. I have not so far analysed the returns from the other Provinces as to be able to speak with the same degree of positiveness as to them, but I believe the general return will represent something like three-quarters of a million, and I believe on that general return, if the popular voice were, as it ought to be, truly expressed according to its strength here, the parties would be found to be balanced, and that after all the influences which the hon. gentleman was able to avail himself of to produce a different result. The hon. gentleman has said that this particular question which has been brought forward is not one of any great consequence—that the state of things which has been alluded to might happen accidentally; and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said, that considering the larger number of Conservatives who were returned from the Province of Ontario than Reformers, it was quite natural and reasonable that more Conservatives should be gazetted than Reformers. Why, of course it was. If there were more Conservatives returned than Reformers, there must be more Conservatives gazetted than Reformers; but it would be natural to expect that the different returns which came out at different times should bear something like the proportion

of the gross returns. But when the hon. gentleman endeavors to induce this House to believe that it is a mere accidental and perfectly reasonable circumstance that the returns should be gazetted in the order in which they have been gazetted, I think he presumes on the simplicity of us young members of Parliament far more than he, with his large parliamentary experience ought to do. On the 5th of March, taking the Province of Ontario, there were eight Conservatives and one Reformer gazetted; on the 12th of March, twenty-eight Conservatives and five Reformers; on the 19th of March, fourteen Conservatives and three Reformers, so that the first three *Gazettes* after the election gave fifty Conservatives and nine Reformers. Then on the 26th of March there were two Conservatives to eighteen Reformers; on the 2nd of April, one Conservative to six Reformers; on the 9th of April, one Conservative to five Reformers, so that the three later *Gazettes* gave four Conservatives to twenty-nine Reformers. Is anybody simple enough to believe that that is an accident? We cannot tell yet where it happened, whether it was the returning officers that delayed them in some cases or that gentle pressure like that exerted by my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Patterson) expedited them in others; but that there was intentional delay in one case and expedition in the other who upon those figures can doubt, particularly when we learn that something like the same results—though I was not able to analyse them as definitely from the statements which hon. gentlemen made—happened in the other Provinces? The general result then is that the first three *Gazettes* after the election gave fifty Conservatives to nine Reformers, and the last three four Conservatives to twenty-nine Reformers. The hon. gentleman says, what is wrong about it—what does the matter amount to? You have thirty days, the hon. gentleman says, during which petitions can be filed, and we have thirty days during which petitions can be filed; and he actually expected his confiding followers to agree with him that it made no difference at all. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) knew better than that. All of us knew better than that. We know that the time for petitioning lasts from the 22nd of February, the day of the election, until thirty days after the *Gazette*, and we know that in some cases, therefore, there are forty days to petition and in others sixty and seventy days, and we know that those who expedite the *Gazette* as a rule have the advantage. This further we know, that what the motive may be or what the advantage or disadvantage may be, we may put to one side, because the law commands the returning officer at once to return his writ to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the law commands the clerk to gazette the return by the next *Gazette* after he receives the writ. Now, all these circumstances are such as must lead every man's mind to the conviction that, if that law has by one or other of these sets of officers been disobeyed, it is our duty to investigate it and ascertain why the law of the land, productive of those consequences, favorable to one side and unfavorable to the other side, has been disobeyed. That is the purpose of this motion, and I do not think it is at all a waste of time that we should discuss the evidence in order to get at the facts, and to ascertain how, practically, the laws the hon. gentleman has caused Parliament to pass, ostensibly to secure the freedom of election, are working, and what results they are really producing.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, commenced his speech by explaining an incident in the political history of this country which has been the subject of discussion on various occasions. We all remember that when he became the First Minister of the Province of Ontario he laid down a general principle with reference to the relation of the Provincial Governments to the Dominion Government. Before that time the late Hon. Sandfield Macdonald was Premier of the Province of Ontario,

and the common expression that used to be made use of by the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends, in speaking of that late hon. gentleman and the leader of this Government was that they were in the habit of hunting in couples, and that was denounced by them as a great public wrong. Now, we learn that although the hon. gentleman denounced them at that time, and declared when he came into office in Ontario that he was thereafter to adopt a different principle, a principle of entire neutrality, he now asks us to believe that when he said that he did not in the slightest degree desire to restrict the independent action of members of either Government as citizens of the different Provinces of the Dominion in connection with the elections of either the Local or the Dominion Legislatures. The hon. gentleman forgets that the late Hon. Sandfield Macdonald was a member of this House—that he stood in precisely the same position the hon. gentleman stood in. He forgets that the moment the late Government of this Dominion came in, the hunting in couples went on between Mr. Mowat and Mr. Mackenzie. The position was precisely the same as it had been during the time the late Hon. Sandfield Macdonald was in office, and the present First Minister was First Minister of Canada. Nay, more than that, this very evening we have had from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) an attack on two members of this Government who happened to be electors in the Province of Nova Scotia, because they ventured to take any part there in the election for the Local Legislature. Why does the hon. gentleman now lay down the principle that he has a right as an independent citizen of the Province of Ontario to take what interest he pleases in the Local elections there, while his joint leader from the Province of Nova Scotia, the member of the syndicate who has been appointed to lead the Opposition with the hon. gentleman, denounces members of this Government who happened to be electors, and prominent public men in Nova Scotia, for taking part in the elections of that Province? I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman, with all the skill he undoubtedly possesses, has utterly failed to explain how he could for four years denounce as a wrong against public and political morality, the joint action in public affairs of the leader of any Provincial Government and the leader of the Dominion Government who happened to think alike on political questions, and at the same time show that he was justified, as an independent member of this House and an independent citizen of the Province of Ontario, in taking an active part in the elections there. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman dealt with the general question, and that is the real question we have before us to-night. As to the appointment of returning officers, he laid down the principle that we ought, as a matter of duty and a matter of right, to appoint sheriffs and registrars as returning officers in Dominion elections. Well, that was not always the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite. If I remember rightly, they actually violated the law on one occasion in order to appoint a partisan returning officer. We know what occurred in the courts of the country. The records are there. We remember the somewhat famous Jacques Cartier election. We know that the returning officer in that election was not the official named in the statute, and he was appointed by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was, either then or before, a member—because he was so frequently in and out of that Government that one cannot say for certain whether he was in or out at that time. I do not for a moment say that the results which followed that appointment were due to it. I do not say that that remarkable effort to steal an election, which was commonly known as the Ste. Anne's cupboard or ballot box scheme, was a consequence of that appointment; but I do say, that gentlemen who violated the law to appoint a returning officer, who was not the official that the law said should be appointed, do not stand very well in telling

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

us here that a wrong has been done when the law has been followed in appointing gentlemen other than those officials as returning officers. But what is the position the hon. gentleman takes? He says we ought not to appoint partisans as returning officers, and he was prepared to read a list of persons who, I suppose, he was prepared to show were active partisans of the Conservative party. Well, Sir, suppose we adopted the other principle, what would be the result? I can imagine a case like this: A prominent member of Parliament happens to be defeated at an election, and his friends are very anxious to have him back in Parliament. His friends happen to control the Government of one of the Provinces. There is a member sitting in this House whose seat would be a very safe one for this gentleman who had been expelled by the verdict of the constituency he should have represented. The Local Government purchase the seat of the member by granting him an office of sheriff in order to provide a seat here for the prominent member of their party. Immediately an election occurs, and this Government have to appoint this impartial person, this man without politics, as returning officer, because, forsooth, he has sold himself for a shrievalty in order to make room for an opponent of the Government. The Government are to appoint him in order to avoid the evil that might result from appointing a partisan. Why, Sir, everyone knows that these sheriffs and registrars are appointed because they are friends of the party that appoints them. Everyone knows that they are appointed because of active political services for the party that appoints them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Even in Ottawa.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, even in Ottawa such things occur, and occur under very peculiar circumstances. Take, for instance, such a case as we have recently had, where a vacancy occurs in a registrarship, where it is kept open for more than a year, during which time there are a dozen applicants, all men who have strong claims for a position of that kind. But it happens that one particular partisan who would never be thought of but for his partisanship or for the partisanship he can bring to bear in favor of his appointment—he happens to have relatives who can do some service to the party—has to be provided for. The office is allowed to remain vacant until the Local elections are through, and when the last election is over and all the service is rendered that can be rendered by this non-partisan, he is immediately appointed to the registrarship. Then, because he becomes an impartial man by virtue of his having been made registrar, he is to be appointed returning officer. The injustice of the system is evident. On the other hand, the policy we have adopted is the best, for this reason, the Government returning officer is subject to the scrutiny of the courts. If we look at the elections through which we have just passed, I venture the opinion, despite what hon. gentlemen opposite have said, that few cases of complaint have occurred in the conduct of them as have occurred at any previous elections since 1867. Where are the complaints with regard to the conduct of returning officers? We have one which is under discussion. We may deal with it here, the courts may deal with it hereafter, but it is a case where the conduct of the returning officer is subject to the review of the court. More than that, the Government in the appointment of returning officers is subject to the control and censure of Parliament itself. The pretence that we will have less partisan men by the appointment of provincial officers is simply a pretence, as hon. gentlemen opposite know very well. Let me say one word more. This is a motion to bring a respected officer of Parliament before the bar of the House. He is asked to bring down papers to be submitted to the House. These papers, it is presumed, will give us the information on which a judgment can be formed; yet we have had hon. gentlemen opposite, one after the other, assuming, before the papers are brought

down, and on the very motion asking for the papers, that some great wrong has been committed and that some one is bound to suffer censure. Would it not be better to wait until the papers are brought down before discussing the question whether wrong has been done at all? I do not believe, when we come to discuss the question as to the conduct of returning officers during the last election, that hon. gentlemen on this side will have any reason to regret the discussion. Take one case, and that is simply one of a number. Take the case of Kingston, where, it is said, the returning and the deputy returning officers were friends of the First Minister, who was a candidate, and what do we find. The judge who, if he had any politics, is not friendly to the Government, and we have no right to assume he has any politics at all, when he came to review the action of the returning officer found that the difference in the number of votes which ought to have been counted and the number which was counted, operated to the advantage of the First Minister. Twelve was the majority returned by the returning officer, this partisan and corrupt man who had been put in that position for the purpose of electing the Conservative candidate; yet when the judge went over the ballots he found the numbers should have been seventeen. I believe when the time comes to discuss the whole question or the election and all the incidents connected with it, it will not be hon. gentlemen on this side who will have any reason to regret that discussion.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I am grateful to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that he has given permission to the junior members of this House to test the acoustic properties of this Chamber, and at the same time air their eloquence. I had hoped to be spared my first speech until a better occasion offered than the present. I had hoped that something would be before the House more important than the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, on which I might exercise my oratory. But it must fall to the lot of every hon. gentleman, who represents a constituency in this House, at some time to have to speak for the constituency he represents. If he be a true man, he is attached to one party or the other, and when he finds his party maligned on any occasion, he is bound to stand up for it. I propose to do this in my humble way. I propose to show to this House that if the Government agent acted in my constituency, as these agents are said by hon. gentlemen opposite to have acted in other constituencies, the results in mine might have been very different. I may be allowed to say that in representing the county of Argenteuil, I represent not only the Conservatives but the Reformers as well. I am afraid many hon. gentlemen opposite are guilty of forgetting the fact that they are representatives of the Conservative party as well as the Reform party of their constituencies, and that in their malignment of Conservative partisanship on the part of the returning officers of their electoral districts, they are equally maligning the people they are sent here to represent. The county of Argenteuil has been represented for the last thirty years, with the exception of an interregnum of four years, by a Conservative in this House, the Hon. Mr. Abbott. On each occasion that electoral district returned a member to the House of Commons by a very small majority, and if any effort had been put forth by the Government to prevent the return of a Grit—I use the word advisedly, for the leader of the Opposition uses the word "Tory" without sparing this side—if the Government suspected as they had reason to suspect, that the county of Argenteuil was not a safe one, in view of the small majorities it always gave, they might have named a returning officer in the place of the one who exercised that function at the last elections. But the Government would not interfere with the usage of years gone by in that constituency. In it, the returning officer

is a pronounced Grit, and yet he was allowed to retain his position. He was allowed to remain, despite the fact that he was a Grit, and despite the fact also that the district had been in the habit of returning a gentleman to this House by a narrow majority of between 4 and 100 in a total vote of 3,000. Did the Government act fraudulently in this case? No; they left the gentleman there who had been returning officer for years. Therefore, I must rebut the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in so far as Argenteuil is concerned. But there is a more forcible point to this question. It was well known to the Government that Mr. Abbott was about to resign his position as a member of the House of Commons, or, at least, that he was going to lay no claim upon the electors of Argenteuil. And that was well known to the Government, I am satisfied long before the appointment of a returning officer. Yet, forsooth, the Government did not see fit, nor did they act in that fraudulent manner, that base manner attributed to them by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. Was it not well known to the Government that it was a very unwise and very unsafe thing to swap horses in crossing a stream? It certainly was, and they must have known that if any effort was to be put forth to reclaim the county of Argenteuil for the Grit party it could well have been put forth at this time. With all this, which they must have known, did they act in this base and fraudulent manner, did they place a partisan there to serve their purpose? No, they left that officer there, and they knew him to be a pronounced Grit. As to the statement made by the senior member for Halifax, and the fault found by him because he was not gazetted earlier, I can scarcely think that his claim that he was not fairly dealt with is well founded, because the returning officer for the constituency of Argenteuil made a return of my election on the 2nd March, and yet I was not gazetted until the 19th March although I was known to be a Tory. Now, if the senior member for Halifax was not gazetted until the 19th March and his return was made on the 4th March, what complaint has he more than I have? None whatever. But the position of the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House reminds me very much of the position of the party they represent in the constituency which I have the honor to represent, after the General election. They believed they were satisfied, and had made their calculations sure and fast, that the candidate who opposed me was to be returned by 450 majority, and I am satisfied that the disappointment of the man when he found I was returned by almost half that majority was not greater than the disappointment of the hon. gentlemen opposite in finding that they are not on the Treasury benches to day. I shall not forget when the hon. the leader of the Opposition took the chance to deliver an address here, whether by fair means or foul, on the day of the election of a Speaker. I have had the honor of representing a constituency in municipal matters, but I had not thought that such devices were introduced into the House of Commons. I had thought better of the conduct of members in the House of Commons. I thought, when I came here, that our time was to be devoted to legislation, and it is well for us that legislation is going on all the time, that we have clerks and servants working for us while we are playing, for, in this little sparring exhibition which we have had going on here from five o'clock this afternoon to the present moment, ten o'clock, I claim that we have been doing nothing but playing. We are talking against time. There is a court where this matter will be decided. It has been said by the leader of the Opposition that it might be as well for us to be here as to be sporting our time in the hotels and in our boarding houses. I question that very much, because if in our hotels and boarding houses we would not now be making objects of ourselves, objects

of ridicule, the butts of the press of the whole Dominion. Now, if the Tory slogan that the hon. gentleman mentioned had gone forth against him in this election campaign, there was a no less forcible slogan which went forth against me in my election. I had a very ticklish question to deal with, and the slogan against me at one time was not the same as the slogan at another time. I had to fight the Riel matter, and that was introduced by the party of the hon. members from the Opposition. If the Riel matter had been left out of my county, I would have had a lesser fight, but that was introduced by whom? By the party of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. It was introduced there, but it had little effect, for the effect which it was thought would be produced in the front of the county, had its counter effect in the rear. I will not mention it further. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said that the slogan had gone forth, and that all sorts of cries had gone out,—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I have not interrupted the hon. gentleman as a new member when he violated your rule laid down a short time ago, when you declined to permit particulars in regard to returning officers to be stated, which I presume will apply to the good conduct of returning officers as well as to their bad conduct; nor did I interrupt him when he proceeded, contrary to order, to refer to a former debate in terms which could only be excused on the ground of his ignorance of parliamentary procedure; but when he misrepresents my observations I think I should rise to order, and call your attention to his remarks, and ask you to restrain him, unless I am allowed the opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman from Argenteuil will remember that it is not allowed, according to our rules in this House, to refer to a debate which has taken place on another motion which has already been tried, and I shall ask him not to refer to any of these debates which are now closed.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I am very happy indeed to be corrected. I supposed when I got up that I would be corrected two or three times before I took my seat. I am very fortunate indeed to have been corrected only once. I am satisfied that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in this matter of bringing these election returns and the returning officers and their conduct before the bar of the House will not do them any good. It will fasten more strongly to this party many members who might be vacillating. Why? Because their question is so imbecile. It is an impossibility to find gentlemen on either side of politics that are impartial. Whom shall we appoint as returning officers? Shall we appoint men who are without an opinion of their own? Would they be fit men to put in a position of that kind, men who are not capable of taking one side or the other? I say no. We cannot find such men in the Dominion. They must be either Conservatives or Reformers. Would the party I belong to be guilty of such an act of suicide as to choose men to be returning officers who would be known to be favorable to hon. gentlemen opposite? I thank the House for having so patiently listened to my first speech here, when I have had the privilege of taking my first bath in Dominion politics.

Mr. DALY. Perhaps the House will permit me to make some observations in reply to one hon. gentleman who has referred to the question of certificates used in Selkirk. I was not aware, owing to the fact of the time having elapsed last Tuesday within which my election could be contested, that there was anything against me, or that anything had been done by myself or my agent, that would void my election; there is not the slightest doubt in the world that a petition would have been filed before last Tuesday if it could

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

have been done. In reference to certificates, I can tell the hon. gentleman that at a place called Deloraine, in my district, where there was a majority of twenty-four against me, I was very much surprised because my committee told me there were only likely to be a majority of two. After the election I ascertained that the reason why I had a majority of twenty-four against me was, that my opponent had voted twenty-two persons at this poll upon certificates given to him by the returning officer; so that if votes were cast for me on certificates, similar votes were also cast for my opponent. But I understand from whom the hon. gentleman received his information upon this question, because my opponent has been in the city during these past few days; and although he had from the 12th of March, when I was gazetted, up to the 5th of April, when I left the city of Brandon, to petition against my election, he did not do so; but when he came here he apparently consulted with the leader of the Opposition and hon. gentlemen opposite, and he, no doubt, received some new light upon the subject. But, unfortunately for the leader of the Opposition, and unfortunately for my opponent, the time had elapsed, he was two days too late to file the petition. I have not the slightest doubt that he received new light from the leader of the Opposition, and in consequence I am pretty sure they would like to file a petition against me. Now, in reference to returning officers in the Province of Manitoba, I may state that the returning officer for the city of Winnipeg is the registrar for the county of Selkirk, not the electoral district of Selkirk, which I represent; and the returning officer for Lisgar was the registrar of one of the counties comprised within the limits of the electoral district of Lisgar; and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will enquire as to whether the election of the hon. member for Lisgar was carried improperly or not, seeing that he was elected by acclamation. The gentleman who acted as returning officer for Provencher was the clerk of the court, and, at the same time, he was a dyed-in-the-wool Grit. Now, the only electoral district, out of five in Manitoba, where that officer was not an officer of the court or registrar, was the district of Selkirk. In Marquette the returning officer was a sheriff of the central judicial district of Manitoba; so that out of the whole five, with the exception of the district I represent, these four gentlemen were officers of the court—one sheriff, two registrars and one clerk of the court. The returning officer in Selkirk was a gentleman who, I am sure, acted most impartially and discharged his duties well, because, if he had not done so, there is no doubt that a petition would have been filed against me before the 12th of this month.

Mr. WATSON. As my constituency has been mentioned by the last speaker, I will take the occasion of saying that I think it very unfortunate that the instructions given to the returning officers should have led to so much trouble. In my county, previous to the nomination and afterwards, the returning officer informed me that he would allow no voters to record their votes on certificate, except two at each poll. That was his interpretation of the Act, and I believe it was correct. But the day before the election, on returning to Portage la Prairie, the returning officer decided that he must do otherwise. The member for Lisgar captured an army of sixty-six certified voters who recorded their votes against me in the town of Portage la Prairie on certificates, as I believe, contrary to law, and contrary to the provision that only two certified voters are entitled to vote at each poll. There are five polling districts in that town, and sixty-six voters outside the town recorded their votes. I have no particular fault to find with that officer in the position he occupies. I know that it was his intention to carry out that election honorably and fairly, but he told me himself that such a pressure was brought to bear upon him by supporters of the Government that he

was compelled, even two days before the election, to issue those certificates, which he believed to be a fraud himself. If it had not been for the use of those certified voters, I should have been returned by a much larger majority than I received. As regards the returns, I believe I might have been gazetted some two weeks earlier than I was. It is true, I live a little distance from here, although no further than the hon. gentleman for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and it seems to me I ought to have been gazetted at the same date he was, instead of two weeks later. I do not know whether that was the fault of the returning officer or the fault of the officials in Ottawa. I think it is of the utmost importance that these documents should be laid before the House, because there is a wholesale charge made against all the returning officers. Some of them must be accused wrongfully. From the discussions I have heard to-night it appears that the returns have not been gazetted as received, but it is not right to accuse those returning officers who have done their duty and made their returns punctually, as the Grit returning officer from Hastings made his. My hon. friend from Hastings was the first gentleman gazetted, I believe, and it was done by a Grit returning officer. It is not right that this wholesale charge should stand against the returning officers, therefore I think the returns asked for by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should be brought down.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say with reference to the returning officer in my constituency, that previous to the last election he had acted as such for many years, and held the position of registrar. He was not by any means a Reformer or a Grit. He was appointed by the Government of Sandfield Macdonald, when my esteemed friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Carling) was a member of the Government. Undoubtedly he was an honest man, and he discharged the duties of returning officer ever since Confederation. I cannot understand for what reason he was jilted at the last election, and another man appointed in his place. I did hear, after the election was over, something about a cause dating since the election of 1882. I believe that at that time, when Senator Plumb was my opponent, he did not carry out what my opponent thought he should have done in connection with the declaration, and it was owing to that fact that a quiet hint was given to him that he would not be permitted to occupy the position any longer. The man that was appointed in his place performed the duties very creditably for a new man, and I have no fault to find, further than this, that I was not gazetted before the 3rd of April. Now, on the 4th of March, I received my certificate of having been duly elected member for North Wellington. I believe the returning officer sent forward his return at the proper period after the necessary number of days had elapsed that these papers should remain in his hands. He told me he would make his return just so soon as the time was up, and I believe he did so. If he did so, those papers would arrive at Ottawa on 10th March, and they were held by the official in whose charge they were until 3rd April. I cannot understand why that should have taken place. I simply say it appears singular it should have happened. With respect to the question of protest, on which a good deal has been said, and as to the probability of a protest being entered against those members last gazetted, I would say this: It will be no new thing for North Wellington to have a protest. There has not been an election in that riding, from Confederation to the present time, when a Reformer has been elected, at which a protest has not been entered. There has never been a protest in that riding entered against a Conservative, but all the Reformers returned have been protested against. So a protest will be nothing new or strange, and I do not feel at all anxious about it, for it is no use getting excited, but it is better to take it coolly. I desire

to offer these remarks in vindication of the gentleman who discharged the duties of returning officer from 1867 down to a recent day, and I believe if anything tended to add to my majority it was the dismissal of that officer from his position and the appointment of a stranger. He was well known and well liked and many of his friends felt deeply aggrieved at his removal; and this action, no doubt, added largely also to the majority of my friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), because that officer lived in Peel, and friends sympathised with him and manifested their condemnation of the action of the Government in removing him from the position he had occupied for so many years and the duties of which he had discharged so efficiently, and appointing a stranger, although I frankly admit that the recent returning officer endeavored to discharge his duties faithfully and to the best of his ability, and I believe he did so on every occasion, even up to forwarding the returns.

Mr. PLATT. It is pleasing to know that in the general and sweeping charge made against the action of the returning officers there are, here and there, instances where we are able to exonerate them from the charge made. I wish to add to the list of those against whom no charge, so far as I know, can be laid, the returning officer of the county which I represent. My grievance in the matter under discussion, is perhaps as great as that of any hon. member, still I am not able to lay any charge at the door of the returning officer, notwithstanding the fact that that officer was, and is to-day, the secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association of the county and was solicitor for the Conservative party during the revision of the lists. It seems, however, that where the evil instrument could not be found in the constituency such instrument was found at the Capital. I have made some enquiry, and I trust the papers connected with the matter will be brought down. I know that the return from the county of Prince Edward was forwarded to Ottawa on 9th March. I know that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery acknowledged the receipt of that return on 11th March. I know that no correspondence took place between that officer and the returning officer of that county between that time and the time of the gazetted. I have further to state that the officer found time, on 11th March, to acknowledge the receipt of the return, but he did not find time to send a message to the printer of the *Gazette* for the issue of the 12th, nor did he find time to send the message by the 19th, nor by the 26th, nor by 2nd April, and it was not till 9th April that my return was gazetted. I trust the papers will be brought down in order that we may ascertain the reason of the delay. I make no charge. It may be that in some instances correspondence was necessary between the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the returning officer, but in my case no such correspondence took place, and no such correspondence was necessary. As has been said the law directs and commands that that officer shall publish the returns in the next *Gazette*. This return was acknowledged on 11th March, and not published till 9th April.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the House to what has been done in the North-West Territories, though the leader of the Opposition has not alluded to what has been done there, because if the same principles guided the Administration in the appointment of returning officers in other parts of the Dominion as guided them in the North-West Territories, then they must have acted with conspicuous fairness. We had in the constituency for the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) Mr. Hugel as returning officer, an old supporter, and I believe still a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. MEMBER. No; he is a Tory.

Mr. DAVIN. Is he a Tory now? I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is in a position to say whether Mr.

Hugel is a Tory or not. If he is I am glad to hear it, because I am glad to know there are so many supporters of good government in the country. Mr. Fitzgerald was also a Reformer, and so far as I know he is a supporter of the Reform party still. He was returning officer at Calgary. In the constituency I have the honor to represent, Mr. Watson, clerk of the court, was appointed, and he was certainly the person who would naturally be appointed the returning officer. Mr. Sproat was also the person, I suppose, who would naturally be fixed on for Saskatchewan. It seems to me we have had a fight, and the party which the hon. member for West Durham leads has been beaten along the whole line. This discussion is also very natural, because I never knew a case in which two contestants measured their strength at anything, whether fisticuffs, billiards or other sports, when the beaten man did not try to explain that if something had not occurred he would have won. In billiards the man who is beaten will be very careful to explain that if he had only chalked his cue he would certainly have scored a triumph. I remember once passing down the main street of Winnipeg and seeing a little boy weeping. On enquiring of the boys in the crowd, one of them said with great contempt: He is not able to take a licking like a gentleman. I have here a paper, the *London Advertiser*, which is a supporter of the leader of the Opposition. There is, in the first article, a reference to the North-West representation which I might have brought up as a matter of privilege, but which I think I may properly allude to as showing the same tendency that has been shown here this evening, to try and pare down the result of the victory which places parties in their present position in this House. This article, which deals with North-West representation, deals with it in precisely the same spirit as that in which this debate has been conducted by the Opposition. It states that the North-West representatives in the House of Commons are representatives rather of the Ministry than of the people. That they were elected by open voting, so that every voter might be made to feel that the eyes of Government officials were upon him. Now, Sir, that is precisely in the same spirit as those remarks which have been made about the appointment of returning officers; the object in both cases is to try to lessen the effect of the victory which was achieved. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) and myself were returned with such overwhelming majorities that those attempts to lessen the effect of these victories by the stories we have heard about the influence of officials, the distribution of seed grain, and so on, are worse than contemptible. Let me say that there is not a particle of foundation for the statements made about the influence of officials in these elections. If any hon. member following the leader of the Opposition will put the matter in such a way that we can bring it before the House, I will undertake to show him that the number of votes cast by the officials was in the aggregate contemptible, and that the large proportion of them were cast against us. The strongest opposition I got myself in West Assiniboia came from prominent officials who happened to be friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and so far as I am concerned one hair of their heads will not be touched.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to appropriate it; that was a figurative expression. Prominent officials on the day of election went and voted against me, and it did not make the least difference with me. Sir, we heard the statement that we had something to do with distributing seed grain. Mr. Speaker, you had as much to do with distributing seed grain as I had, and when the statement first came up I asked my opponent, who was on the platform, if he had anything to do with it, and he came

Mr. DAVIN.

forward and told the people that there was not a word of truth in such statements, that he and I were members of the same committee, and that he had as much to do with the matter as I had. Why, Sir, the man who distributed seed grain at Maple Creek was chairman of my opponent's committee, and two of my strongest opponents in West Assiniboia were appointed deputy returning officers. In East Assiniboia one-half the deputy returning officers were followers of the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition. Sir, I call the attention of the House to this, not because I want to go into the questions which have been discussed with regard to eastern constituencies, but I reason from analogy that if the charges with regard to eastern constituencies are as foundationless, as contemptible, as those which have been made in regard to that part of Canada with which I am familiar, and as to which I can speak with authority, then, Sir, they are unworthy the hon. gentleman, unworthy of a man of his talents to make.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I just want to bring to the notice of the House the question as it stands in the motion now before us. The meaning of the motion is to the effect that there shall be laid before this House the returns made by the different returning officers to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in order that information may be afforded to this House, as to whether that officer has done his duty or not. The law, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the hon. members on the other side of the House, is very plain, and if you will allow me I will read a section or two of the law. Section 65 says:

"Returning officers shall, immediately after the sixth day after the final addition by him, unless before that time he receives notice that he is required to attend before a judge, &c., transmit his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that the candidate having the largest number of votes has been duly elected, and shall forward to each of the respective candidates a duplicate or copy thereof and such return shall be in the form, &c."

Sub-section 3 says:

"The returning officer shall also transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with his return, the ballot papers, the original statements of the several deputy returning officers, &c."

What, then, is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery? It is explained by section 66:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of any member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette* of the name of the candidate so elected."

Well, is this our law? If it is our law, hon. gentlemen opposite explain it apparently by holding that it is the law for the other side of the House, but not for this. There is evidently in this matter, as in many other instances, two laws—one for the Tories and one for the Liberals. Take, for instance, my own case. I do not want to go into the details of the two elections I had to run before taking my seat; it would probably be too long a story. I may say, however, that the returning officer in my county made his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 7th of March. The papers were in perfect order, because the returning officer had the experience gained in the former election in July, in which he made all sorts of blunders; but he performed his duty tolerably well at the last election. His return was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 7th of March, having been sent a day or two previously. I was gazetted on the 26th of March. I do not mention that fact because I am afraid of a contestation or petition. I stand in the same position as the hon. member for North Wellington. In the county I represent it is customary to have petitions; there is never any election without a petition, especially if a Liberal or a Nationalist is elected, so I expect a petition, and the anxiety under which I labor at the present moment is not very great. It would have been just as bad if the petition had been served on me, or if I had been waiting for it. But by the

papers which have been filed here by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I suppose we shall discover that in many instances he acted in the same way. If he did not act under special instructions, there is no doubt that he did not carry out the law as contained in the Statute-book, and the sooner we know it the better, so that such amendments can be made in it as will make it bear equally on the members on both sides of this House. If we were allowed to refer to the Local elections which took place in the Province of Quebec, on the 14th of October, 1886, and to the returns as they were published in the *Official Gazette*, we might discover that this plan of publishing the returns of the greater portion of the members on one side first, and the greater portion on the other side last, so as to allow a longer delay in the one case than in the other to contest the election, has not been invented by this Government or this Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but was invented in the Province of Quebec after the last Local election. Certain members of the Local House were threatened with election petitions because their returns were not made until after a great delay. Well, that course had no great effect after all, as everyone knows by the result. This matter, so far as it concerns the members of the House of Commons, is one of the greatest importance. I do not stand here to lecture anybody, but rather as a new member to be lectured; but my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson), with whom I sat as a member of the city council of Montreal for many years, will allow me to remark that he departed widely from the subject when he brought the Riel question into the discussion, for it has no bearing whatever upon this simple motion of the hon. member for Bothwell. What concerns this House to-night is whether the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is under the control of this House and not of the Government, and is bound to carry out the law, acted upon the advice of someone else, or whether he acted on his own authority. If he acted on his own authority, it will be for this House to declare whether he acted according to law. Before I take my seat, I wish to mention a fact in connection with the elections in my county. Another proof that there is not one law for everybody in this House or every citizen of this country, was given by the first election that took place in the county of Chambly after last Session. It had been stated in the press, and on the floor of this House, that the election in the county of Haldimand could not take place until the new lists were in force. My friends in the county of Chambly were aware that the former member for the county was about to secure an office, and to a certain extent we depended on this declaration of the Government, although we had no great confidence in them, and therefore folded our hands and waited until the new lists should be completed. Well, in the county of Chambly the application of the law was different from that in the county of Haldimand. In Haldimand the election could not take place until the new lists were in force; in Chambly the Government were bound to have the elections under the old lists, and the polling day was fixed just the day before the new lists came into force. The election took place on the 30th of July, and the new lists were to come into force on the 1st of August. We tried to get an explanation of the matter from the Government candidate, but could not get any. Perhaps we may get one during the course of the Session. At any rate this is another fact showing how the law has been administered in different cases.

Mr. BRIEN. At this late hour I will not detain this House any great length of time. Somebody is to blame in this matter, either the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or the returning officer. But I rise especially in defence of the gentleman who occupied the position of returning officer in my constituency. He has occupied that position for sometime, and is a man who is perfectly conversant with

his duty, and I have evidence here to show that he made my return on the 12th of March, while I was not gazetted until the 2nd of April, so that the blame does not lie at his door. The hon. member who represents West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says the hon. leader of the Opposition failed because he did not chalk his cue properly. I presume he had not the right kind of chalk for his cue. I understand the game of billiards somewhat, and presume that had the leader of the Opposition good seed grain to chalk his political cue with, he would have been more successful. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is so sympathetic with the officials of that country that although they voted against him he will not see one hair of their head injured, for he knows the difficulty of the lack of that same material himself. The right hon. the First Minister found a great deal of fault with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), because he thought fit to call the attention of the House to this matter. The First Minister pooh-poohed the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell, but no one knows better than he the value of these things. The *Mail* once said, when the notorious Gerrymandering Act was passed, that, if four or five, or seven or eight, Grits perished it did not matter; and so the First Minister can afford to say that if the naming of partial returning officers would have the effect of cutting off a few Grits, that was not any great matter. The hon. member for North Essex said the Government were not afraid of the Opposition; but if we look over the record we cannot fail to see clearly that they must be afraid of the Opposition or at least of the people, because they are never willing to go fairly and squarely before the people on political issues, they must always have the Grit party tied hand and foot in some way or other. I have no objection to being called a Grit myself, although I presume it is an equivalent to Tory. This is the first time I have heard that the Conservative party were ashamed of that name, but I presume there are many things connected with that name in history of which they may well be ashamed. I believe if we had an opportunity of going before the people without any Franchise Bill, and without any Gerrymander Act, without seed grain and open voting, the leader of the Opposition would return with the majority of votes in his favor. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) referred to the religious cry brought against him. I am sorry to see there are any parties in this country who would raise such a cry, but hon. gentlemen opposite are the men who must bear the responsibility. As the evening is now late, I may say, in conclusion, that I have evidence showing distinctly that in my case the returning officer is not to blame for the fact of my not being gazetted for nearly three weeks; but there must be some one to blame, and this motion is made in order that we might find out where the blame lies.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the leader of the Government to say he agrees in this motion, substituting the word "tomorrow" for "forthwith." I am quite ready to accept that amendment. I will not detain the House by any observations in reply to what was said by hon. gentlemen opposite, further than to call the First Minister's attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the extreme charge he made against the Local Government of Ontario, that it so controlled, bullied, and coerced its officers that neither the sheriff nor registrar could be trusted with the duties of returning officer in the elections, he himself selected sheriffs and registrars for the discharge of these duties. I think the hon. gentleman will have some difficulty in reconciling his charge against the Administration that has long had control in this matter, with the fact that he selected officials of the Local Government to be returning officers, which he would not have done had he not felt assured they would act in a manner, at all events, not detrimental to the party he leads. The hon. gentleman, in making the selection of certain officials of the

Local Government, certain sheriffs and registrars, to be returning officers, has clearly disposed of the charge which he himself made against the Local Administration. I alluded to the fact that there was misconduct on the part of the returning officers in many instances, that the law was disregarded, that there was one rule and one measure of justice for hon. gentlemen on that side, and another rule and another measure, not of justice, but of injustice, for hon. gentlemen on this side. Now, the First Minister said that it really made no difference whether we were gazetted immediately after the election or one month later, and yet the whole conduct of the hon. gentleman and his friends shows that he himself did not subscribe to the doctrine he had put forward in this House. Here are the *Official Gazettes*. In those *Gazettes* the hon. gentleman and his supporters are nearly all gazetted before any hon. member on this side. Has the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or the returning officer been doing the hon. gentleman wrong? How came the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to act in this way? It is perfectly clear that the law has not been complied with; it is clear that some gentlemen, either the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or those whom the Government appointed returning officers, have neglected to comply with the law of the land. They have not discharged the duty imposed upon them. Either they have not given in their returns of members within the time required by law, or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not gazetted them as soon as he received the returns. We are entitled to know who has violated the law in this particular, and to see that just punishment is meted out to the party who has been guilty of dereliction of duty.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In rising to move the adjournment of the House, I may say to the hon. member for Bothwell, that if it will ease his mind we will keep Mr. Hudspeth on the gridiron on the next sixty days. He has just been elected by 50 of a majority.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not be so unmerciful to Mr. Hudspeth. The hon. gentleman procured the revising officer from one county to stand contrary to law. He then used his power for an improper purpose, while a petition was capable of being filed against him, to give the equivalent of a resignation by appointing him a landing-waiter. Mr. Hudspeth was made revising officer, then elected for Victoria, then appointed landing-waiter, and re-elected by a small majority. The hon. gentleman now proposes, after all these violations of the law, to violate it still further in favor of this person. I trust, in obedience to the law, if not out of consideration for the suffering person, he will gazette him as soon as possible, and I dare say that, even with the early gazetting, there will be time enough to file a petition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When do the Government propose to lay the papers connected with the census returns of Manitoba on the Table? That was taken in August last and ought to be in readiness now.

Mr. CARLING. They are preparing them as fast as possible, and I am informed that to-morrow they will be brought down.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing: 1. The number of vacancies in the Civil Service on the 1st day of January, 1887, caused by superannuation during the year 1886. 2. The number since filled, and whether filled by promotions or new appointments. 3. The date of the appointment, the names of the party promoted or appointed, and the salary paid. 4. The names of all new appointments to the Civil Service since the 1st day of January, 1885, up to the 1st of April, instant, the position to which they have

Mr. MILLS.

been appointed and the salary paid. 5. The respective ages of the parties appointed, and also the changes and new appointments in the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of all casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway arising from collisions, broken rails, or any other cause, for the calendar year 1886, and to 1st April, 1887; the respective causes and dates; the names of conductors, engine-drivers, or other officials dismissed, suspended or fined for any such collision or other neglect of duty; the amount of damage (if any) to property in such cases; the amount of compensation paid to owners of property destroyed or damaged, as well as amount of claims for loss or damage to property (if any) unsettled.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return of all contracts made during the calendar year 1886 for furnishing wire or other fencing for the Intercolonial Railway; the names of the contractors and the amount paid under each contract; also amount of purchases of wire or other fencing (if any) made without contract during the same period, and the amount paid.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return of the quantity of lubricating, machinery, car or other oil, furnished or delivered to the Intercolonial Railway during the year ending 31st December, 1886; the contracts under which the same were delivered; the names of the several contractors, and the several amounts paid under such contracts.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing the quantity of rolling stock purchased for the Intercolonial Railway during the last six months of the year ending 31st December, 1886, giving each kind of rolling stock and whether purchased under contract or otherwise, the parties from whom bought and the cost of each kind; also a statement showing what has been built in Government workshops.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return of the number of Pullman and parlor cars belonging to the Intercolonial Railway and used thereon, the cost of such cars, and the parties from whom the same were purchased, or by whom built for the railway.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return of the reports of Inspector McLaren and Mr. Bremner of the Customs Department to the Minister of Customs, as to the mode of gauging molasses at the Port of St. Stephen, N.B., and also any reports as to the mode used at the Port of St. John, N.B., and any Orders in Council or instructions from the Department of Customs.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Report of Department of the Secretary of State for the year ending June 30th, 1886.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Report of the Board of Examiners for the Civil Service of Canada, for the year ending 31st December, 1886.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 9) for the discharge of insolvent debtors whose assets have been distributed rateably among their creditors.—(Mr. Edgar.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY EXTENSION TO QUEBEC HARBOR.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the sum of \$960,000 voted in 1884 (47 Victoria, chapter 8) for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the harbor of Quebec, has been in whole, or in part, paid to any person; and if so, to what amount, to whom and when has the same been paid?

Mr. POPE. I would say that the sum mentioned by the hon. gentleman was invested in bonds of the railway, the interest on which is held liable, according to agreement, to pay any deficiency that may arise in running the road.

PROTECTION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Whether the Government have represented to the Imperial Government the necessity of taking such steps as will protect the rights and liberties of British subjects in the waters of Behring's Sea? If so, with what result?

Mr. FOSTER. Representations have been made to the Imperial Government, and the papers, so far as they can be brought down, will be laid on the Table of the House at an early day.

LIFE SAVING STATION ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Whether the Government intend establishing a life-saving station on the south-west coast of Vancouver Island?

Mr. FOSTER. This subject is now engaging the attention of the Department.

HIGH COMMISSIONER AT LONDON.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Who is now acting as High Commissioner for Canada at London? Has Sir Charles Tupper continued to act since his return to Canada, and is he still acting as such *ad interim* or otherwise?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir Charles Tupper has consented to act as High Commissioner without salary or emolument of any kind. While he is here Mr. Colmer, Secretary of the Department, in London, acts as *Chargé d'Affaires* and Secretary of Legation.

REVISING OFFICER FOR MONTMORENCY.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. LANGELIER, Montmorency) asked, On what date did J. A. Charlebois, Esq., revising officer for the county of Montmorency, resign his office, and when was his resignation accepted by the Government?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The letter of resignation bears date the 3rd of February, 1887. It was submitted to Council on the 14th. The Order in Council accepting his resignation was signed on the 2nd of March. A letter informing Mr. Charlebois of the fact was sent to him a few days afterwards.

EXAMINING WAREHOUSE IN OTTAWA.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. EDWARDS) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to proceed at once with the construction of the new Customs Examining Warehouse in Ottawa, for which tenders were called some time ago?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention to build a new Custom House and Examining Warehouse in Ottawa. The time of beginning the same is not yet fixed.

POST OFFICE IN THE TOWN OF MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates this year a sum of money sufficient for the building of a post office in the town of Montmagny, in the county of Montmagny?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg to say, in answer to the hon. member, that it is not the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates this year a sum of money for the building of a post office in the town of Montmagny.

WARRANT FOR ARREST OF EDMUND E. SHEPPARD.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE asked, Whether the Government or the Minister of Justice has been informed that Mr.

Geo. T. Denison, police magistrate for the city of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, has refused, contrary to the Act, chapter 174 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, section 49, to endorse a warrant signed and issued by one of the Judges of the Sessions of the Peace for the Province of Quebec, for the District of Montreal, M. C. Desnoyers, Esq., one of the police magistrates for the city of Montreal, for the arrest of one Edmund E. Sheppard, the said warrant bearing upon its face a criminal charge against the said Sheppard, for having libelled certain of the officers of the 65th Battalion, of Montreal, in relation to the expedition to the North-West in 1885; and if so, was it by the instructions of the Department of Justice such endorsement was refused, and if not, what position do the Government intend to assume in relation to the matter?

Mr. THOMPSON. We have no information on the subject other than what has appeared in the newspapers. No instructions whatever were given by the Department of Justice in relation to the subject, and as to any action that may be taken it will be necessary to make application to the Government of the Province of Ontario, whose officer Mr. Denison is.

IMMIGRATION INTO THE DOMINION IN 1886.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, What was the total number of immigrants arriving in the Dominion during the year 1886, as reported to the Department of Agriculture; the total number as far as known remaining in the Dominion, and the total number settling in the North West Territories and British Columbia?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That information will be found in the report which was laid before the House yesterday, or the day before, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MAIL CONTRACTS IN LÉVIS COUNTY.

Mr. GUAY asked, To whom were the two contracts for the mail between the town of Lévis and village of Etchemin, county of Lévis, granted? Were tenders called for in relation to each of said contracts? If so, who were the parties who tendered and what was the amount of each tender?

Mr. McLELAN. The first contract was given to the lowest tenderer, Mr. Eloiard Leclerc, for \$245. The second was let by the Post Office Inspector at Quebec, for the sum of \$100, to P. E. Bourassa, the arrangement to be terminable at the pleasure of the Postmaster General.

CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that, in accordance with the Order of the House of yesterday, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is in attendance at the Table with the several papers he was directed to produce.

Mr. MILLS. I move that, in obedience to the Order of yesterday, the papers having been brought down by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, they be now read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that the returns should be put in the Votes and Proceedings, so that we could all read them.

Mr. BLAKE. But the only way it can be done is by a motion that they be now read. The formal reading can be dispensed with; but it requires the motion to get them in the Votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; so be it. Motion agreed to.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Mr. CURRAN moved the following resolutions:—

That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland; and

That in the year 1886, by Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and

That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Bill enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, whilst satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.

That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this her jubilee year and, if possible, render Her Majesty more dear to the hearts of her already devoted and loyal subjects.

That the present resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and Charles Stewart Parnell, M.P.

He said: Mr Speaker, The motion I have now the honor to lay before this House is one of very considerable importance, if we are to judge by the extended comment it has caused in the public press of the country since it first appeared on the Order paper. No doubt there have been very many opinions expressed as to the appropriateness or desirability or otherwise of bringing this question before our Parliament for discussion; but there is one thing that is exceedingly gratifying to me, and must be gratifying to all those who feel as I do on the question, that is, that throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion there has not been found one single paper that has come under my notice, no matter to what political party it belongs, or belonging to no political party at all, that has expressed anything but a desire that Home Rule should be granted to Ireland, and that at a very early date. Certain writers in the press have, no doubt, expressed themselves in very forcible terms against this motion. Some have gone so far as to call this motion a wild and insensate one. I think I shall recover very speedily from the effects of the strictures of such writers. For my part, I feel that I have no other apology to offer to this honorable House for bringing this subject forward than my own inability to deal with it in the manner in which it deserves. I feel that, in proposing this motion to-day, I am speaking the sentiments of at least 80 per cent. of the people of Canada. I make this appeal, Sir, not only in the name of an ancient race that has been oppressed for years, I may say for centuries, but I make it in the name of our common humanity; for, after all, as was said only a very few hours ago by a distinguished clergyman speaking at a public meeting on this subject, we are all members of the human family, and when one section of the family is oppressed or sought to be oppressed, the whole must feel a pang of suffering at witnessing such a sight. In the few observations I have to make to-day I shall not attempt any rhetorical effort. If eloquence could have saved the ancient Parliament of Ireland, the eloquence of Grattan certainly would have saved it from destruction. If eloquence could have revived that Parliament, the eloquence of O'Connell would have done so many years ago. But, Sir, that cause, the cause of a great nation, the cause of an ancient people, the cause of a people who have given to the world an exemplification of the truth, that the spirit of a nation never dieth—that

Mr. CURRAN.

cause has been spoken, and sung, and written of by the genius of Ireland's sons; and I feel that those great efforts having failed so far, although they have kept the spirit alive, although they have enabled the people to go on hoping almost against hope, it will be my duty to-day to confine myself principally to facts, to speak in the language of the greatest moderation, and to induce as many members of this honorable House as I can secure to wait across the Atlantic, to those who are favoring coercion and to those who are opposing it, the sentiments of the Canadian people upon this important subject. Now, Sir, I may be asked, how do I know what are the sentiments of the Canadian people on this question? I may be asked, can you rely upon the newspapers—can you take the press of this country as your guide in this matter? I say we have that already, but we have still more. The city of Montreal first gave the example of calling a large and unanimous meeting on this subject. Speaking of that meeting, a leading journal said:

"A great demonstration was held in the Queen's Hall to protest against coercion in Ireland. The meeting was one of the largest ever held in the city, and citizens of all classes attended. The proceedings were most enthusiastic. A prominent feature of the demonstration was that in addition to members of the Federal and Local Parliaments and leading gentlemen present, three ex-Mayors of the city, the Hon. Mr. Coursol, M.P., Dr. Hingston and Mr. Beaugrand spoke on the occasion."

On that occasion there was something more done than to protest against the measure of coercion that the Imperial Ministry now propose to impose on the Irish people. This resolution was passed:

"That as citizens of Montreal we call upon our representatives in the Parliament of Canada, the Legislature of Quebec, and the City Council of Montreal, to give fitting expression to the indignant feelings of the people of the Dominion, the Province and the city against the proposed measure, and their unwavering sympathy for Ireland in her aspirations for Home Rule."

Now, Sir, what was the expression of opinion with regard to that meeting by the leading English journal of the Province of Quebec? It said the next morning:

"If anything that can be said or done in Canada would advance the cause of Home Rule for Ireland, or stay the enactment of the very stringent Coercion Bill now under consideration in the British Parliament, it would be the moral force of such meetings as that held in the Queen's Hall last night. The unanimity in sentiment of the addresses delivered, and the manner of their reception, left no doubt of the earnest desire of the Irish people in Montreal to see their native land placed in a position towards the United Kingdom in which it would be a strength instead of a weakness to the Empire; when its own people would control its own affairs, and the cause of dissatisfaction being removed the excuse for coercion would cease. There was uttered no word to which the most loyal Imperialist could with reason object. What was desired was that Ireland should receive the same treatment, and the same rights of self-government, as have been accorded to Canada. If the people of Canada could grant this, or even aid in securing it, their voice and sympathy would be heartily accorded. As it is they can hope that before long the cause that has the past few years made such wonderfully rapid progress will soon be successful, and that a new era will open for the country that so many of their number remember with reverence as the home of their fathers."

That is the article of the *Montreal Gazette*. Now, Sir, in obedience to the instructions of that meeting, the City Council of Montreal met a few days afterwards—the day before the opening of this Parliament—and at that meeting it was proposed, not by an Irishman or the descendant of an Irishman, but by Mr. Grenier, a French Canadian of high social standing in Montreal and the leading member of the board of aldermen, and the resolution was adopted that:

"At the meeting of the City Council this afternoon Ald. Grenier and Donovan introduced the following resolution:—

"Whereas there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Bill enacting a most stringent coercive measure for Ireland:

"Whereas, the said Bill is calculated to deprive the Irish people of the rights most dear to all British subjects:

"Whereas, a public meeting of citizens of Montreal held on the sixth of April, instant, has protested against such legislation and called upon this council to express the feeling of the citizens against the proposed measure:

"Be it, therefore, resolved that this council has witnessed with regret the introduction in the Imperial House of Commons of the Bill above-mentioned, and desires, as representing the citizens of Montreal, to

place on record its protest against the adoption of the measure so servient of the liberties of a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects.

"That this council renews its already expressed opinion that the most effective means of securing the prosperity and loyalty of the Irish people, and thereby assuring the stability of the Empire, will be found in granting to that people such a measure of Home Rule as Canadians enjoy, and as, while gratifying the national aspirations of Ireland, will also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire, that His Worship the Mayor be instructed to forward the present resolution to the Right Hon. Lord Salisbury, as a protest against the proposed measure of coercion, and to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and Mr. Parnell, as an assurance of the unwavering sympathy of Montreal's citizens with the cause of Home Rule for Ireland."

I based my present resolutions upon the opinion of the city of Montreal thus expressed. I followed those resolutions as closely as I could, making such additions as I thought appropriate. But the movement did not stop there. It reached the city of Quebec, and there in the ancient capital of Canada, we find the Hon. John Hearn moving in the city corporation, seconded by Councillor Duquet, a French Canadian, the following resolution:—

Hon. John Hearn moved, seconded by Councillor Duquet:—"That this corporation avails itself of the present meeting, the first since the announcement of yet another Coercion Bill for Ireland, to declare its abhorrence of the Draconian measure of the Government of Lord Salisbury, termed the 'Irish Crimes Act Amendment Bill' and, as faithful subjects of Her Majesty, desirous of contributing at all times, but particularly in this year of Her Majesty's Jubilee, to the prevention of everything calculated to create feuds and heartburnings amongst her people, protest against its becoming law. That this body heartily falls into line with the many municipal and legislative bodies in the Dominion of Canada, the United States and elsewhere, who sympathise with the people of Ireland in the sufferings brought on them, through their conflicts with the rack-renting oppressors of their country, and it desires to join in the widespread encouragement given to that sorely tried people to persist in their patriotic determination to be ruled, in all matters, properly and exclusively Ireland's, only in accordance with their own constitutionally expressed wishes. That a copy of these resolutions be cabled by His Worship the Mayor, to Parnell, Gladstone and Morley, and that they be assured that not even in Ireland are the prayers offered for the success of their Irish policy more fervent, than are those that ascend, for that object, from the good old city of Quebec." In speaking to his motion, Ald. Hearn said he would not take up the time of the council long, but would simply congratulate it in advance upon the unanimity with which he believed the resolution would pass. In no city was there more sympathy, he believed, with the people of Ireland than in Quebec, which was inhabited by a people whose forefathers had risked their lives for the principles for which Ireland was to-day contending and against the rule of Downing Street.

Ald. Rheame made a lengthy and eloquent speech in support of the resolution, referring to the struggle and leaders of the French-Canadian party of 1837 and 1838.

The resolution was then adopted.

Well, Sir, the movement went on, and we find the citizens of Halifax also meeting under the auspices of the Irish Charitable Society of that city. At that meeting we find present the leading citizens of Halifax; amongst others:

CHARITABLE IRISH SOCIETY CONDEMN TORY COERCION, AND PASS RESOLUTIONS ON THE SUBJECT.—A special meeting of the Charitable Irish Society was held last evening for the purpose of expressing their feelings regarding the proposed Coercion Act in Ireland. Hon. James Butler presided, and there was a large gathering of the members—Dr. Farrell, M. B. Daly, Hon. A. J. White, J. J. O'Brien, J. M. Inglis, D. F. Power and others.

Dr. Farrell moved the following resolution, seconded by M. B. Daly, which passed unanimously, and the secretary instructed to cable it to the gentlemen named in the resolution—the Premier of Great Britain, Gladstone and Parnell:—

Whereas, during the past few months the people of Ireland, gratified and encouraged by the disposition shown by a portion of the people, and of the parliamentary representatives of Great Britain, to assist them in their legitimate aspirations for an improvement in their constitutional and material position, have conducted their agitation in a peaceful and constitutional manner with great apparent prospect of an early success;

And whereas, the policy of coercion—at no time a proper remedy for Irish grievances—has been adopted by the recent introduction of a measure in the Imperial Parliament, which proposes, in the absence of grave crime of any kind in Ireland, or of any other sufficient reason, to deprive the people for an indefinite time of the most essential rights of British subjects;

And whereas, the Charitable Irish Society, ever loyal to the Queen and country, as its history for over one hundred years in Nova Scotia will show, desires to record its most earnest protest against this Coercion Bill, as a cruel and unnecessary effort to make a spirited and liberty-loving nation a nation of slaves;

And whereas, in the opinion of this society, the occasion of Her Gracious Majesty's Jubilee, in the celebration of which this society has

cordially united with their fellow-citizens, would be darkened and degraded by a return of her Government to the barbarous methods of governing Ireland, adopted in what are known as penal times;

Be it, therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this society the Dominion and Local Parliaments, representing the large numbers of Irishmen and their descendants, and called upon to administer the affairs of a population to whom the goodwill of the Irish people is of great material value, and deeply interested in the unity and harmony of the various sections of the Empire—should express their strong disapproval of the coercion measure now before the Imperial Parliament.

Also resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Premier of England, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Mr. C. S. Parnell, M. P.; Right Hon. the Premier of Canada, and the Hon. the Premier of Nova Scotia, with a respectful request to the last named hon. gentlemen that the foregoing resolution should receive their favorable consideration and also that they take prompt action in accordance with the views therein expressed.

Halifax was not the last place in which anti-coercion meetings were held. In Toronto, only a few evenings ago, an anti-coercion meeting was held, and the Temperance Hall of that city, according to reports in the press, was literally packed with citizens who had gone there to protest against the Coercion Bill and express their opinion in favor of Home Rule; and amongst those who spoke were gentlemen of all creeds and of every nationality in this Dominion. Again, last night, in this city of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, another anti-coercion meeting was held, at which clergymen and others spoke in eloquent terms against the proposed measure now sought to be imposed on the people of Ireland, and there again the resolutions moved were unanimously carried. I have not seen or heard of a meeting being held anywhere in the Dominion in favor of Coercion or against Home Rule for Ireland; and, therefore, in so far as public meetings are concerned, and I have not gone through all those that have been held,—so far as public men can express the sentiments of the people of Canada, those sentiments are diametrically opposed to the legislation now sought to be imposed on Ireland. But it is not merely at public meetings we hear those sentiments expressed. Only a few nights ago the Legislature of the Province of Quebec unanimously adopted resolutions in almost the same terms as those I lay before you; and we have on the file of the proceedings of the Parliament of Ontario a resolution there to be proposed by the Premier of that Province, in which he calls upon the Legislative Assembly to express its sentiments against Coercion and in favor of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. But having gone through those evidences of sympathy with the Old Land, I find still other evidence which speaks volumes as to the opinions of the public men of this country. Only a short time ago I had the pleasure of assisting at a magnificent banquet tendered to the hon. the Secretary of State for the Dominion, in Montreal, and there that hon. gentleman, in answer to the toast of his health, after having dealt exhaustively with the subject of Canadian politics, made an outburst of eloquence which will be long remembered by those who had the pleasure of listening to him, in favor of fair play and justice to Ireland and against this coercive measure. I shall read the report of the hon. gentleman's remarks as they were summarised in one of the city papers, but the report is but a feeble reflex of the magnificent periods which elicited the rousing cheers of every gentleman present, and there were present representative men of all races and nationalities in this Dominion. The hon. the Secretary of State is reported to have said: He asked

"What is to be the end of the exciting and tragic drama which is now being played in the United Kingdom, a drama where the plot is the subject of the liberation of a nation. I feel with Ireland in her aspirations. (Great applause) I weep with her in the agony of her sufferings, I plead with her for justice, for pity, for humanity. (Hear, hear and cheers) Born, brought up and educated with proud notions of the British constitution, that sublime charter of free humanity; breathing that atmosphere of independence which surrounds and permeates this free land of America, I cannot realise that a nation in the world can be condemned and put in bondage. (Cheers.) I regret the necessity, if it is a necessity; I detest and I condemn the device, if it is the only opportunity that justifies the most extraordinary legislation which the British people are now called upon to sanction."

These were the words of my hon. friend, the Secretary of State; and, at the opening of this present Parliament, in the first address delivered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition in this House, he re-echoed those sentiments, and expressed his detestation of coercive measures for the land of his forefathers. I may be asked, why should this Parliament be called upon to give expression to this opinion, why should the voice of our people be raised against this coercion measure? Because coercion in its most detestable form has been employed over and over again in Ireland, and has utterly failed in the past as it is doomed to utter failure in the present instance. I will refer this honorable House for a very few moments to a list of Coercion Acts which have been passed in Ireland since the date of the unfortunate union eighty-seven years ago. In 1800—they began soon—in 1800 an Act was passed which extended to 1805. I will give the list:

- 1800 to 1805. Habeas Corpus suspension. Seven Coercion Acts.
 1807. Feb. 1st, Coercion Act, Habeas Corpus suspension. Aug. 2nd, Insurrection Act.
 1808-9. Habeas Corpus suspension.
 1814 to 1816. Habeas Corpus suspension. Insurrection Act.
 1817. Habeas Corpus suspension. One Coercion Act.
 1822 to 1830. Habeas Corpus suspension. Two Coercion Acts in 1822 and one in 1823.
 1830. Importation of Arms Act.
 1831. Whiteboy Act.
 1831. Stanley's Arms Act.
 1832. Arms and Gunpowder Act.
 1833. Suppression of Disturbance.
 1833. Change of Venue Act.
 1834. Disturbance, amendment and continuance.
 1834. Arms and Gunpowder Act.
 1835. Public Peace Act.
 1836. Another Arms Act.
 1838. Another Arms Act.
 1839. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1840. Another Arms Act.
 1841. Outrages Act and another Arms Act.
 1843. Another Arms Act.
 1848. Act consolidating all previous Coercion Acts.
 1844. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1845. Additional Constables near Public Works Act.
 1845. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1846. Constabulary Enlargement.
 1847. Crime and Outrage Act.
 1848. Treason Amendment Act.
 1848. Removal of Arms Act.
 1848. Suspension of Habeas Corpus.
 1848. Another Oaths Act.
 1849. Suspension of Habeas Corpus.
 1850. Crime and Outrage Act.
 1851. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1853. Crime and Outrage Act.
 1854. do do do
 1855. do do do
 1856. Peace Preservation Act.
 1858. do do do
 1860. do do do
 1862. do do do
 1862. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1865. Peace Preservation Act.
 1866. Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act.
 1867. do do do
 1868. do do do
 1870. Peace Preservation Act.
 1871. Protection of Life and Property.
 1871. Peace Preservation—continued.
 1873. Peace Preservation Act
 1875. do do do
 1875. Unlawful Oaths Act.
 1881-1882. Peace Preservation Act (Suspension Habeas Corpus).
 1881-1886. Arms Act.
 1882-1885. Crimes Act.
 1886-1887. Arms Act.

Now, it would seem to the impartial observer, it would seem to the mind of anyone who has read the history of Ireland, written by no matter whom, when we find that every historian who has written upon this subject has denounced the manner in which the people of Ireland were deprived of their national Legislature, in view of the means of bribery and corruption which were used upon that occasion, that the people of England or the Government of England would have endeavored, by a policy of conciliation, to win the affections of the people whom they had thus

Mr. CURRAN.

deprived of their national Parliament, that they would have endeavored, by some means or other, to convince them that their interests lay in having one Parliament for the two kingdoms, and that, though they were deprived of their national Parliament, although the voice of Ireland's patriots and statesmen was no longer heard in College Green, at all events they would get justice and fair play in the British Parliament; but, instead of that, since the first year of the alliance there has been only an interval of some five or six years, I believe, during which no Coercion Act was in force in Ireland. From that day to this, every year has brought forth new measures of coercion, new devices for depriving the people of their liberty, and in this year of grace 1887—eighty-seven years after the Union was consummated—we find the Government of England again coming forward and asking from the Parliament of the Empire new powers to suppress and repress the Irish people, and if possible to choke out the last spark of their national aspirations. I say that such a state of things cannot be tolerated. I say that such a state of things is not one which we should expect to find in any Christian country. In 1848 an Act consolidating all previous Coercion Acts was passed. On 28th July, 1843, Mr. Sherman Crawford proposed a motion to the effect that the state of Ireland demanded instant attention of Parliament, to improve the condition, redress grievances, establish just rights, &c., and thereby promote the good order and prosperity of that part of the United Kingdom and give increased security to Her Majesty's Crown and Government. Mr. Crawford pointed out that bad government was the cause of distress and discontent in Ireland. The people were treated by the Government as a race of slaves. He stated the people were allowed to be exterminated, while there were 5,000,000 of acres of improvable land in Ireland, and all the authority of the State was given to aid the landlords to produce the extermination. Whenever the Government was asked to do aught to ameliorate the condition of Ireland, the answer was that they had no means nor time—but they had means and time to push on a Coercion Act at that moment. Vainly they have attempted to govern by coercion. It failed, it will fail, it can never succeed and will only widen the gap between England and Ireland and sap the support of the United Kingdom. And the longer we live, and the further we move from the days of ignorance, barbarism and slavery, the more dangerous will coercion be to England and the less effective will it be in Ireland. In the same debate, Mr. Fagan, a member of the Imperial Parliament, spoke as follows:—

“That the Chief Minister referred (Lord John Russell) to the grievances of Ireland, but that he took no steps to ameliorate the country's condition—rather he wished to goad her on by adding insult to injury. The First Minister said that in due time Ireland would get measures to improve her condition,—but Mr. Fagan asked, had the Irish to die in the meantime? What were they to do? At the rate the Government was proceeding forty years would pass and still they would cling to coercion as the old slave driver—played out and dying—would still wish to wield the lash, forgetting that his slaves had been freed and his strength was gone.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask if the words of Mr. Fagan have not proved to be a true prophecy? The period of time which he then indicated has elapsed, and to-day we find a Government, not a strong Government, not a Government able to control the affairs of the country by the votes of the party to which it belongs, but a Government supported by Liberal and Radical coercionists, endeavoring to wield the lash again, and only wielding it by the grace of those men who have joined in the pressing of this measure. Now, we find that Ireland is not alone in this conflict. She has been joined by Scotland and Wales, she has been joined by the people of Canada and by the other possessions of Her Majesty in all parts of the world. This brings me to another branch of the subject. We have seen it stated in the press, as having been urged in the English Parliament, that the Protestants of Ireland are against Home Rule, and in favor

of coercive measures. Well, I hold in my hand a report of a meeting of Protestant Home Rulers in the city of Dublin, only a short time ago, in connection with this very Coercion Act. The report states:

"Upon the motion of Mr. C. H. Oldham, the chair was taken amidst applause by Mr. James Johnstone, of Belfast. There was a large attendance. Amongst those present were:—

"Thomas A. Dickson, J.P.; Rev. Prof. Galbraith, F.T.C.D.; J. Johnstone, J.P.; Alfred Webb, Alderman Winstanley, Surgeon-Gen. King, T. H. Webb, Richard Ashe King, J. F. Keatinge, T.C.; R. Gregg, T. C.; James Walker, C. H. Oldham, Edward Purser, Surgeon Myles, F. J. Gregg, Amos Varian, Henry E. Brown, A. Andrews, Thomas Mason, &c.

"Mr. Thomas Dickson, J.P., on coming forward, was greeted with loud applause. He said it was a pleasure for him to come to that meeting to-night, and to see it presided over by an Ulster man, a Gladstonian Liberal like himself (applause), a gentleman who was not afraid of applying Liberal principles to Ireland at the present time. (Hear, hear.) They met there to-night, he need not say, at another very important crisis of the history of their country, to consider and discuss the policy of Lord Salisbury—(hisses)—to consider the policy of coercion, as again announced by his Government in connection with the introduction of fresh coercive legislation for Ireland. Again the Tory party and an English party bring forward coercion as a remedy for Irish grievances and discontent. He had been asked, in view of this crisis, to propose the following resolutions:

And then he read the resolution, which was very much in the tone of those that I have the honor to lay before the House to-day, and he went on to speak as follows, as an Irish Protestant, to the Irish Protestants there assembled:—

"He could only say, and he was sure they all agreed with him, that if the Tory Government expect to succeed in a policy of coercion in Ireland—a policy that had failed in the strong hands of Earl Spencer and Mr. Forster—that that policy would never succeed in the hands of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Balfour (cries of 'Never'). Never was a Coercion Act more vigorously administered than it was administered by Lord Spencer, but the policy ignominiously failed; and yet when Lord Spencer was in Dublin Castle administering this Act, he was backed up by the whole Liberal party, and that party was now as much opposed to the renewal of such a Coercion Act as Lord Spencer was (applause). But then they were told that remedial legislation was to accompany Coercion. Now, this was only repeating the old blunder over again. One Government goes out and another Government comes in, and these Governments never seem to learn a lesson from their predecessors (hear, hear). Coercion failed with one of the strongest Governments which ever existed, and the Tory party helped to discard it when administered by the Liberal party, and yet with the light of the past before them the Conservatives ventured to try another oppressive measure for Ireland. What happened in 1881, when Mr. Gladstone brought forward his Land Act? There was then a strong cry from the landlords and Dublin Castle that coercion was wanted, and Mr. Gladstone then, as he now admits, erred in listening to the advice which reached him from Dublin Castle, and his Government pushed forward side by side the two measures. What was the result of the Coercion Act? It discredited the Land Act, and placed serious difficulties in the way of the Act being administered. Coercion, which had failed in the hands of Mr. Gladstone, will never succeed in the hands of Lord Salisbury (applause)."

Now, Sir, we are told in some quarters that the people of this country are talking about what they really do not understand. That they know nothing at all about the nature of this Coercion Act; that they have not the text of this Act before them, and consequently are not able to express an opinion upon it. Well, I think it will not be out of place, as the Act is a very short one, to read the text of it to the House. I give it as published in *United Ireland*:

The following is the text of the 87th Coercion Bill:

1. Magistrates may examine witnesses on oath, even in cases where no person is charged before them with the committal of the crime which is the subject of enquiry.

2. The jury system is abolished altogether for certain classes of crime, punishable by a limited term of imprisonment. In other words, two stipendiary magistrates are to have summary jurisdiction, and may impose sentences not exceeding six months hard labor for any of the following offences: Criminal conspiracy, boycotting, rioting, offences under the Whiteboy Acts; assaulting officers of the law, taking forcible possession or inciting to any of the foregoing offences.

3. In jury trials the venue may be changed on the certificate of the Attorney General that a fairer trial can be had in some other place in Ireland. A prisoner, however, is to have a right to appeal against any proposed change of venue.

4. In jury trials either the Attorney General or the prisoner may demand a special jury.

5. In cases of murder, attempt to murder, aggravated crimes of violence, arson, or breaking or firing into dwellings, the Attorney Generals for England and Ireland together may certify that a fair trial can be

had in England, the State to pay expenses of carrying prisoner, his witnesses, solicitor and counsel to England.

6. These enactments are only to apply to such districts of Ireland as may be proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant.

7. The Lord Lieutenant in Council will have power to declare it an offence against the Act to have anything to do with an association formed for the purpose of commission of crimes or of inciting or enabling persons to commit crime, or of inciting to intimidation, or of interfering with the administration of the law or the maintenance of order.

8. The Act is to be permanent.

Now, Sir, anyone knowing, as I said before, the history of Ireland, anyone knowing what has occurred there and the unfortunate circumstances that have surrounded the trials of prisoners for each and every offence enumerated in this Act, will realise the full import of this legislation. In the first section magistrates are empowered to examine on oath witnesses in cases where no person is charged with the committal of the crime which is the subject of enquiry. Those gentlemen are to have a roving commission, they are to be authorised to fish about for evidence; and the country is to be made, what? Why, it is to be made a regular elysium for the informer, a regular elysium for those who will first of all induce poor, unfortunate and misguided men into secret societies and conspiracies against the Government, that those informers and traitors may hand them over to the authorities and receive the reward for their noble and disinterested services. That is one of the effects of this first clause. It will make Ireland a land where no man who values liberty, no man who hopes to call his soul his own, can live for a day. He will be at the mercy of every traitor, every spy and every scoundrel who wishes to induce poor men to become his victims. We now take the last section, and we find that this Act is to be permanent. And thus we are told that after all those years of Union, after all those Coercion Acts I have enumerated have been passed and have failed to produce the effect desired, the people of Ireland are told that this document which I hold in my hand is to be the charter of their liberties for ever, that the Act is to be permanent, the light shut out for ever. And this is the result of coercion as practiced during the last 87 years. I shall not trust myself to speak on the other clauses of this Act; I shall quote the words of Mr. Gladstone's speech on the subject at the time the measure was introduced into Parliament, in answer to Mr. Balfour's explanation of the Bill. He said:

"It is an extreme measure, in my opinion; to grant that demand would be one of the most formidable breaches of trust that any popular assembly could perpetuate. In my opinion, one of the greatest and grossest breaches of trust will be committed by this House if it relaxes the conditions on which it has been its rule to give its sanction to changes in the criminal law for the purpose of giving it increased stringency against a portion of Her Majesty's subjects (cheers). No case, I must say, has been made out for such a demand, not even a shadow of a cause to justify the demand, and none has, by candid confession on the other side, been made on account of the extreme crime and offences which exist in Ireland (hear, hear). The right hon. gentleman the Chief Secretary, has been good enough to explain to us the provisions of the Bill. One proposal, however, would have to be carefully examined. I refer to the Irish trials which are to be heard here in London by English juries (laughter). There have been sinister predictions in the newspapers of a proposal of this kind; but I thought it my duty to the Government not to believe it (cheers). I did not believe that I should live to see the day when a proposal so wanton, so insulting, so exasperating, so utterly in contrast with the whole of the lessons of Irish history, would ever have been submitted to the British House of Commons (loud cheers). I shall have an opportunity of saying more than this when the exact provisions are before me; but this I must say—this I always understood—that trial by jury meant trial by our peers—trial, as nearly as possible, by persons as near as may be in the same circumstances. But the enforcement of such a proposal as this would be an exact reversal of the fundamental principle of trial by jury (hear, hear). Whenever we do interfere with trial by jury it is well that you should avoid the capital and fatal error of discarding the substance while you keep only the form, as seems to me to be at the bottom of the cruel and grievous proposal of the Government. Another provision on which I would say a word, or rather the absence of provision, is in relation to the duration of time. That, I must say, makes our blood run cold (hear, and cheers). It is a very sad state of things if, after our eighty-seven years of legislation, which was, no doubt, intended by many, even of those who used such discreditable means of promoting the union, to be the harbinger and certain hope of peace and goodwill between the countries—after going through three

generations of men cobbling at the business of coercion, struggling as we could with good intentions here and there at intervals, hoping the sun of liberty might rise unclouded on Ireland, at least for a time—that now all that we propose is that a temporary remedy shall become the rule for the government of a people, that the brand of inferiority is to be placed on them forever, and they, with the full enjoyment of the representative system, are expected to acquiesce, to welcome, to embrace, and to hug that law (cheers).

I shall not say one word myself in addition to what has been so admirably stated in the extract from that great speech which I have just read. But it has been whispered about that we in this House have no right to interfere in this matter; that we have no right to have our say upon this subject; that we, as British subjects, as men living under the same Sovereign, under the same flag, and under the same institutions, in a great measure, have not the right to say one word upon this subject; that we should pass it by in silence, and while we enjoy our own liberty and prosperity and witness our own progress, we should turn a deaf ear to the piteous wail of our fellow-subjects in another section of the Empire, and turn away our eyes altogether from the painful scene that is there sought to be enacted. I need not insult the intelligence of this House by quoting authorities on the subject; but I will say that if precedents, which find so much favor in the eyes of Englishmen everywhere, are of any value, we have two precedents, owing to the proceedings had by this House. In 1832 the first Home Rule resolutions were introduced here. In 1886 the sentiments of those resolutions were reaffirmed, and upon both occasions the resolutions were transmitted to the Old Country. The first time it was done in the shape of an Address to Her Majesty; and I will just say a few words upon that subject. If anyone desires to find upon what authority we can proceed in this matter, let him refer to the speech of the present Minister of Inland Revenue on that occasion; let him refer to the eloquent appeal of the leader of the Opposition on that branch of the subject; let him refer, still further, to the words of the leader of the present Government, without whose goodwill, without whose good word no Home Rule resolution could have gone from this Parliament to the Old Land. There is something more. The first resolution passed by this House, the resolution of 1832, was more than a Home Rule resolution. It was more than a Home Rule resolution in this sense, that it went beyond the mere expression by the House that it believed Home Rule would bring peace and prosperity to Ireland and create harmony in that country. It was virtually a protest against coercion, because at that time there were lingering in prison in Ireland under the effects of a Coercion Act men who had no prospect of being tried, who perhaps hardly knew the offence with which they had been charged; and upon that occasion my hon. friend included in his motion an appeal to the authorities that those men would be liberated, that they would be accorded fair play. I shall now read in that connection the words of the First Minister of the present Government. He said:

“The hon. member for Victoria expresses the hope that the time has come when persons charged with political offences, whether rightly or wrongly, may be released, enjoying the inestimable blessings of personal freedom. The hon. gentleman will, I hope, succeed in having his resolutions adopted by the House; I hope they will receive the votes of a majority of the House. This is not a Government question, although it was moved as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. But it is certainly not a Government question, and I, as First Minister, and I believe speaking with some influence, would ask all my hon. friends in the House who can conscientiously do so,—I ask no man to vote against his conscience,—to support the resolutions. And it is only by the support of the Ministerial majority in the House that these resolutions can be carried.”

We have, therefore, these high authorities I have mentioned to justify us in our present proceeding, not merely as pronouncing an opinion in favor of Home Rule for Ireland, but in the protest that is implied by the request that those men who were lingering under the penalty of a Coercion Act should be liberated or brought to trial in the usual way. But, Sir,
Mr. CURRAN.

there is more than that. If we look across the Atlantic to the course which has been followed on more than one occasion by the Imperial Government there, we will find that English Ministers, speaking on behalf of the nation, have not been at all reluctant to interfere, but, on the contrary, have with great alacrity interfered in behalf of oppressed nationalities in various parts of the world. I will quote one or two brief extracts from the English *Hansard* to convince the House of that fact, or rather to refresh the memories of hon. gentlemen, most of whom have lived through the period to which I intend to refer. I will first allude to the question brought before the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Pope Hennessy with regard to the affairs of Naples. Lord John Russell, speaking on behalf of the Government in answer to a statement made by that hon. gentleman, said:

“The hon. member is mistaken in supposing that I made any appeal to nationalities. I stated what were then the views of the Government with regard to Italy, and especially with regard to Naples and Sicily, and I was induced to do so because Russia and Prussia had already pronounced their opinions, and because there must sooner or later arise a question, which has arisen, whether the Government which superseded that of the late King of Naples, was such a Government that we could acknowledge it as a regular Government in Europe. It was on that account necessary to give some opinion with reference to what was taking place in Italy. I gave that opinion. I stated that, since the year 1821, the people in both the Roman and Neapolitan States had suffered mis-government, which I believed was worse than that which existed in any other country in Europe—a good deal worse than that existing in Turkey—”

I am sorry he did not give us his opinion about the state of affairs in Ireland—

“and that after suffering so long I could not wonder that they had joined the invaders who had overthrown the authorities who had mis-governed them. I think I should be attributing more to that despatch than it really deserves if I were to suppose that either Poland or Hungary had become discontented and disturbed in consequence of its contents.”

Thus we find the leader of the Government stating that it was perfectly justifiable for him, not merely to make a speech but to issue a manifesto, stating the views of the Government, not upon any international question, but upon the internal arrangements of another Government, upon the mode in which that Government and other Governments were treating their subjects, and drawing comparisons not very flattering to these Governments between the mode in which their subjects were treated and the manner in which they were treated in the country which was supposed to have the most uncivilised Government in the world. Again, Mr. Pope Hennessy brought up the question of Poland before the Imperial Parliament, and after speaking at considerable length he said:

“Sir, in this story of English connivance at Polish oppression there is an instructing moral. I commend it to the consideration of what is called the Liberal party. Hon. members who have comprehended the guilty action of England may fairly ask what pretension have British statesmen to style themselves the champions of freedom. If the noble lords opposite (Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell) have done so much to maintain Russia against Poland, and in doing this have deluded Europe, and mystified their country with all the specious cant of Liberalism, surely their foreign policy to-day should not be exempt from scrutiny; and when they call the loyal peasants of South Italy ‘brigands,’ and when they publicly approve of the barbarous conduct of Cialdini and Rivelli, we may be pardoned for remembering that the English statesmen who now support Piedmontese oppression in Italy, are the same English statesmen who supported Russian tyranny in Poland.”

Under that attack Lord John Russell stated what were the views of the Government on that subject and Sir Harry Verney said:

“The speech to which the House had just listened was the most hopeful sign for Poland which he remembered in the course of a long parliamentary experience. The statement of the noble lord would give hope to the Polish nation, without exciting them to forcible attempts to obtain their rights. He was most anxious that nothing should be said in that House which would give rise to the expectation that England was likely to interfere by force of arms for the restoration to the Polish nation of their rights; but it was at the same time of great importance that they should state calmly and dispassionately their opinion that

those rights had been violated, and that the events which had recently occurred were the consequence of that violation."

Viscount Palmerston, speaking in the same debate, laid down this doctrine:

"I agree with my noble friend that it is impossible for anybody who has any admiration for high national qualities, for patriotism, endurance, love of liberty, not to admire the Polish character. And it is equally impossible for anybody who had any sense of wrong not to lament those misfortunes which have befallen the Poles from the time of the first partition of Poland down to the present moment. That partition was a gross violation of national right. The stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna were broken almost as soon as concluded. The British Government, upon every occasion on which it was called on to pronounce an opinion, or on which it thought it could pronounce an opinion usefully, declared that to be its due, and when the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) says that the English Government interferes in some cases by opinion and advice, and does not interfere in others, I must tell him that the English Government interferes in proportion as it thinks it can do so usefully; that when it thinks its opinion may prevail it expresses it in a form which it believes the most likely to prevail."

That is to say, it interferes with the condition of the subjects of a foreign Government, interferes with the character of that Government, expresses opinions as to the modes in which they deal with their subjects; and yet we who are fellow subjects of Britain with the people of Ireland are to be told that we are not entitled to express our views on this important subject which is engaging the attention of the whole civilised world to-day. If we wish to know the state of affairs which exists on the other side of the Atlantic, of the wretched condition in which those who seek to impose coercion on Ireland now find themselves, we have it in the gross and infamous attempt that is being made to bolster up the Government cause by making an outrageous charge against Charles Stewart Parnell, the trusted leader of the Irish people the world over on this question. I say that is an insult to the whole Irish race; it is one which no words of mine can sufficiently condemn. And, Sir, I contend that if there is a man in the British Empire to whom the Government of England are indebted it is Charles Stewart Parnell. He has done more than any other man since the days of O'Connell, to lead the people of Ireland into constitutional ways. He has done a great deal for Ireland, but he has not done less for England. We all remember that the people of Ireland and their compatriots, more especially in the neighboring Republic, had lost all hope of ever obtaining any constitutional reform from the Parliament of Great Britain. We remember the last unfortunate outbreak that threatened the peace of England and the peace of Ireland, and the peace of this country also, in 1866, when the Fenian organisation was in force. After the failure of that movement, the late lamented Isaac Butt took up once more the direction of the Constitutional party of Ireland. He struggled manfully, and poured forth the eloquence of his race into the ears of the British Parliament; but his arguments were not heard by a full House. Most frequently the benches were empty. But he struggled on. His movement was looked upon in most places as a milk-and-water affair which would not satisfy the people of Ireland. After his demise the present trusted leader of the Irish people took the management of the affairs of the Irish party, and he infused new life and new aspirations into the people. He gave them to understand that they might look forward to a day when the whole people of Ireland would be united and would send a strong contingent to the British Parliament who would knock effectively at its doors in the name of the Irish race. He had done that with 86 members at his back; and, Sir, he has done more. He has satisfied the aspirations of those who had gone out of Ireland, many men who had gone away with vengeance in their hearts against the British Government and against those who were taking advantage of the laws as they existed. And we are told to-day that this man, who has lived down all the calumnies that were hurled against him in days gone by, should go before a jury in England or Scotland or elsewhere and vindicate his char-

acter. We find the greatest newspaper in England saying that, having made the charge against him, it is not for it to prove that charge, but it is for Mr. Parnell and his friends to disprove it. The old maxim, *onus probandi qui dicit*, is entirely ignored by that paper, and we find lords and statesmen standing by its allegation. Well, I feel that the great leader of the Irish people can afford to trust himself to the hearts of that people and the common sense and common justice of the world. It would be a pitiful affair for him to appeal to a jury on this subject. We know very well that the very mild and dove-like Government that corruptly expended millions of dollars in order to corrupt and bribe a Parliament to deprive a nation of its liberties, would hardly hesitate at the peccadillo of either packing or bribing a jury for the purpose of destroying the reputation and influence of the man who is now trying to restore to Ireland the rights of which she was deprived. I leave this branch of the subject without further comment. I now appeal to my friends in this House that in addition to these resolutions, if they be carried, as I have no doubt they will be, one more hope may be expressed, that the advice tendered by O'Connell and by Parnell to the people of Ireland may be followed in this hour of their trial, and that they may not be seduced away from the right path by the terrible oppression imposed upon them to violate the law in the slightest degree. There are some misguided persons, without judgment and devoid of the true sense that ought to inspire men on occasions of this kind, who say that the only way to obtain liberty and justice for Ireland is to have recourse to outrages which would bring discredit and disgrace upon the name of an honored race. We find in the February number of the *Nineteenth Century* an article written by the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, in which he states that it is not the case that upon all occasions England has given way to fears in making concessions to Ireland. He says:

"It is sometimes said that when Ireland has obtained anything that she deemed good from England it has been through fear. I admit this to be true in most cases; but it is not in all. In 1845, for example, Ireland desired, or appeared to desire, and she obtained, three boons from Parliament from the wise forethought of Sir Robert Peel. They were, the better endowment of Maynooth; the foundation of the Queen's, yielded by Sir Robert Inglis the goddess, Colleges; and the Charitable Bequests Act. No one would assert that these measures were passed through fear, unless indeed it were that 'early and provident fear,' which, says Burke, 'is the mother of security,' and which may attend upon, but does not disparage, any good act of any person for any purpose. If it be said that the instance is *de minimis*, then I quote three other measures, two given and one offered by Great Britain, to which this objection will not apply. They are: (1.) The Disestablishment of the Irish Church; (2.) the Land Act of 1870; (3.) the Education Bill of 1879, approved on the second reading by a majority of British, but rejected by the votes of Irish members. It still appears to me little short of ludicrous to assert that these measures were the product of slavish fear, or that a couple of local outrages are to be compared with the case of the Emancipation Act, of which the Duke of Wellington said he adopted the policy as being preferable to civil war. In a somewhat sluggish state of the public mind, those two outrages, at Manchester and Clerkenwell just made it possible, by exciting general attention, for a powerful political party to give the Irish question precedence over other pending questions; and they did no more. I remember a case of a small timid spaniel frightened by a hare; Great Britain is not to be frightened even by a couple of hares."

These are the words of this eminent statesman who, for some two years past, has appeared himself anxious to bring this great question to a consummation; and we trust and hope that wherever Irishmen are found sympathising with the national cause, their endeavor will be to influence those over whom they can exercise any control in the direction of restraining men from those outrages which the unadvised oppression imposed upon them might incite them to. I speak here, in the presence of the Parliament of the Dominion, where men have enjoyed for years past the glorious privilege of Home Rule; I speak here in the presence of French Canadians to whom—no matter what may be said, though we may admire, as was said by the First Minister, the motives of those who took part on both sides in the con-

flict of 1837—we must do the justice of saying that the blood of their forefathers, shed on the battle field and on the scaffold, nurtured the roots of constitutional liberty in this our country. What has been the result to that people of giving them the rights for which they agitated? Have they not prospered and progressed since then? What a change has been since then effected in their sentiments, when one of the noblest of their sons declared that the last shot fired on the continent of America for British connection would be fired by a French Canadian. I appeal to the representatives of that race, as to the representatives of all sections, to support my motion. We have had in the history of our country instances of how Irishmen and Irish Catholics were ready to fight for our country in its days of trouble. In 1866, the first regiment called out to oppose the Fenian organisation that threatened to invade our territories, which never would have been invaded had it not been for the unfortunate state of affairs in Ireland, was the Prince of Wales regiment, which was commanded at the time by a distinguished fellow-countryman of mine, the late lamented Bernard Devlin, formerly member of this House. Later on, we had another little trouble in this country, the rebellion in the North-West, and Canadians, without distinction, sent forth their sons to fight for the integrity of their Dominion. Amongst those who went out the first that comes to my mind is a young Irish Catholic, the President of the Junior Conservative Club in Montreal, the President of the Irish Land League in Montreal, and an officer in the 65th regiment, who left his sick-bed to join his regiment rather than have it said he would hold back one moment from showing that in this country, where we enjoy all the glorious privileges which free men love in their hearts, no Irish Catholic, wearing Her Majesty's uniform in the volunteers, would be found holding back in the moment of danger. I speak of Mr. C. J. Doherty, Q. C., of Montreal. He was but one, and I mention him as a notable instance among many others of the fact that where we enjoy Home Rule, Irishmen are as loyal and devoted to the British constitution as men of any other race. We are going to have, in a very short time throughout this Empire, a celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee, in which all the nations and all the peoples that live beneath the British flag will be called to take a joyous part. Shall it be said that among all these peoples who are called upon to congratulate our august Sovereign upon her auspicious reign, the only victim, the only disconsolate one in all that scene of rejoicing, will be poor old Ireland? Shall it be said that our ancient race will alone appear in the rags of poverty, the sullenness of discontent, in the chains of coercion? I hope not, and for that reason I ask this honorable House to permit me to present this resolution:

That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland; and

That in the year 1886, by a Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and

That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Bill enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, whilst satisfying the National aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.

That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional

Mr. CURRAN.

sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this Her Jubilee year and, if possible, render Her Majesty more dear to the hearts of Her already devoted and loyal subjects.

That the present resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P., and Charles Stewart Parnell, M. P.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much regret, as I regretted last Session when the hon. the leader of the Opposition introduced a resolution in reference to this question, that my hon. friend (Mr. Curran) has deemed it to be his duty to introduce resolutions at this time in this House on the same subject. I very much admire the ability of my hon. friend. I am fully convinced of the depth of his devotion, of his heartfelt devotion, to the cause of the Irish people; I am fully persuaded that nothing could be to him a source of purer pleasure than the conviction and the consciousness that he had been able to do something to effect a settlement of the difficult and complicated questions which convulse unhappy Ireland to day. I will go further, and say that I believe most sincerely that if any sacrifice of his own convenience or interest would, in his opinion, benefit Ireland, if any such sacrifice would carry peace to her people and prosperity and contentment to her homes, that sacrifice on the part of my hon. friend would be willingly made. But I believe that the very warmth of his sentiments and generosity of his nature have impelled him to assume an attitude in these resolutions with reference to the Imperial Parliament and the people of the Mother Country, that I do not believe this House will or can approve. It is perfectly true that the Canadian House of Commons has, on two occasions, passed resolutions in favor of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, but not unconditionally. Only last year we affirmed the principle that no measure of Home Rule for Ireland would be satisfactory which was not compatible with the unity and integrity of the Empire, and with the safe-guarding of the rights and status of the minority. At that time Mr. Gladstone's measure of Home Rule was under consideration in England, and the hon. gentleman opposite, with that dove-like simplicity and singleness of purpose which are so eminently characteristic of his political actions, moved in the House a resolution virtually committing this House to an unquestioning approval of Mr. Gladstone's course. I presume that he was impelled to do this from a heartfelt conviction that the vote of this House would have an enormous effect upon the vote then to be taken in the Imperial House of Commons, and that his own action in the matter was not likely, in any degree, to affect the Irish Catholic vote in Canada. However, this House wisely refused to pledge itself to the unquestioning approval of a policy with the details of which it was unfamiliar, and which had resulted in driving from Mr. Gladstone's side almost every Liberal statesman of eminence in the House of Commons, and which had driven from his side also a full dozen of the ablest and most experienced Ministers that had ever adorned his Cabinet. Since then, the conditions connected with this question have very much changed. Since then, the English House of Commons has condemned Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, and there has been an appeal from the House of Commons, from the Parliament to the people, and the people at the polls have also condemned, unhesitatingly and unequivocally, Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy, and they have returned a majority of over one hundred in a new House of Commons pledged to oppose any such measure of Home Rule for Ireland as is advocated by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. It is admitted by all his political opponents that Mr. Gladstone is a statesman of transcendent ability and of almost infinite fertility of resource. His Irish policy has been the leading feature of his political career. No man has studied the Irish question more profoundly than he, and yet, when, with all the advantages of matured study and vast experience and transcendent ability and infinite fertility of resource, he en-

deavors to frame a Home Rule scheme for Ireland, it is pronounced by a majority of the ablest of his own supporters, by the Imperial House of Commons and by the English people, to be absolutely impracticable and hopelessly a failure. Now, under these circumstances, what is it that my hon. friend asks us to do in these resolutions? He asks us, in the first place, to complain that no measure of Home Rule has yet been granted for Ireland. Would it not, in view of the notorious facts to which I have referred, be only fair and reasonable that we should make some allowance for the difficulty of the task that we have asked the Imperial Government to undertake, and is it altogether fair and reasonable, or is it not rather unfair and unreasonable, to complain that a task so difficult has not already been accomplished? I venture to think it is, and I venture to think this House will agree with me. Is this Home Rule so very light a thing that it can be dealt with in a haphazard and perfunctory manner? Is it not now very well understood, are we not all of us very well aware, that, in some quarters at least, this agitation in favor of Home Rule is closely connected with a dangerous conspiracy aimed at the very existence of our Empire? Is it not very well known that this agitation in favor of Home Rule is largely fanned and fomented by men who are the avowed enemies of the British race, by men who have declared that nothing will satisfy them short of the severing of the last link which binds Ireland to the Empire? Is not the British Government bound to take cognizance of these things, and do not these facts add enormously to the difficulty of the situation? Ought we not also to consider these matters? How will our conduct in this matter, if we pass these resolutions, be regarded in the Mother Country in the hour of her difficulty and her sorrow? Will it not be regarded, very likely, as an unpardonable impertinence, if not as a deliberate affront? Should not we regard it in that light if the Mother Country were to act in such a manner in regard to us? If she were to do so, a score of members here would rise in condemnation of and indignant protest against such conduct on the part of the Mother Country, and is it to be supposed that she will not take the same view with regard to us? Is it, then, so very desirable, just at the present juncture of affairs, that we should endeavor to stifle that warm sympathy which has been so strongly developed in the Mother Country towards the Dominion of Canada? Is that very desirable at this juncture? If not, might it, be altogether undesirable that we should endeavor to treat the Mother Country with some slight degree of that courteous consideration that she invariably extends to us? But my hon. friend says that while there is no Home Rule measure introduced, a measure of coercion, or what he calls a measure of coercion, has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament. I think it would be well, I think it would be interesting to members of this House that they should be in possession of some reliable evidence as to the condition of things which has called forth this action on the part of the Government of the Mother Country, and with that object I will read you some evidence which will be as brief as possible. The evidence I am about to submit to the House is not that of political partisans nor enthusiasts on one side or the other, nor is it the evidence of men who know not well whereof they speak, but it is the evidence of men who are, of necessity, able men, of men who are trained in impartiality, of men who, by reason of their acquaintance with the facts, are peculiarly able to speak with authority on the subject. It is the evidence of Her Majesty's judges in Ireland and is contained in their charges to the grand juries at assizes. After having read this the House can form its own opinion on the subject. Mr. Justice Lawson, in Mayo, says on the 10th of March:

"The present state of things was morally unsatisfactory and according to the reports made to him approached as nearly to rebellion against

the authority of the country as has anything short of civil war could be."

Mr. Justice Murphy, in Galway, said:

"From the reports made to him by the inspectors of the Crown and the officers of the county, there appears to be a complete paralysis of law, that it is unable to protect many of the inhabitants in the exercise of their most ordinary rights, and that lawlessness is perfectly triumphant."

Mr. Justice O'Brien, in Clare, said:

"All these returns which I have before me and the information which has reached me from other quarters of an unquestionably authentic character, lead me to the conclusion that law, to a great extent, has ceased to exist in this country; the common rule of obedience which must exist in every civilised state, and which every honest and well disposed citizen is expected to perform and must yield if unwillingly, is abrogated for the present by an influence, and replaced by an influence fatal to industry, fatal to prosperity, fatal to every interest connected with the welfare of the community,—"

And I beg hon. gentlemen to remark these words—

"and an influence that I still cannot but be persuaded is becoming dominant here and elsewhere through want of courage and firmness in meeting it."

Mr. Justice Johnson, in Limerick, said:

"I find here that in no less than nine cases parties of armed men, frequently disguised and all under circumstances which enable them to avoid detection and be made amenable, have gone deliberately roaming about through the country for the purpose of wreaking vengeance or committing injury on unfortunate inmates of peaceable homes, sometimes to the large number of thirty, sometimes being smaller—varying from two persons to thirty—sometimes their visits being accompanied with acts of brutal violence."

He then instances two cases, of one of which he says:

"A peaceable family were dragged from their beds and the women cruelly beaten, in the other a son was shot in the thigh because he endeavored to protect his father."

Mr. Justice O'Brien, in Kerry, said:

"The law is defeated—perhaps I should rather say has ceased to exist, houses are attacked by night and day, even the midnight terror yielding to the noon-day audacity of crime, persons and life are assailed; the terrified inmates are wholly unable to do anything to protect themselves, and a state of terror and lawlessness prevails every where."

And he again says:

"Experience and observation teach every day in all the forms of social life, that there is a system of unseen terrorism, a system of terror and tyranny."

Mr. Justice Johnson, in Cork, said:

"People who live in remote and isolated districts are subject to violence, alarm, plunder, by day and by night—principally by night—from gangs of armed men, disguised, who rove through the country seizing arms, plundering sometimes property, always with a show of violence, often accompanied by threats, and sometimes with assaults of the meanest and most dastardly character, and sometimes with grave results."

And he mentions one case of a most horrible character, where a man's daughters were dragged from their beds by ruffians, who poured pitch on their heads and cut off their hair with shears. He ends by saying:

"So long as there is no security there is no order; so long as there is no order there can be no peace, and so long as there is no peace there can be no prosperity."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I had at one time the pleasure of being personally acquainted with Mr. Justice Lawson, and although that is, perhaps, a matter which ought not to be referred to in this connection, still, it might be as well that I should say that I know him to be a Liberal in politics and a nominee of Mr. Gladstone's own, as, in point of fact, a large majority of the Irish judges are. Now, hon. gentlemen can decide for themselves whether they are prepared to condemn the Imperial Government who, with these solemn words of the custodians of justice ringing in their ears, have deemed it their duty to increase the efficiency of the criminal law in Ireland. Hon. gentlemen can also come to the conclusion for themselves as to whether anything could be well imagined more fatal to the well-being of that country than the triumph of this organised terrorism which has been so vividly and terribly depicted by the judges of the land. Hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves.

whether anything could be more unfortunate for Ireland than the triumph of a pitiless policy of coercion, not by Act of Parliament, directed against criminals, but by boycott and bludgeon, by maiming and murder, by calculated, slow, remorseless persecution, by sudden midnight attack upon peaceful and happy homes. Hon. gentlemen can form their own opinion with regard to that question. My hon. friend protests against the Coercion Bill which has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons. Has he no word of protest for this other coercion which is directed, not against criminals, but against the peaceful, law-abiding peasantry of Ireland? It is, I admit, a very unfortunate thing, a thing very much to be deplored, that this Coercion Bill has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament. It is a thing much to be deplored, Mr. Speaker, that we have any criminal law at all; it is all coercion. But I am afraid that, so long as we have crime, criminal law, which is coercion, will be an unfortunate necessity. My hon. friend, however, objects to this process of coercion, but I think this House will believe that when ordinary law is insufficient for the protection of life and property, it is the bounden duty of the Government to implement that law by further coercive powers. It is the first duty of a Government to protect life and property. For this object Governments primarily exist, and no British Government dare stand idly by and see in Ireland property destroyed, men maimed and murdered, and women outraged in the manner described by the judges of the land. If they did do so they would be derelict to their duty and traitors to their trust. My hon. friend in his resolution complains that some of the people of Ireland will, by the Coercion Bill, be deprived of some of those liberties which, as British subjects, we all prize so much. Mr. Speaker, that is, unfortunately, one of the little inconveniences attaching to an indulgence in criminal proclivities, and unfortunately it is necessary that those persons who do those things should be deprived of just so much of their liberties as British subjects as is necessary also to deprive them of the power to commit such atrocities. But my hon. friend objects to that, and he asks this House to condemn the Imperial Government because they endeavor to grapple with this condition of things, because they endeavor to protect the law-abiding, peaceful subjects of the Queen against the assaults of bodies of murderous miscreants who, with arms in their hands, blackened faces and every accompaniment of barbaric terrorism, scour the country by night, destroy property, mutilate dumb animals, fire volleys of bullets into peaceful homes, drag men and women from their beds, sometimes to murder, sometimes to maim, but always to coerce—always to coerce the law-abiding into being breakers of the law; always to coerce those who are peaceful, and to force them to be turbulent. I venture to think that this House will not adopt that course, and will not make any such protest. My hon. friend has spoken about the number of times in which it has been necessary to implement the criminal law in Ireland. If it had been necessary to do so, not the number of times the hon. gentleman has mentioned, but that number of times multiplied by itself, it would have been none the less inexcusable if the Government of the Queen, who are responsible for the protection and life and property in that country, had not again resorted to those measures which were necessary for the protection of life and property in Ireland. My hon. friend has said that the last Coercion Act was a miserable failure. I do not know upon what authority he bases that statement. All I can say is, that the public records do not show it to have been so; that statistics of crime do not show it to have been so; but they proved the very reverse; and if there is one thing better established than another, it is that when the ordinary criminal law has been supplemented, it has had the effect of restoring, in a great measure, law and order in Ireland.

Mr. McNEILL.

But really, Mr. Speaker, the matter simply resolves itself into this. The Imperial Government believe that it is necessary to take immediate steps for the protection of the law-abiding, peaceful subjects of the Queen in Ireland, that it is necessary to supplement the existing criminal law for that object; and what we have to decide is, whether we are prepared to take the altogether unprecedented course of passing resolutions of condemnation upon the Imperial Government because they are going to act in accordance with that belief; whether, in other words, we are going in this jubilee year of the Queen to vary our ordinary procedure in this House by insulting the Mother Country and the Imperial Government, because these resolutions are not merely a suggestion as to the advisability of Home Rule such as was contained in the resolutions introduced into this House before, but they are a direct condemnation of the course of conduct pursued by the Government of the Queen. I venture to think that this House will adopt no such course; but, on the contrary, that hon. members will be inclined to think that there is a good deal to be said in favor of this coercive measure, which, although it has been introduced by a Conservative Government, is being supported by men of such eminent Liberal reputation as Lord Hartington, formerly leader of the Liberal party; Mr. Goschen, often spoken of as the probable leader of that party; John Bright, the world-renowned champion of popular rights and the life-long friend of the Irish people; Mr. Chamberlain, the most conspicuous figure in the Radical ranks; Sir Henry James, Mr. Gladstone's own Attorney General, and Lord Selbourne, the famous Roundell Palmer, his own Lord Chancellor. I think that, in view of these facts, when hon. gentlemen know that men of such eminence, statesmen of such experience and of such well-known liberal sentiments, have felt constrained to support their political opponents, their own life-long political opponents, in carrying this measure into effect, this House will pause before it solemnly declares that it is better able to form an opinion on the subject than are those eminent statesmen and proven good friends of Ireland, who are so much better informed of the facts than we can possibly be. But, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, in asking us to support these resolutions, asks us not only to pass a vote of censure on the Imperial Government for its conduct of Imperial affairs, but he asks us to pass a vote of censure on the Government of Great Britain and Ireland in respect of matters which are purely local to Ireland. The protection of life and property in Cork, Limerick or Mayo, is a question as purely local to Ireland, as the protection of life in the valley of the Ottawa is a question local to Canada. I am one of those who believe that it would be of immense value, not only to the colonies but to the Mother Country, if the colonies possessed a greater influence in Imperial affairs than they do to-day. I believe the time is rapidly approaching when the colonies will possess that greater influence. I believe it is almost impossible to exaggerate the advantages that would accrue to the Empire by the better organisation of the forces making for greatness that are so richly at our disposal and by a closer and more intimate union of the different parts of the Empire. But while I hold those views, I hold, in common with all who endorse those views, the belief that it is essential that the rights and privileges of Local Parliaments in local affairs should be maintained; and it does seem to me that the Legislature of Ontario have as good a right to pass a vote of censure with respect to the Government of Québec in regard to matters pertaining to Québec, and we have as good a right to pass a vote of censure on the Government of New South Wales in respect of matters pertaining to that colony, as we have to pass a vote of censure on the Government of Great Britain and Ireland in regard to matters pertaining exclusively to Ireland. Mr. Speaker, let us remember also that in asking this House to pass these

resolutions my hon. friend is not only asking us to pass a vote of censure upon the Imperial Government and Parliament, but he asks us to pass a vote of censure also upon the people of the Mother Country. For that Parliament is fresh from the people, charged with a mandate from the people, commanded by the people of the Mother Country to grant no such measure of Home Rule as that demanded by Parnell; charged also with a mandate—a special mandate—to take instant means for the better protection of life and property in Ireland. Let us remember also, Mr. Speaker, that this question of Home Rule is one of the most difficult and complicated that we could possibly approach. Let us remember that the people of Ireland themselves are divided on this question, and that, while no doubt a majority of those people are in favor of such a measure of Home Rule as has been suggested by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, there is a very great minority of that people—a majority of the weight and intellect of the country—who are altogether opposed to any such measure, who are permeated with the conviction that any measure of Home Rule, unsurrounded by ample safeguards, would result in the ruin of their country and be a death-blow to their own peace and happiness. There is not a man who is acquainted with the character and the sympathies of these men who does not know thoroughly well that, if occasion should arise, they would fight to the last gasp in defence of their property, their homes and their religion. There is no doubt whatsoever that any measure of Home Rule unsurrounded by ample safeguards, is a measure for civil war in Ireland; and he must be an able man indeed, and a far seeing man indeed, who can tell us what that would ultimately involve. This question is fraught with momentous issues; it is surrounded by dangers which, perhaps, many of us here in Canada can but dimly discern. We have on two former occasions pronounced our opinion on this question. Would not we act the part of wise men at this crisis by leaving the question in the hands of those who are, of necessity, better informed as to the facts connected with it than we can possibly be, and who are directly responsible for the manner in which they may deal with it. And above all things let us take care, let us beware lest while my hon. friend is asking us to support these resolutions, he is not all unconsciously, all unwittingly, asking us to support something which will not so much benefit the poor, warm-hearted, generous, suffering peasantry of Ireland as it will strengthen and encourage those who are the foreign enemies of our Empire and Fenian traitors to our Queen. I have to thank you, Sir, and the House for the very patient attention you have accorded me during the time I have addressed you. I fear I have occupied too much time; but I will now, with the permission of the House, move an amendment to these resolutions which is as follows:—

That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following words substituted therefor: This House desires to repeat the expressions of its deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of the people of Ireland and its adhesion to the sentiments on the subject of Home Rule, enunciated in the joint Address to Her Majesty from both Houses of the Canadian Parliament, passed in the Session of 1882, and in the resolution adopted by this House in 1886. This House is, however, unable to form or express an opinion as to the merits or demerits of the Bill for the amendment of the criminal law with respect to Ireland, now before the Imperial Parliament, in the absence of the measure itself and of the papers and evidence on which it is based.

Mr. KENNY. I consider it fortunate that on this, almost the first, occasion on which I have had the honor of addressing the Parliament of Canada, I have to refer in terms of eulogy to the institutions of our own country; that I have to express the hope that a part of the great Empire to which we are all so proud to belong should be permitted to enjoy some such measure of self-government as we possess in this country and which has been a fruitful source of so much happiness to the people of Canada. In no part of the Empire is our illustrious Queen more beloved, or the people

more attached to her throne than they are in this Dominion of Canada; and none of us Canadians are more loyal than those of Irish birth or descent. Every Irishman knows that here, in common with all our people, he enjoys the fullest measure of civil and religious liberty, that his position in this country is exactly what he makes it for himself by his conduct, his industry or his abilities. The cordial reception which has ever been given to the mention of Her Majesty's name at every festive gathering of Irishmen that I have attended in Canada is that expression of affection and loyalty which freemen are ever ready to accord to the representative of the Government under which they live. We know that the advocates of self-government for Ireland have ever pointed to Canada as the happiest illustration that could be found of a people of different creeds and races living harmoniously and prosperously under a form of Home Rule. And now, for one moment, I will refer to some of the arguments that have been used by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He spoke of the desire—what appears to me, Sir, the very natural desire—of the Irish people to have some form of self-government, as a conspiracy against the Empire. Now, Sir, are we Canadians prepared to admit that our form of Home Rule is any conspiracy against the Empire? If it is not a conspiracy in Canada, why should it be a conspiracy in Ireland? The hon. member has referred to certain crimes that have been committed in Ireland. Every man who listened to him must have deplored them; but does he mean to tell hon. gentlemen sitting around these benches that the extent of crime is greater in Ireland than it is in any other country in the world of the same population? Every hon. gentleman here knows that that is not the case; that crime in Ireland assumes only one form, which is the result of centuries of misrule. The hon. gentleman also referred to the feelings of the minority in Ireland if Home Rule were granted to that country. Does he not know that the advocates of that measure have always insisted that the rights of the minorities would and should be protected? Why, Sir, it seems to me as if every Canadian must be a Home Ruler, for that is the form of government which prevails in our own country. Living in this free land, where the people rule, and the voice of the majority is absolute, the state of things in Ireland to-day is thoroughly incomprehensible to us; it is an unfathomable mystery. The condition of the people of that country is a sad caricature upon the boasted civilisation of the nineteenth century. Enjoying all the blessings which we do under our advanced form of popular government, we feel warranted in expressing the opinion that it would be a wise, a prudent and a gracious act to grant the Irish people that form of government which works so advantageously for us. Last year, Sir, some amongst us had the pleasure of welcoming to Canada one of the most distinguished members of the Imperial Parliament, and a prominent member of the Irish parliamentary party. I refer to Mr. Justin McCarthy, the celebrated historian and journalist. That gentleman told us publicly from the platform, and privately in our homes, that what he desired for Ireland was some such measure of self-government as we possess in Canada. I believe that granting self-government to Ireland would lead to the contentment, and consequently to the prosperity of the people of that country, and add to the honor and dignity of the Empire. It seems to me, Sir, that the heart of every lover of freedom, and especially the heart of every Irishman, must throb with dismay whenever and wherever the Coercion Bill is named. It seems to me that that is the most sadly retrogressive piece of legislation which has ever been proposed in our day. Who, Sir, can read a description of the present state of Ireland and the Irish people, and not feel a desire to have it, if possible, ameliorated? We desire that amelioration, not alone in the interest of the people of

Ireland, but in the interest of our common Christianity and in the interest of the great Empire to which we belong. I know, Mr. Speaker, that we are sent here to deliberate upon the affairs of our own country, and to legislate upon all that concerns the welfare of Canada; and if a young member might be permitted to express an opinion upon such a matter, I would say that I do not consider it wise that we should encumber our deliberations with the consideration of extraneous matters. But, I must remember, too, that we are loyal subjects of Queen Victoria, and all that concerns any part of her domain interests us. Believing, then, Sir, as I do, that granting a form of self-government to Ireland would be a benefit to that country, and that the Coercion Bill should be suppressed, I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution of my hon. friend, the member for Montreal Centre. I have, Sir, every faith in the high sense of justice which usually actuates the Parliament and the people of Great Britain; but I know that there, as indeed in all old countries, prejudices are strong, and that changes, especially changes in the forms of government, are wrought slowly. Yet, I do believe that sooner perhaps than many of us imagine, some form of self-government will be granted to the people of Ireland which will satisfy their natural national aspirations. Appearances indicate that the long night of Ireland's misery and humiliation is drawing to a close, and that the dawn of a brighter day is breaking; and when that day comes, when peace and contentment reign throughout the British Isles, nowhere will the glad tidings be received with greater joy than among the liberty-loving people of Canada. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the motion made by my hon. friend the member for Montreal Centre will receive a generous support from the members on both sides of this House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FLYNN. I feel it my duty to offer a few observations on the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). In 1882, when I had the honor of a seat in this House, similar measures were introduced by the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of Inland Revenue, and I had then the pleasure of voting for those resolutions, as I will have to-day the pleasure of voting for those proposed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre. We were then told from Downing Street that the question was one in which we had no concern, that it was purely an Imperial question in which we had no right to interfere. From that doctrine I then dissented, as I do now. I believed then we had the right to interfere, as I believe now we have that right. I believed then it was the duty of the Parliament of that day to present an humble Address to Her Majesty, asking for a measure of Home Rule to be granted to Ireland similar to that we enjoy in the Dominion, and which we believed, if granted by the Imperial Legislature, would be the means of restoring quiet to that country and peace to the Empire. If we believe that still to be the case, it is clearly our duty to present an humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty, as proposed in the resolutions before the House. But there is another reason why we should do so. On the borders of this country, in the neighboring Republic, there is now a large body of Irishmen, numbering, I believe, nearly fourteen millions. These men left their native country filled with strong feelings against the British Government. They will continue to be governed by these so long as the British Government continues to treat Ireland unfairly by denying her a fair measure of Home Rule, and while these people are on our borders, imbued with these sentiments, they are a standing menace to Canada. Therefore, if from no higher motive than self-interest, we have the right to humbly ask the Imperial Government to grant Home Rule to Ireland.

Mr. KENNY.

Already bodies of these men have revenged themselves on England through Canada, and we do not want to suffer a repetition of their revenge. In Canada we have nearly a million of Irishmen and their descendants, who naturally sympathise with their friends at home struggling for self-government, and if they can, through their representatives in Parliament, give expression to their views, they have the right to do so. We do not arrogate to ourselves any authority over the British Parliament, but only come here as the representatives of five millions of people in humble supplication to the Throne, asking the Imperial Government to give to the people of Ireland what the people of Canada enjoy, what gives us peace and happiness, and what we believe would give to Ireland the same measure of prosperity and happiness, namely, the control of their own domestic affairs. It must be quite clear to every student of history that the means hitherto adopted by the English Government and the Imperial Parliament to govern Ireland have been failures, and why? Simply because Ireland has been governed, not as England and Scotland have been governed, but in a different manner altogether. When any one of her grievances has been redressed, it has not been redressed in a graceful manner, through a spirit of fair play and a sense of justice, but rather from a sense of fear. History confirms this assertion. We know that not even the smallest concession has been made to Ireland, either political or religious, except through a sense of danger and fear, rather than from any desire to do justice to that unhappy country. To my mind there are two questions connected with Ireland, on the speedy settlement of which depend in a great measure the happiness of Ireland and the restoration of social harmony and peace in that country. These are: the settlement of the land question and Home Rule. It is high time that the civilised world should cease to be shocked by the repeated evictions of human beings, thrown out in every stage of sickness and infirmity on the roadside. Ireland has long submitted to the system which produces such results, but will do so no longer. The spirit of the people is roused against it, and they will no longer submit to a system which sends her children either to the workhouse or the pestilential emigrant ship. Is there any wonder that a system such as this should produce violent agitation and social disorder, and drive men to become rebels, bringing in its train those periodical famines which have shocked and at the same time called forth the charity of the world? There is no country of the extent so fertile as Ireland, no country of equal area so capable of producing agricultural produce to as large an extent. Yet, notwithstanding that fact, time and again has the civilised world been shocked by these famines, and its charity been invoked to keep the Irish people from starvation. To what can we attribute these famines occurring periodically in a country so fertile and purely agricultural? I unhesitatingly say, and history bears me out, that it is due to the bad system of laws which governs them. It is due to these laws which, in the language of one of her gifted sons, "compels her children to perish in a climate soft as a mother's smile and on a soil fruitful as God's love." It has been often said by people who know nothing of the history of that unhappy country that the Irish are turbulent naturally, but what better answer can be given to that assertion than to point to the record and career of Irishmen in Canada. We find in Canada Irishmen emulating their neighbors of other extractions in building up the country, and vying with the men of other nationalities in works of benevolence and charity, as well as in enterprises of commerce. To what must we attribute this change in the character of Irishmen in Canada, as compared with that attributed by many people to them in their own country? Is there something in this invigorating northern clime that drives treason out of the Irishman's head? And is it only in the moist climate and green hills of his native land

that with him treason flourishes? No, it is due to the fact that in the land he is forced to leave, he suffers from tyranny and oppression, while in this country he lives under a system of equal laws for all, and enjoys, in common with every Canadian, the fullest measure of human liberty. You will find the Irishmen here as loyal and faithful to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, as any subject in her vast Dominions. I believe, that the land question is one of the greatest evils and troubles, and will be so until that question is settled. We in this Dominion have had our landlords. In Prince Edward Island, that little Province down by the sea, they have had their landlords. In the early history of that country that island was parcelled out to the retainers and followers of the Crown, and the immigrant who came there and settled in that island and tilled the soil, and by the sweat of his brow reclaimed the land from the forest, had to pay rent to a landlord and to suffer all the evils incident to that state of affairs. But he would not submit to it, and the result was that in that island they had their Land League as they had in Ireland. They opposed the administration of the law. In order to carry out the civil law, in order to collect those rents, the military power had to be invoked, and they had to get a company of soldiers from Halifax to enforce that collection. When the Government of Prince Edward Island found that it was necessary to aid the civil law by the military power, they found it necessary to take steps to cure that state of things. They saw that the only remedy was to convert the tenant farmer into a proprietor in fee simple, and they saw that the only remedy that could be applied was to put their hands into the Provincial exchequer and buy out the landlords; and the result has been that from that hour to the present you have had peace, prosperity and contentment in that fertile and productive little island. Let the Imperial Government do the same in reference to Ireland. It is much easier for them to pay the amount required to buy out the landlords of Ireland than it was for the Government of the small Province of Prince Edward Island at that time, twenty odd years ago, to pay the amount required for the purpose there. I see no reason, therefore, why the Imperial Government should not pursue that course and restore order in Ireland. But, instead of grappling with these difficulties, instead of meeting the Irish people in their just demands for Home Rule and for the settlement of this land question, we find that the Imperial Government have introduced a coercive measure, a Crimes Act. They are now endeavoring to pass, and I have no doubt will pass, another coercive measure, which will make eighty-seven since the commencement of the union. This measure is directed against the expression of public opinion, against the freedom of speech, against the right of public meeting, and against the freedom of the press. All these great constitutional privileges were the foundations of English liberty, because the English people enjoyed these privileges long before they obtained the constitutional rights they have to day, and these were the means by which they obtained their great constitutional privileges. Freedom of debate, liberty of the press, and freedom in the expression of opinion were the means by which our forefathers obtained, in England at all events, the great constitutional privileges they now enjoy, but which Ireland has been persistently denied, and now for the eighty-seventh time in eighty-seven years they are again to be deprived of these means. An eminent historian has said, that we recognise in the fierce contention of our ancestors the conflict of great principles and final triumph of freedom. By argument and discussion truth is discovered, public opinion is expressed, and a free people are trained to the science of government. These great powers which were given to the English people, enabling them to agitate for the reforms they thought necessary and to have their grievances redressed, have been systematically denied to the

Irish people; and, now, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, when British subjects all over the world are invited this year to celebrate Her Majesty's Jubilee, when joy and gladness are supposed to prevail all over her vast dominions, there is one spot in which, if this coercive measure that is now before the Imperial Parliament is carried, sadness will prevail in place of joy. On that account, if on no other, this is to be regretted. Whenever measures of this description were introduced into the Imperial Parliament before, the Government of the day, when they introduced them and invited discussion upon them and asked a majority of Parliament to pass them, at least gave some statistical information which warranted them in stating to the British House of Commons that a coercive measure of that description was necessary for the government of Ireland. But in this case they did not do that; in this case it has been shown by incontrovertible statistics that crime in Ireland was never less than it is to-day, that, so far from its being a case requiring a coercive measure, it is the very reverse. Let me here read a comparative statement taken from a speech of Mr. Gladstone's, comparing the year 1832 with the year 1885, extending over a period of fifty-three years. You will find from that comparative statement what a diminution there has been in crime, and what little justification there is in this year of grace 1887 for a coercive measure. In 1832, the homicides were 248; in 1885, they were 65. The cases of attempts to kill were, in 1832, 209; in 1885, they were 37. The serious offences of all other kinds in Ireland, in 1832, were 6,014; in 1885, they were 1,057. The whole of the criminal offences in Ireland were, in 1832, 14,000; in 1885, they were 2,683. Here, during a period of fifty-three years these figures show a very marked diminution of crime. There is, I believe, a slight allowance to be made for the difference in population, for unfortunately the population of that country in 1832 was greater than it is to-day, and that is one of the greatest proofs of the misgovernment of the country—misgovernment which has driven the sons of that land to every part of the world, because they could not submit to the laws which were forced upon them there. Since 1885, since Mr. Gladstone and the great bulk of the Liberal party have taken a stand in favor of Home Rule, we find that the mind of Ireland is very much quieted and that crime has almost disappeared from that country; so there is absolutely no justification for the introduction of this coercive measure. What was given to every Parliament before as a justification for the passage of a coercive measure does not exist in Ireland to-day, but the reverse is the case. During all this time when Ireland has had to suffer so much from the want of a domestic Legislature and from a bad system of landlordism, she has had to pay much more than her share of taxes into the Imperial Treasury in proportion to her population. Here is a statement from the London *Daily News* quoted by the *Montreal Herald*:

"In 1884-85 the contributions of the three countries were:—

	Contributions.	Population.	Amount per Head.
Ireland.....	£7,755,001	4,962,693	£1 11 3
Scotland ..	8,825,941	3,866,521	2 5 7
England & Wales	57,327,686	27,132,449	2 2 3

"According to this Ireland seems to pay less. But the total value of property and income assessed in 1885 was as follows:—

England.	Scotland.	Ireland.
£53,429,560.	£61,125,422.	£23,912,150.

"In this connection the *Daily News* publishes the following comparison:—

	Contribution.	Population.	Incidence.
1851.....	£4,006,711	6,552,785	£0 12 2
1861.....	6,420,378	5,798,664	1 2 1
1871.....	7,086,593	5,412,377	1 6 2
1885.....	7,755,000	4,962,693	1 11 3

"Whilst taxation has increased in Ireland since 1861 from 12s. 2d. *per capita* to £1 11s. 3d., the Imperial taxation of Great Britain has diminished by more than 3s. per head.

"The same authority estimates that in the 32 years since 1853 this poor country has paid £100,000,000 beyond her fair contribution to the Imperial Treasury. While this has been going on—that is to say, while her population has been reduced to one-half of its former numbers, and the total taxation has increased on the reduced population—it was to be expected that pauperism would show a great increase. The figures are certainly startling. The *Daily News* supplies the following tables:—

"The admissions to the Irish workhouses were, during the year ended September, 1884, in comparison with admissions during different periods in the last twenty-five years—

	Total No. admitted in sickness.	No. admitted who were not sick.	Total No. admitted.	Total No. relieved.
1850	44,200	70,334		
1874	49,540	131,490		
1884	53,106	200,237		
1859	118,594	153,706		
1871	181,032	225,510		
1884	253,342	299,953		

"No of persons who received poor relief during the years ended September, 1885 and 1886—

	In Workhouses.	Out-door.	Total.
1885	329,550	120,939	450,439
1886	357,621	348,295	705,826

"In three years the paupers have much more than doubled. They now number 1 in every 7 of the population. In Connaught, with a population in round numbers of 800,000, 247,184 persons received poor relief last year, or 309 in every 1,000. In England and Wales the ratio of paupers per 1,000 in the same year only fractionally exceeded 28."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out that Ireland believes that nothing can remedy the evils existing within her borders but a Local Parliament. She believes that the only remedy for these evils is local self-government—Home Rule. The Imperial Government also know the troubles they have had with Ireland, the cost of maintaining the police force and constabulary there, and the Imperial Government also know that during the last fifty years, since Canada enjoyed Home Rule, the people of this country have been contented. An hon. member of this House, when speaking on the Address, said that so long as the people of Canada had not complete control of our domestic affairs, a feeling of discontent existed. The same spirit and the same feeling existed in the Maritime Provinces, and, Sir, if there was no revolt, if there was no direct appeal to arms there—for we were on the very verge of it, so far as the agitation of public orators could carry us—it was because we were granted responsible government and control of our own affairs. We now control our own affairs, and peace reigns within our borders. Now, why does not England, instead of coercion, try these means with Ireland? Mr. Gladstone pointed out, in introducing his Home Rule Bill, that for nearly a century England had been trying to govern Ireland by coercion, and it was now time to try other measures. Why does she not grant Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule measure if she wishes to secure peace and happiness for Ireland? To Irishmen and their descendants the world over, to all true friends of the freedom of the human race, the rapid change that has taken place in English public opinion in reference to Home Rule, must be very cheering. We know that a majority in Scotland and Wales are in sympathy with the Irish people, we know that the democracy of England are in sympathy with Ireland, we know that the greatest statesman that England ever produced (Mr. Gladstone) is now in sympathy with Home Rule. For eighty-seven eventful years, ever since the Union, Ireland has been struggling for her freedom, and it is folly now, it is madness of the worst kind, for the English Government to refuse a just measure of Home Rule. Even in the darkest hours of her history, she never abated one jot of her demands for local self-government. Now, when she never stood better than to-day, when her sons, scattered all over the world, are aiding and assist-

Mr. FLYNN.

ing her, the present Government of England must try some other means for the pacification of Ireland, for the restoration of social order in that country, besides coercion. Let them do away with the Crimes Act, let them treat the Irish kindly, let them manifest an earnest and honest desire to lift Ireland up to the level of their own contentment and prosperity, let them earnestly and honestly obliterate the bitter memories which centuries of cruel wrongs and oppressions have left in the Irish heart—let them do that and they will no longer require a Crimes' Act or coercive measures. In place of the discontent and discord that exists in that country to-day, they will find contentment and peace reigning. If they attempt to govern Ireland according to the well-understood wishes of the Irish people, to meet the Irish people on fair grounds, instead of discontent, they will find a loyal, contented and happy people.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think it is very much to be regretted that this question has been again brought before this Parliament. It is to be regretted for the reason already stated that it is a matter not coming within our jurisdiction, and I think it a very improper position for this country to occupy that our Parliament, year after year, should express an opinion which, so far as its effects on the Home Government is concerned, is just as idle as the wind. But there is another reason why we should not deal with this question, in the fact that we are called upon, with very slight knowledge of the facts, to give an opinion upon a question which has puzzled the brains of the wisest and ablest statesmen, and I say it is presumptuous in us to express an opinion upon a question of such vast magnitude, and I say it with all due respect to the members of this House, when a large majority of them know very little of its merits. Now, Sir, I would ask the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) what would he think if the Imperial Parliament were to pass a resolution saying that it would not be for the benefit of the Dominion of Canada that the Province of Quebec should pass an Act to incorporate the Society of Jesuits, how would he like such a resolution as that to be passed in the Imperial Parliament? Yet it would be no more preposterous for them to pass such a resolution than it is for us to pass a resolution affecting, not the whole of Ireland, nor the Irish people, as we are told so often to-day, but affecting the administration of justice in some particular localities where the existing state of the law is not found sufficient to repress lawlessness. Now, with regard to another thing; I think any one who listens to this debate, must have been struck with the very broad assumptions upon which the supporters of this resolution base their arguments. We hear over and over again the old hackneyed story of oppression and misgovernment in Ireland, as though every ill to which Ireland has ever been subjected, as though every misfortune the Irish people have ever undergone, was inevitably due to misgovernment and want of knowledge of her interests. One would imagine that Ireland was a Province governed as Poland has been by the Czar of Russia. One would hardly believe that Ireland has a large share of representation in the Imperial Parliament and in the affairs of the Imperial Government—I believe a larger share than any other part of the British Empire. One would think that Irishmen were excluded from the Imperial service; one would think they had not the same opportunity as men of any other part of the Empire to rise to the highest places in the Government of the Empire, and to enjoy every possible right and constitutional privilege which every Englishman enjoys. It is also assumed for the purpose of this argument that the Irish are a homogeneous people, that the whole people are suffering from misgovernment, that there is a unanimous expression of opinion in favor of this measure of Home Rule. Now, those who make these statements ignore—for they must know better—that there are a million and a-half of

people in Ireland who will not submit to such a measure as Mr. Gladstone has sought to introduce. There is no statesman in England, at the present day at any rate, who is not willing to give to any part of the British Empire, Scotland and Wales as well as Ireland, a measure of Home Rule for the purpose of controlling its own domestic affairs; but if the English Parliament and people voted against Mr. Gladstone's measure last year, it was expressly because the terms of that measure were such that, if the Irish people had been willing to accept it as the ultimate object of their desires, then they were utterly unfit to be a free people. Was it to be supposed that a free people would consent to Mr. Gladstone's proposal to give up absolutely the right of self-government so far as the Empire is concerned—for this was contemplated in proposing that the Irish people should abandon the great constitutional privilege of having representatives in proportion to the taxes they were called upon to pay. They were called upon to contribute to the Imperial revenues, and yet they were to have no representation and no voice in the Imperial Councils, and in many other respects Ireland was placed in a position far inferior to what she had occupied since the conquest. In every way the Imperial service would be shut against the Irish people. The argument is clear, that Mr. Parnell never intended to accept the measure as a final settlement of the question, and his supporters among the people would never have been ready to accept it. Fortunately, we are not left in any doubt as to what Mr. Parnell's intentions were or the intentions of his party, because the view was expressed in the clearest language, time and time again, that nothing but separation and absolute independence would be acceptable to them. It was because of that position, that the Home Rule measure was rejected, not only by the House of Commons, but by the people of England and the Empire at large. I have this fault to find with the resolutions moved by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), namely, that in reciting the resolution passed last Session he would lead the House to believe that the last Parliament expressed an opinion in favor of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. His language conveys that impression, which is an erroneous one; and in reciting the resolution, not only should the actual words be quoted, but it should be made clear as to what was the actual intention of Parliament at that time. There are a great many other assumptions on which the argument for Home Rule is based, and the most preposterous assumption of all is one that appears to be the most reasonable proposition until due consideration is given to the subject. We are told that because we have Home Rule in Canada, therefore the people of Ireland should have Home Rule too; that because Home Rule has succeeded in Canada, and succeeded as we hope it may continue to succeed in all the Provinces of the Dominion, as well as regards the Dominion at large, the same measure should be applied to Ireland, and because it has been successful here it would prove successful there. Those who lay down such a proposition entirely ignore the difference of circumstances. There is no analogy whatever between the two cases; the people are different, the circumstances are different, the relations between the two countries are geographically different, and when hon. gentlemen, as did the last speaker, speak about the emancipation of this country from the rule of Downing Street, they must be aware that there is no sort of analogy between our position towards Downing Street and that existing between Ireland and England. Ireland is an integral part of the Empire and shares to the fullest extent its glory and responsibilities, and whatever position is obtainable or can be enjoyed by any subject of the Empire, no matter from what part he may come, is attainable by an Irishman. I say any analogy is absolutely wanting. It is an assumption that is likely to appeal to the people, but if examined the case utterly fails. In the first place, self-government

in this country was, in the beginning at any rate, an absolute necessity, and it must be remembered also that government by the Colonial Office was as different a thing as there could possibly be from the government of Ireland by the British. Ireland has her own representatives in the Imperial Parliament; they are present to submit her grievances and to assist in shaping legislation, and they possess all the powers to which other members are entitled. In every other way the assumption on which this argument is based is entirely fallacious. Hon. gentlemen who are to speak and vote on this question should not pass over these matters too lightly. The assumption is also made that the Irish are a most oppressed people, that the country is tramped under foot by foreign power, that it is governed as Poland may have been governed in the past or is governed at this moment by the Czar of Russia, utterly forgetting the representative institutions that prevail. The way in which it was proposed to effect a remedy was, as I have said, by making Ireland a mere province, and by abandoning all the advantages which it possess as an integral portion of the Empire. Another assumption, and it is equally a fallacious one, and indeed it is more than a fallacious one, it is an assumption which is a most dangerous one to present to this House and the country, is that the British Government have been treating the Irish people without mercy. I say the assumption of those who are agitating in favor of Home Rule is that the Irish are a long-suffering, down-trodden people, and are entitled to the sympathy of subjects in all parts of the Empire. What are the facts? Who is carrying on the agitation? Why, it is the National League, successors to the Land League. And what is the National League? The National League is composed of men who, with all respect to their ability, and the ability of several of them is unquestioned, have set themselves, deliberately and avowedly, to render all government in Ireland impossible. That is their avowed declaration; that is what they say they intend to do. What are the means they adopt? They have adopted the most terrible system of coercion and tyranny ever established? Talk of coercion by law! The law generally, as administered by British courts, is more or less tempered with mercy. The law of the National League knows no mercy and no consideration. It tramples on the innocent laborer, and shoots him down if he disobeys their behests; it treats every one who disobeys without mercy or consideration; and yet those are the men with whom we are asked to express sympathy in the present resolutions. Every one who has read the debates in the Imperial House of Commons will see that the assumption to which I have alluded, that this agitation is one which should create sympathy in this House is entirely without foundation; and hon. gentlemen who wish to give intelligent votes on this question should inform themselves in that regard, and a very slight perusal even of the debates of the last few days in the Imperial Parliament will convince them that there are two sides to this question, as there are two sides to every other question; and the Home Secretary brought a mass of evidence in favor of the proposed measure, improperly called the Coercion Bill, which it is impossible to the Government or people of England to resist. The hon. gentleman who last spoke endeavored to show by statistics that crime in Ireland is less than for years past. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, in the course of the speech in which he introduced the Crimes Bill, expressly declared that he did not rest his case on the number of crimes committed or on the criminal statistics quoted, but upon the fact, which was established by the most incontrovertible evidence, established by quotations from the charges of the judges, that in certain portions of Ireland there is no such thing as law, that it is impossible to successfully prosecute, that it is impossible to obtain a conviction even

when the case is a most glaring one and the evidence most conclusive. A further difficulty was that, in most cases, evidence could not be obtained, so complete was the terrorism established by the National League over men who came forward to give evidence. If a man came forward he did so at the risk of the loss of his property and the destruction of his family as well. The Chief Secretary rested his case not on the criminal statistics but on the fact established beyond controversy; that the law in Ireland, or rather, I should say, the law in certain portions of that country, had become practically a thing of the past. The case of coercion was well and fairly argued by the hon. member from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and this Bill instead of being called a Coercion Bill should properly and strictly be called an Anti-Coercion Bill, because it is intended to relieve those suffering under the tyranny of the Land League from the attacks and cruelty to which they are subjected. The consequence of this state of terror which prevails in the disturbed districts, not over the whole of Ireland fortunately, but over a considerable portion of it, is that when a crime has been committed, when the perpetrators have been arrested and when the witnesses have come forward, a jury will not convict. If anyone will read the speech of the Chief Secretary—I do not like to occupy the time of the House by quoting facts and figures within the reach of hon. members—they will find it stated that it is impossible to carry on government in some portions of Ireland under the existing state of the law. If such is the case, and it is proved beyond all question, then the Government are bound to step in and pass such measures as are necessary to cover the difficulties that have arisen. Now take the Coercion Bill as it is called. Why it is not nearly so severe as the one which was introduced by the Gladstone Government a few years ago; and if any one will read the debates he will find that when the last Act was put in force crime was sensibly diminished, and when that effect has been produced by the measure now before the English Parliament the Government will then be in a position to proceed with remedial legislation. But it is necessary in the meantime that measures should be adopted which will enable the process of the courts to be respected and carried out. There is another point which is clearly brought out by speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, which was that the matter had gone far beyond a mere question of agrarian crime; that a man may commit any outrage altogether apart from matters connected with the land agitation and if he is a member of the League or has influence with it he is as safe from prosecution as though his crime was exactly of an agrarian nature. Now the National League has brought about this state of things. As the Chief Secretary stated: "it strikes at every relation of life, it does not spare the relatives of those who have offended, and its influence extends even beyond the grave." Those who have read anything of what has gone on in Ireland for the last few months will understand the Chief Secretary's allusions, when he used the language I have quoted. Now it is against those men and such as these that the Coercion Bill is intended to act—not against peaceable, law-abiding subjects, but against those who would, in the name of liberty, deprive the subjects of Her Majesty in Ireland of those rights which are enjoyed by British subjects in every part of the world except in Ireland itself. Who are these men and what is this National League? Who are the men who are dictating to the people of England, and are now turning round and attempting to dictate to the people of Canada? The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) alluded to the charges which were made against Mr. Parnell and his followers. Now those charges rest on evidence which is far too conclusive to be met by a simple denial, and appeal so strongly to public opinion that they cannot be disregarded. What is charged against them by the *London Times*? Hon. gentlemen who have not looked

Mr. O'BRIEN.

into the subject are not perhaps aware of the real state of the case; they are not aware of the position which those men occupy, the ends and aims which they have in view, and the means which they use to carry out those ends. I read the charge made by the *London Times*—the charge which is now hanging over the League and its leader—men with whom, and with whose methods, I am very certain the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and other hon. members on the floor of this House are too generous and too right-minded to have any sympathy; and it is a misfortune that, if their cause is a good one, it should be carried on by men who resort to such nefarious schemes and such infamous methods as the National League has adopted within the last few months. Before quoting the *London Times*, however, I would just like to give the opinion which that heaven-born statesman, as they now regard him—Mr. Gladstone—expressed about them a little while ago, and I think it would be difficult to imagine a more terrible charge to be brought against any body of men or political agitators than that which was brought against the leaders of the League by Mr. Gladstone himself. Mr. Gladstone said of them before his alliance with them: that the Land League relied upon boycotting and murder, by which in the long run can boycotting be made thoroughly effective. That charge included the great majority of those who in Parliament and elsewhere are carrying on the agitation which has caused disquiet and trouble throughout the Empire. With regard to the charge which is made in the *London Times*, it is a serious charge; and any charge which is made on the responsibility of that paper is no light matter. There is no business concern, no institution, I suppose in the British Empire, which has better means of obtaining information upon such a subject, or which is less likely to make a false or frivolous charge than the *London Times*. That paper says:

"We charge that the Land League chiefs based their movement on a scheme of assassination, carefully calculated and coolly applied. Be the ultimate goal of these men what it will, they are content to make towards it in company of murderers. Murderers provide their funds, murderers share their inmost counsels, murderers have gone forth from the League offices to set their bloody work afoot, and have presently returned to consult the constitutional leaders on the advancement of the cause."

Now that charge is not brought forward without evidence; it is not put forward without any substantial ground to support it; and if any one will take the trouble to read the series of articles in the *London Times* on which the charge is based he will find that it is made on evidence which no man can afford to disregard. I say nothing about the last letter which the *Times* attributes to Mr. Parnell; that charge may or may not be true; but I speak of the evidence which connects Mr. Parnell directly with Ford, of New York, with the men who were the means of obtaining the principal funds by which the agitation is carried on, and that connection is traced down to the men and women who provided the knives by which those two men Burke and Cavendish were murdered in Phoenix Park. And these are the men with whom by these resolutions we are practically called upon to express sympathy to-day. I put it to the hon. gentlemen, let their sentiments with regard to Home Rule be what they may, let them think what they please about the rights and the wrongs of Ireland, are they prepared to express sympathy with men who are convicted, — yes, I say convicted, because the evidence admits of no possibility of doubt—of using such means for accomplishing their ends, as are mentioned in the charges I have referred to, charges which have been made time and again on several occasions, in public prints as well as in the House of Commons. Now, if any further evidence is wanted of the character of those men and the means to which they are prepared to resort, I need only refer to the fact that the National League has declared its

intention of sending one of its emissaries to this country, and for what? To dog the footsteps of the Governor General, the Queen's representative, because, in the capacity of a landlord in Ireland, he has chosen to do something which his tenants did not approve of. What was the language used by that emissary on the occasion to which I have referred? I have not the extract at hand, but hon. gentlemen have seen it, and they know it is a direct incentive to the Irish population of this country, who are in favor of Home Rule, to rise up and dog the footsteps of His Excellency, to insult him, to hoot and jeer him, to deride him from one end of the country to the other. That is the avowed object of the mission of the League's emissary to Canada. I saw a statement in one of the papers that this Government were asked whether they were going to have this emissary put under police surveillance. I take the liberty of telling him and those who sympathise with him that if he comes to this country, and does what he says he will do, it will not be police surveillance that he will require, but something more in the nature of police protection. I venture to tell him that if he comes to Canada and endeavors to carry out the programme he has announced, there are men enough in every town and village of this country to teach him that he comes to the wrong place for such a purpose, and that it is not here that such traitorous doctrines are to be talked or listened to. If further evidence is wanted of how this National League is working, I need only recall your attention to one of the facts stated by the hon. member for Montreal; and I confess I was astonished that he had the hardihood to stand up and refer to the vote in the Quebec Legislature a few days ago. Has it come to this, in a Province of this Dominion, supposed to be under British law and governed by the British constitution, and where the people have lived long enough to imbibe a sense of British fair play, that an hon. member of that House could not be allowed to express the opinion in the most mild terms that the Coercion Bill was not a proper subject for that House to deal with? Yet he was jeered and insulted and hooted down, not only by the members of the House, but by the people in the galleries, and neither the Speaker nor any member of the Government had the manliness to get up and defend him; and the only man who had the courage to do so was a French gentleman named Casgrain. If that is a specimen of the way in which Home Rule is to be carried out, God help the unfortunate Protestant minority who would be placed at the mercy of the National League. Now, Sir, I will venture to refer to another circumstance which is fresh in the recollection of any hon. member of this House who has paid any attention to what has been going on in connection with this question. I was surprised to find that a prelate like Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, could write such a letter as he did to a public meeting, in which he used the most insulting language towards Her Majesty's representative—in which, to use a vulgar expression, he told the boys "Don't nail his ears to the pump." That was practically the substance of Archbishop Lynch's letter—inciting the people to do all they could to insult the Governor General. All these things are very good evidence of the character of the men who sympathise with the objects of the National League, and the means by which they propose to carry out the scheme they have in hand; and I think it would ill-become the members of this House, whatever their sentiments on the subject of Home Rule may be, to sanction the proceedings of men who are guilty of acts which have not only been charged, but proved, against the leaders of the National League. Now, what about this Coercion Bill? It is a very terrible thing that a magistrate should have the power of instituting an investigation even where there is no charge laid. I believe the reason why this Crimes Amendment Bill is so objected to and resisted by the National

League is just because they know it will have the effect which it is intended to have, that is, to put an end to their nefarious agitation, and enable the people of Ireland to pursue their various industries without interruption; and then the Government will be in a position to go on with the remedial measures which are already being prepared in the Parliament of the Empire. The last speaker alluded to another subject which I must say I was surprised to hear mentioned by any hon. member of this House, and I was still more surprised when in his speech at the opening of this House the hon. leader of the Opposition used language precisely to the same effect. Both of these hon. gentlemen referred to an Irish element on the other side of the border which is hostile to the British power; and the legislation of this country, whether it has reference to the fisheries or is a resolution in favor of Home Rule, is to be influenced by threats made on the other side of the border. Well, I think the people of this country will come to a very different conclusion from that intended to be drawn by the references made. I think that we will not shape our legislation either with regard to the fisheries or anything else, according to the threats of the Fenian element on the other side of the border; and if anything could induce us to take a bold and independent course and throw out such a resolution as this, it would be just such a threat as that. Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke last must be strangely ignorant of the condition of the country to which he referred. He talks about the necessity of the Imperial Government allowing the Irish tenants to have the same opportunity to purchase their lands and become owners of the soil as tenants have in the Island of Prince Edward. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that such a law now exists on the Statute book, and that there is now before the House of Lords a measure intended to carry that law still further. Is he not aware that it is the expressed intention of the present Administration to pass an Act by which the state will assist the tenant with money at a low rate of interest to purchase his holding, so that in a few years he may become its owner? Therefore, it is idle for him to say that some measure ought to be introduced which is already bearing very satisfactory results, and which would bear still more satisfactory results if it were not that the National League would like to prevent it as far as they could from being carried into effect. The hon. gentleman who spoke last said that this was Her Majesty's year of Jubilee, and that there was only one spot in the Empire where that Jubilee could not be celebrated if the Coercion Bill was passed, and that was Ireland. I venture to say that there will be far more people ready and willing to celebrate Her Majesty's Jubilee if this so-called Coercion Bill is passed than there will be if the tyranny of the National League is permitted to exist during the next few months; and if anything is likely to make those people loyal it will be the passage of that Bill. I do not look for much loyalty from men who openly proclaim their intention to sever the connection of Ireland with the British Empire and make it an absolutely independent State. The hon. gentleman, when he speaks about the condition of the tenants, ought to be aware that there is no tenantry in any part of the British Empire or anywhere else who have the same peculiar rights and privileges as the tenantry of Ireland—neither the tenantry of Scotland nor of Wales, nor of any other part of the British Empire, not even of the Province of Ontario. They have obtained the three F's. The Irish tenant can sell his improvements or compel the landlord to pay him for his improvements. Everything that a landlord can give a tenant to place him in a free and unfettered position the Irish tenant is now in the enjoyment of; and the Bill at present before the House of Lords, which is going on *pari passu* with this Coercion Bill, is likely to place the tenant in a far better position than he would have been in under

Mr. Gladstone's Bill. The Tory House of Lords intends to include in the class of tenants those whom Mr. Gladstone's Bill did not include, the leaseholders, who form, I believe, one-third of the tenants of Ireland, and place them in the same position as ordinary tenants. When the Imperial Government has done so much, and is doing still more to-day—when it is trying to relieve the peaceable people of Ireland from the intolerable oppression and tyranny of the Land League, is it the proper time for us to indulge in the sentiments expressed by some hon. gentlemen? That may be all very well in public meetings, but it is hardly consistent with the dignity of an assembly like this to follow the example set at public meetings. I do not like to impute any motives to the hon. members who have spoken in support of this resolution, but I may say that were it not for their desire to conciliate a certain class of voters in their constituencies, we should hear now and for ever, in this House, the last of Home Rule for Ireland.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has treated us to a very violent attack upon the unfairness and virulence and bitterness of those who object to the Crimes Bill, which he will not allow us to call the Coercion Bill, and he has given us also a glowing illustration of the impartiality and fair mindedness and absolute absence of bias with which hon. gentlemen who favor the Coercion Bill can regard the question of Home Rule and the character of Irishmen as individuals or citizens. After hearing the hon. gentleman's denunciation of the National League as a band of traitors, in league with murderers and conspirators, after hearing him tell us that the evidence given of the complicity of Mr. Parnell, and the other Home Rule leaders, with the authors of the Phoenix Park outrage is so convincing and irrefragable, that it leaves no further room for doubt—after hearing a statement of that kind from the hon. gentleman, who is a specimen of the fine old Irish gentleman, what Irishman would hesitate to leave his fate in the hands of two stipendiary magistrates chosen from that class to replace the jury in Ireland? I do not intend to cast the slightest imputation on the hon. gentleman's desire to be fair and impartial, or on the clearness of his intellect, but I ask the House to take notice how far from anything like impartiality or fitness to conduct judicial investigation, without the check of a jury, men of that kind are, and to what extremes they may be led by the bitterness of partisan spirit. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the tone he did, for in so doing he has given us a particular proof, if any were needed, of the strength of our argument against allowing any two individuals, especially two Irishmen, from whatever particular class you may take them, to be made sole judge of the guilt of a party opponent. The hon. gentleman has given us that proof unintentionally, and therefore it is all the more convincing. But let us come back to the question itself and the arguments that have been advanced. I hope it will be possible for us, even after what we have heard in this bitter strain against the Irish National leaders, and against Irishmen as individuals, to consider this question in something like a judicial spirit, and try to come to some conclusion on the two points now before the House. Those two points are: in the first place, have we any business to interfere and express any opinion about matters such as this? In the second place, is this the proper time to interfere by expressing an opinion, and should we express the opinion the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) wishes us to express? This House has shown already on two occasions—more strongly on the first but to some extent also, on the second—its conviction that we have the right to interfere, and to tender our views to the Government of the Empire, in regard to its treatment of Ireland. I need not go into all the arguments, as they have been very ably dealt with already. I would

Mr. O'BRIEN.

simply say, in the first place, that if we were snubbed by Mr. Gladstone in 1882, as we are told we were, when we presumed to address Her Majesty, we would be less than Canadians, less than free men, if we would sit down smilingly accepting that snub, and allow it to be taken as the conclusion of the whole affair. In the second place I claim that, whether snubbed or not, we have the right, as Canadians, as representatives in the Canadian Parliament, to express any opinion we think fit as to the conduct of the Government of Great Britain, and to address that opinion either to Her Majesty in Council, or to the leader of the Government in England, or to anybody else. We have even the right to send it to our own agent in London, as was done last year, and I think that was the weakest and most inefficient way of making known our opinion on the subject to the people in England that we could have adopted. I believe we would be unfaithful to our duty as Canadian citizens if we allowed the statement, that it would be preposterous for us to interfere in matters of this kind, to pass unchallenged and unanswered in the most effectual way in which it can be answered, namely, by doing the very thing we are told not to do. We would be allowing the right we have to approach the Throne with whatever we considered a grievance to fall into abeyance and disuse, if we did not exercise it. Especially in the present case have we the right to interfere. As you have been told already, this is not a question which merely affects Ireland. It affects Canada as well. We have two reasons for our right to interfere in regard to the treatment of Ireland. Those two reasons are, the loss of immigration to Canada, caused by the discontented state of Ireland, and risk of invasion in Canada, caused by the irritation of Irishmen in the United States, who are in sympathy with their friends in the old land. Allusion has been made already to the Fenian raid of 1866. Why was that raid made? Because Ireland was discontented. Why was Ireland discontented? Because then, as now, Ireland was misgoverned. It is perfectly absurd to beg the question by assuming, as some hon. gentlemen have assumed, that Irishmen have been disloyal and discontented simply out of pure natural wickedness—there is a slang word which expresses clearly what I mean, but it would not do to use it on the floor of the House. It is absurd to assume that Irishmen are discontented on account of some natural defect in themselves. No nation has ever been discontented for the number of years Ireland has been without some cause. The failure of eighty-six years of coercion to remove that discontent is sufficiently strong proof that grievances do exist in that country, and the existence of those grievances was the cause of the invasion of Canada in 1866. Who knows but that the same cause may produce another invasion? We all remember what that invasion cost us in blood and treasure. Suppose such a thing were to happen again, we would have to spend the blood of our best citizens and our treasure to repel the invasion, and would my hon. friend, who would be the first to put himself in peril, then come here and say we have no right to utter a word as to the treatment of Ireland by England? These are two reasons for our having a special right, as I contend, to interfere and give advice as to the treatment of Ireland by England. Of course there is the other reason that we have tried Home Rule and that we have a right to give our experience of it, and that is entitled to great weight, although, as my friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has pointed out, there are some differences between the two cases, and it does not necessarily follow that because Home Rule is good for Canada it is therefore good for Ireland in this particular form. The principle, however, remains the same. Having therefore, as I contend, the right to interfere and the right to give our opinion on the matter, and to urge upon the people and the Government of England that they should do simple justice to the people of

Ireland, the question is whether the present case is one for that interference, and whether the present resolution is a fit and proper one for us to adopt. As to part of the resolution, I hardly feel like entering into an argument on the question of Home Rule. I think this House has sufficiently committed itself on that question, or rather two successive Parliaments of Canada have unanimously committed themselves to the support of Home Rule in the last Session and in the Session of 1882, so that there can hardly be any doubt that the present Parliament will commit itself almost as unanimously to the same principle. Two Parliaments have affirmed the principle, and this, the third Parliament, elected after those two endorsements of the principle, is not likely to go back on that declaration of opinion. As to the second part of the resolution, the most important part of it I believe at present, for it is something new, the protest against the Coercion Bill, I think we have a special right to speak upon it. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that an Irishman had all the rights and all the constitutional privileges of an Englishman. To a certain extent, that is true now, but how true will it be when this so-called Bill to amend the criminal law of Ireland becomes law? Is it consistent with the rights and privileges of a Briton that he should be tried for a serious offence before two stipendiary magistrates without a jury in certain classes of crimes, and that in regard to certain other crimes he may be taken out of the country in which the crimes are alleged to have been committed, and taken into a hostile country and tried before a hostile jury? I do not think that can be held to be consistent with the rights and privileges of Britons. If it were proposed that an Englishman accused of certain crimes should be taken over to Ireland or up into Scotland to be tried, especially in the case of crimes where he was likely to find a prejudice existing against himself and against his people in the country where he was to be tried, is there an Englishman or an Irishman in this House who would say that that was consistent with the rights and privileges of a Briton? No, there is not. The same thing is true in regard to an Irishman. Of course it is true that the Bill provides that he may have Irish lawyers to plead his case before the English jury. I do not know that it would be any great benefit to a man who was accused before an English jury to have an Irish lawyer to plead his case. I know, of course, that the Irish lawyers are more witty, and more eloquent, and more learned in the law than any others, because that is the nature of the nation, but, as an advocate before an English jury, I would rather have an old-fashioned, thick-headed John Bull of a lawyer to plead my cause than the best that could be brought from across the channel. See the prejudices that exist. Take a jury of average clod-hoppers in any part of England, and put the cleverest lawyer in Ireland before them to defend some man for agrarian or socialistic crime, and what chance would he have with that jury of Englishmen? Certainly no favor is shown to an Irishman by enabling him to import an Irish lawyer to plead his case. By this Bill he is to be subjected, at the will of the Attorney General for Ireland, to be taken away from his own country and into a foreign country—into what is practically a foreign country to him, a country, perhaps, that he never visited before and in which he finds prejudices existing against him—and to be tried before any jury the Attorney General might choose, because the Attorney General has the right to fix the place in England in which the trial is to be held, and he may just as easily fix it in a place where it is impossible for an Irishman to get fair play as not. He may do that unintentionally, and, after hearing some of the attacks which have been made against Irishmen—I do not mean in this House merely, but here and elsewhere—I think it is not impossible that the Attorney General might do it intentionally and

send a man to be tried where he would know that he would have no chance but for conviction. Mr. Balfour, the Secretary for Ireland, in explaining this Bill to the House of Commons, gave as a reason for requiring the enactment of this extraordinary machinery, that the existing machinery of the law had failed entirely, that you could not get witnesses to give evidence in Ireland, or juries to convict when witnesses did give evidence, and that consequently it was impossible to convict a man of any offence, no matter how clearly it might be proven or how well he might be known to be guilty. This new machinery is intended to correct this failure of justice. How is it going to do it? Mr. Balfour proposes to do away with juries, because he says they will not convict, but there is the other difficulty. He says you cannot get witnesses to give evidence. That is one of his reasons for taking the cases over to England, because he says if you take the witnesses across the channel, they might be less afraid to give evidence. That, however, does not apply to cases of trial before stipendiary magistrates, and there is no provision to make the witnesses give evidence. There is nothing to prevent a man perjuring himself under this Bill more than there is under the existing law. How then, will a stipendiary magistrate be able to do justice better than a judge acting with a jury? I do not see how he will be better able to obtain a conviction unless it is part of the plan that he is to convict without evidence. Barring that—and I do not suppose even Mr. Balfour meant to go so far as that—I do not see how the abolition of the jury is to place the magistrate in a better position to secure the conviction of a man accused of agrarian crime than now. Then, as to the change of venue to England. I have touched upon that, partly in showing what a prejudiced jury an Irishman is likely to meet in England, but I may ask if anything is gained by it? Would witnesses brought across the sea be more likely to testify than they would in Ireland? I do not think so. Mr. Balfour says there is terrorism exercised to prevent their testifying. Well, unless it is intended to locate them permanently in England and keep them under police protection for the rest of their lives, I do not see how they will escape the terrorism by being taken across the channel. If they are afraid now to give evidence affecting their neighbors, because their neighbors may shoot them from behind a hedge, they will be afraid to do so when taken across the channel for fear of being shot when they return to Ireland. Now, I do not believe that this system of terrorism is anything like so wide-spread as Mr. Balfour pretends it is. It may exist to a certain extent, but I wish to point out that Mr. Balfour's supposed remedies for terrorism will not meet the case; that the provisions of this Act do not put him in any better position to obtain convictions against persons accused of crime, than those which exist now, unless, indeed, the new courts were to convict upon insufficient evidence. Now, I think the fact that this is a new and irritating change in the law, which does not seem likely to attain its object, would be sufficient to condemn it, and is sufficient to justify us in protesting against it. But there is something more; there is a provision in the latter part of the law that the Lord Lieutenant in Council may issue a proclamation against associations for political purposes which he may consider dangerous to the commonwealth. Well, Sir, after the discussion here to-night, it is quite clear that this is a clause of the Bill not intended to enforce existing laws at all, but intended to create new crimes, intended to put in the power of the Lord Lieutenant to declare certain associations to be criminal, to prohibit their meetings and to outlaw them, practically, whenever he chooses to say that the association is dangerous to the peace of the country. It is quite clear that if my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) happened to be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland he would consider the National League dangerous to the peace

and welfare of the country, and that upon the evidence already before the public, that is to say, upon the unsupported assertions of certain newspapers, and the unproven assertions of certain men opposed to its leaders in politics, upon such evidence as that he would consider it proven that the National League was a dangerous association, and he would outlaw them and practically deprive them of the rights of citizens. That is precisely what is likely to happen in the case of some other statesmen of England who are no more free from prejudice than the hon. member for Muskoka would be, if he were chosen to fill the high position I have mentioned. I say it is unwise, unconstitutional, and un-British to put such unlimited power in the hands of one man, and that man almost sure to be a prejudiced party politician. For that reason alone, apart from the two others that I have named, I think it will be proper for us, more than that, it would be our duty, to protest against the passing of this Coercion Bill, because it seems to me, and I believe it will seem to the majority in this Chamber, to be more conformable to the institutions of Russia than to those under which Britons are supposed to live. In regard to crimes charged against Irishmen, I think it has been clearly shown to-night that the total amount of crime in Ireland is not so very remarkable after all, and as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has pointed out, the only direction which Irish crime appears to take is in agrarian outrages. Well, then, what is the proper cure for this sort of crime? Is it to bring in an un-British, unconstitutional, untried, unheard of means of enforcing the laws which have been found unworkable for so many years past? Is it to create new crimes, to entrust the creation of those crimes to prejudiced party politicians? I think not. I think the only remedy for agrarian crimes is to remove the grievance. Of course we may be told that it is the duty of a good citizen to abstain from agrarian crimes, no matter what the provocation may be. No doubt it is. But, Sir, you and I, and every member in this House, and every citizen of Canada, have reason to thank a higher power than the Queen or Government of Great Britain, that we are not exposed to the same temptations to violate the law by agrarian crimes that the people of Ireland are exposed to. My hon. friend who spoke recently told us that the tenants of Ireland possessed peculiar rights and privileges, and I think they do—extremely peculiar rights and privileges. One of them is the privilege of being turned out on the roadside in mid-winter, perhaps with a sick wife and children. That is one of the peculiar privileges of the Irish peasants. But, Sir, I do not want to excite my feelings nor those of hon. members by going into the horrors of this question. I merely wish to point out, that if the Irish peasant is guilty of agrarian crime, he does no more than, perhaps, you or I, or the member for Muskoka, or, perhaps the leader of the Government himself, or my own leader, might do, if they were placed in similar circumstances. Human nature is human nature, and we who believe ourselves to be a moral and respectable people have reason to be thankful that we are not subjected to the temptations which beset the Irish peasantry, otherwise we do not know what we might do ourselves. We are not sitting here in judgment upon the Irish peasants; we are here to-night to express our opinion as to the best means by which this agrarian crime may be avoided. I believe it to be our duty as loyalists, our duty as men who wish to see the unity of the Empire maintained, to point out and to urge that the only means of preserving the unity of the Empire, the only means of removing that weakness that will always exist as long as Ireland is discontented, is not to try to enforce unfair laws, but to remove the grievances from which the people suffer. They talk of making changes in the land laws, and they say, before we make these changes, before we amend the laws so as to make them tolerable to you, we must force you by all sorts of unconstitu-

Mr. CASEY.

tional, unheard of means, to obey the bad laws which now exist, and after we have forced you to do that, then we will amend the laws and make them a little easier for you. That is the meaning of the cry about enforcing the law before amending it. Now, there is one thing in which my hon. friend from Muskoka and my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) appeared to be agreed, because their utterances were remarkably alike, and both those hon. gentlemen are well known and declared loyalists. The hon. member for North Bruce told us that Home Rule would mean civil war, that the people of the north of Ireland would not submit to Home Rule, would not submit to be governed by the majority from the south.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend will pardon me. I did not say any measure of Home Rule, Home Rule unsurrounded by ample safeguards; I spoke of a crude measure of Home Rule, hurried upon the people.

Mr. CASEY. I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. If he chooses to consider that a crude measure, very well.

Mr. McNEILL. I do indeed.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman's remarks apply to Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and they were to the effect that if that Bill were carried the people of the north of Ireland would not have submitted but would have taken up arms, a sentiment expressed not only by the hon. gentleman but by some members of the British House of Commons and by loyalists and others of the same stripe. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) put it in very similar terms. He stated it more briefly but very much to the same effect—that the Protestant minority in Ireland would not stand Home Rule, that they had shown themselves able to defend themselves in the past and would do so again. These remarks amount to distinct threats. These two hon. gentlemen speaking in the name of the Protestant population of Ireland, for they are both Protestants from Ireland, and I suppose are acquainted with the feeling of that portion of the population with whom they were acquainted there, make these threats, and I do not doubt that they express the feeling of that particular class of the Irish population—the higher class of the Protestant, Tory landlord population of Ireland. Those members evidently speak for that class, because we find the very same words expressed by representatives of that class in the British House of Commons and on different platforms in Ireland and England. What does it mean? It means a threat—that if Great Britain exercises its undoubted right to pass such legislation, the minority in Ireland will resort to bloodshed rather than be governed by the majority. If that is thought to be a proper argument to use in order to influence the votes of members, well and good; but I am sure most of us will be influenced the other way; and we will be only strengthened in our opposition to this measure, which we will still insist on calling the Coercion Bill.

Mr. McNEILL. Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to say that I was speaking of an attempt to coerce Great Britain by the hon. gentleman, and those who agree with him, into passing a measure of Home Rule which the British people do not approve.

Mr. CASEY. I do not quite understand how we are going to force Great Britain to pass a measure which the people do not approve.

Mr. McNEILL. We know that the British people have pronounced against the attempt to pass a measure of Home Rule.

Mr. CASEY. There is no danger whatever of our coercing Great Britain into passing such a measure. No one wishes to coerce the Imperial Parliament, and no one thinks of such a thing; but we deem it proper to give our advice

from our experience in the working of Home Rule in this country. Before this little conversation commenced, I was referring to the tone of certain people in regard to Ireland, and I am sure it will be remarked that all the violence of language in this debate has come from those who profess to be the friends of law and order in Ireland, and I will not say that all the violence of language used in the British Parliament, but most of it has come from those who profess to take the side of law and order, and that most of the violent language used throughout the discussion everywhere has come from those who profess to be the loyalists. This is true here to-night. The assumption of loyalty and the threats as to what would happen have all come from one side, and that is from the loyal side. It is a peculiar state of things, and I am sure the lesson will not be wasted upon the House. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) also stated that the British people had practically given a mandate to the present Parliament of England to pass the present Bill, or to pass some measure to further secure life and property in Ireland. Of course, it is always the duty of a Government to secure life and property, but to say that the people of England gave a mandate to the present Parliament to pass a Coercion Act is to state what the facts do not bear out. The people of England elected a majority in support of Lord Salisbury's Government, but nearly every one, if not every one, of the so-called Liberal-Unionists, by whose votes alone Lord Salisbury's Government maintains power, declared himself at the polls as distinctly opposed to any Coercion Bill for Ireland. If the people had known that the Liberal-Unionists were going to vote for coercion, they would not have sent those members to Parliament, Lord Salisbury would not have had a majority, and he would never have had an opportunity to introduce that Bill. The people of England clearly did not give a mandate in favor of coercion; they returned a majority of members pledged against it. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) told us we could not speak intelligently on this question and form a correct opinion on the merits of the case as we had not the Bill before us, or the information and papers on which the Bill was founded. We have not a copy of the Bill, but we are pretty well informed as to what is the Bill from reading English, American and the Canadian papers, for no newspaper of any importance has failed to publish a summary of its provisions. But that hon. gentleman went on to show that we had sufficient information on this point by quoting from Mr. Balfour's speech the very facts and the information on which the Bill was based. The hon. gentleman showed that we had the facts before us by quoting them, and he is thus condemned out of his own mouth. Mr. Balfour's speech, which was very fully reported, contains sufficient information as to what the Bill is and what it is intended to effect. One thing we know, and that is, that it was intended to secure the paternal care of newspapers. The hon. gentleman said he "was not going to interfere with the liberty of the press, but hoped that the power of summary conviction given to magistrates would prevent newspapers from sharing in these crimes." What would appear to magistrates entertaining the feelings and prejudices of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), or the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), to be sentiments instigating the commission of offences? I am afraid many innocent utterances in our newspapers during a Parliamentary campaign would appear to those gentlemen to be treasonable utterances if published in Irish newspapers, and such power in their hands would be practically that which it is intended to be by the Government introducing the Bill, the means of introducing a Russian censorship of the press and cutting off freedom of discussion in the press, in the same way as the Lord Lieutenant can shut off free discussion at public meetings throughout Ireland. I think the convictions with which many of us, including the hon.

member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and myself, entered upon this debate have not been shaken, and that nothing has passed in the course of the debate to shake those convictions, but that, on the contrary, every argument used by those opposing the resolutions tended to strengthen our desire that such a protest should be adopted by the House and should tend to induce other hon. members to concur in that view. I might criticise the wording of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). It would have pleased me a great deal better if it had been in the form of a direct Address to Her Majesty instead of a mere resolution of the House. But leaving that aside, if it remains in its present shape, I shall vote for it in preference to the resolution of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I hope the House will show again by a large and practically unanimous vote, as they have shown before, the sympathy they feel with the people of Ireland and their determination to protest against any unconstitutional methods of coercion.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know what may be the fate of the resolutions proposed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), but I am satisfied that a large portion of them do not express the opinions of the majority of the people of this country. I am myself in favor of a measure of Home Rule. I have taken occasion in previous Parliaments to express my conviction that a just and equitable measure of Home Rule would be a great benefit to Ireland, and perhaps to England and Scotland as well. We, who enjoy the great benefits of local governments and county councils, we, who have local control of our school system, no doubt feel that if those same powers were granted to the people of Ireland, the complete control of their local affairs, so that they might regulate their local matters in any way they might choose, it would conduce to the harmony and peace of that portion of the British Empire. But while, during the last Session of Parliament, we expressed our conviction that a measure of Home Rule should be granted to the people of Ireland, we at the same time dissented from the position that the Home Rule Bill of Mr. Gladstone was a proper one for that country. I think that, perhaps, we have been going a little out of our way in past years, in attempting to dictate to the Government and the people of England as to how they shall manage their affairs. At least Mr. Gladstone thought so in 1882, when he snubbed the sympathisers with Ireland in Canada, and politely told them to mind their own business—that the Government of England were capable of attending to its affairs. For that reason I think we should be a little careful in addressing the Government of the British Islands. But the resolutions of the hon. gentleman go a good deal further than any previous resolutions brought before the House of Commons. It proposed that we shall protest against the adoption of the Coercion Bill which is now before the British House of Commons. Well, it has been stated before in this House by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that this was not a Coercion Bill. Our idea of a Coercion Bill, I think, is that it is a Bill intended more for the punishment of political offences than anything else. This Bill, so far as I can learn its provisions, is one for the repression of crime—for punishing those who commit the ordinary crimes which are committed in the country, but whom the law has hitherto failed to reach. I approve of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Bruce—that we have not sufficient information before this House to guide it to a decision, and that we have not the evidence upon which the decision of the Government was founded when they brought that Bill before the House of Commons of Great Britain, and that, therefore, we should take no action in the matter. I have much pleasure in supporting that amend-

ment. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) told us he thought we were quite justified in interfering in this matter, in making our representations to the Government of Great Britain, because that Government had on many occasions interfered in the affairs of other countries; because on many continental questions, which had disturbed the different Governments of Europe, representations had been sent by the Government of England to those Governments. This is one of those questions upon which the people of Canada to-day are divided. In my opinion the majority of the people—most of those with whom I have met—consider that we have nearly as much as we can do to attend to our own business successfully, and that we will be best fulfilling our duty by attending to that business. Besides, I believe that the elections recently held in Great Britain have demonstrated that the people of the British Islands are largely in favor of the present Government in England. We see by the divisions in the House of Commons that they have a majority of from one hundred to one hundred and twenty. They are fresh from the people; they represent the feeling of the people of England, more particularly on this one question of Home Rule, because that was almost the sole issue before the people at the last general election. Now, a great deal has been said about this Coercion Bill—a Bill which is for the repression of crime and which, so far as I am informed, does not create any new crimes, but proposes to punish crimes that have been committed, and which the laws, as hitherto carried into effect, have failed to reach. We were told last fall and during a portion of this winter that it was impossible for the people of Great Britain to govern Ireland. Those who said this pointed to the crimes and disorder in various parts of Ireland, and said that that condition of things showed the impossibility of the British Government ruling Ireland and that therefore Ireland should be granted a Government of her own, with complete control not only over her local affairs but over the entire affairs of the country. To-day we are told a different story. To-day it is said there is no need for a Crimes Bill because Ireland is not in a state of disorder; that the people are obeying the laws tolerably well, that you do not see there as much crime as you did some years ago; that the condition of affairs there compares favorably with that of the other portions of the British Empire. There is certainly a little contradiction and inconsistency in these statements. I think the Government who have control over the matter, who have the responsibility for carrying out the law, and seeing that peace and order are maintained in every portion of the British Islands, who have information which we have not got, are better able to judge than we are, and that we should not hastily force our opinions on them, when we have not the Bill before us, when we have not the evidence on which that Government founded their Bill and know not the reasons for which they are pressing it before the country. I read the speech of a distinguished statesman not long ago, Lord Randolph Churchill. I think there is no man in England to-day whose opinion, perhaps, would be more impartial than his. He is not a member of the Government nor is he a member of the Opposition; he occupies, perhaps, to-day the most independent position in the House. In making a speech to his constituents he expressed the following opinion of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill:—

"It is quite absurd to call that a Coercion Bill. It is a Bill to enable the Government to carry on the elementary—what I call the alphabetical duties of government. Well, I support that Bill. I consider that the Bill is admirably conceived and admirably constructed. I support every provision of it. I go for the whole Bill. But I go further than that and I say that that whole Bill, in its entirety, must be passed if you wish to preserve the union between Great Britain and Ireland."

He says further:

"Within a month or two months from the passing of that Bill, Ireland will be, as far as law and order and the protection of life and property

Mr. WALLACE.

are concerned, as quiet as this Philharmonic Hall. Then will be the moment to push forward rapidly and boldly your remedial legislation. Then will be the moment to show the Irish people practically that you can do more for them than any National League."

Now, I think the words of an eminent British statesman, a man who is destined to occupy perhaps the most important position in England at no distant day, a man who at the present time stands in an independent and impartial position, should have very great weight with us in the consideration of this question. More than that, what is proposed that we should do? It is proposed that we should strengthen the hands of Mr. Parnell. There is a cloud hanging over Mr. Parnell and the National League, and I think that cloud should be dispersed before we fully endorse, as the resolutions proposed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre do, the actions and the policy of that League. A letter appeared in the *London Times* a few days ago, dated 15th May, 1882, without any address, and signed "Yours, truly, Charles S. Parnell."

Mr. MILLS. As valuable as your forged telegrams.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Bothwell had better be called on to withdraw that expression.

Mr. MILLS. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to forged telegrams which the hon. gentleman read in this House at the last Session—telegrams which purported to come from my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and which the hon. gentleman must have known he had never sent.

Mr. WALLACE. No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what he said. He said, "Your forged telegrams," accusing me of forging telegrams, and I have to say to that hon. gentleman that his assertion is baseless, unfounded and untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. If such an accusation was made against the hon. gentleman, I do not think it is parliamentary. Of course no member of this House can be accused of having forged telegrams, and if the expression has been used it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Bothwell, in referring to the telegrams which were uttered in this House last Session by the hon. member opposite, I think properly referred to them as forged telegrams. They were not real telegrams; they were issued in the public press, and the hon. gentleman was the utterer of those telegrams in this House; they were uttered here for a purpose, and he persistently refused to withdraw them or acknowledge that they were spurious. The representations made in this House regarding them were used in the country, and I hold that the hon. member for Bothwell is justified in referring to them in the language in which he has done by the facts of the case and the attitude assumed by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is not whether the hon. gentleman has been justified in using the words. I am not going to hear any discussion as to that. If the words "your forged telegrams" have been used they are unparliamentary and must be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman was reading here a letter which he said had appeared in the *London Times*, and which he said was signed by Mr. Parnell, and I referred to the telegrams the hon. gentleman had read as purporting to come from the leader of the Opposition in this House. I used the words "your forged telegrams," not in the sense of their being forged by him, but as being uttered by him on the floor of this House. If the hon. gentleman says he did not utter those telegrams—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. MILLS. I am bowing to the Chair. I say I did not pretend to accuse the hon. gentleman of having written those telegrams. I referred to the fact that he had uttered them on the floor of the House. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker,

and I do not suppose you ask me to deny a fact that is known to everybody in the House. But certainly I withdraw the expression in the sense of his having written them. I do not know who wrote them. I know that the hon. gentleman uttered them on the floor of this House and that they were forged.

Mr. WALLACE. I am forcibly reminded of a little anecdote told by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) last evening. A gentleman met two boys on the street, one of whom was crying and whining. He asked what was the matter? The other boy replied: "He can't take a licking like a gentleman." The subject of these telegrams was brought up in the House during the last Session on several occasions. I stated then, and I repeat the statement to-night, that I took those telegrams from the public press of the city of Ottawa, that I read them in this House in the presence of the two gentlemen who were more immediately interested, and they made no objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. At least three or four weeks afterwards one of them took occasion to do so, but not at the time they were first read. I have nothing further to say about them.

An hon. MEMBER. The less you say about them the better.

Mr. WALLACE. I will just say this further about them, that they were used against me in my election, and that my majority in 1882 was 237, and my majority in the last election, in spite of those telegrams, was 528. The people of West York know all about them. Now, when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Bothwell, I was referring to a letter which appeared in the *London Times* a day or two ago. The letter, according to the statement of the *Times*, was signed, "Yours very truly, Charles S. Parnell," in Mr. Parnell's writing on the top of the leaf opposite that on which the letter was written. The letter was as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—I am not surprised at your friend's anger, but he and you should know that to denounce the murders was the only course open to us. To do that promptly was plainly our best policy. But you can tell him and all others concerned that though I regret the accident of Lord F. Cavendish's death I cannot refuse to admit that Burke got no more than his deserts. You are at liberty to shew him this and others whom you can trust also, but let not my address be known. He can write to the House of Commons."

I do not say whether this is true or not, because I do not know; but the responsibility of saying that it is true has been assumed by the *London Times*, the greatest newspaper, perhaps, in the world, and the greatest exponent of public opinion in England. That wealthy and powerful organ has taken the full and entire responsibility of making the assertion, and while this cloud is hanging over the heads of the Land League party we should hesitate before passing a resolution strengthening Mr. Parnell's hands and endorsing his policy. I have nothing further to say except that it will give me much pleasure to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill).

Mr. BURNS. So far as we have heard during this discussion, there seems to be very little, if any, difference of opinion on the question of Home Rule itself. Even my very bellicose friend, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), has not attempted to advance one argument in opposition to the principle of Home Rule. His whole discourse seemed to be directed to the paragraph in the resolution which has special reference to the Crimes Bill. I am quite in accord with those who believe that, as a general principle, the policy of non-interference by the Canadian Parliament with the Acts of the Imperial Government, especially so far as these Acts affect the United Kingdom, is

a correct policy; but this I do say, that the case of Ireland stands out boldly as a particular case, and is one that should be dealt with and spoken of by every Irishman and descendant of Irishmen, and every lover of Ireland and freedom the world over. Especially do I think it the province of Irishmen occupying representative positions to speak out boldly on an occasion of this kind. One of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me, said that this Parliament would occupy a humiliating position if it were to deal with this resolution. I hold that this Parliament, composed as it is of free men, the descendants of different nationalities, would occupy a very humiliating position indeed, if it did not, at this critical time in the history of Ireland, speak out openly our sentiments, as regards the matters now at issue between the Imperial Legislature and the people of Ireland. Some hon. gentlemen have said, forsooth, that a discussion of this question in the Dominion Parliament would alienate from us English sympathy. I do not think we have anything to fear on that score. English sympathy has been, and is outspoken to day in favor of remedying the wrongs that Ireland has been suffering under for generations. Whether or not the majority of the people of England are in favor of Home Rule, we do not yet know, but we do know that a large minority is, and I need only instance the case of the recent election in the important city of Liverpool—when Mr. Goschen, who recently went into the Salisbury Administration, was a candidate—as a case in point. There we find English sentiment expressed in very decided terms by his rejection. While we may not have a majority of Englishmen on our side to day, I trust that with the information that is being diffused among them, I trust that with the enlightenment being brought about in England, we will have, in a very short time, a majority with us there. But if we have not the majority of the people of England, we have the majority of the people of Scotland and the people of Wales; and beyond question we have the majority of the people of that country which is more interested than any of the others—Ireland. The majority of the people of Ireland at the recent election pronounced in unmistakable terms in favor of Home Rule. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that the majority of the intellect of the people of Ireland was opposed to Home Rule. I take exception to that statement. We have no proofs of that assertion. On the contrary, we find to day the brightest minds in Ireland, her cleverest men, her greatest orators and most patriotic men, proclaiming to the world their country's wrongs. Do we see any evidence to bear out the statement of the hon. gentleman? Do we not rather see on the other side an array of talent, patriotism and ability? If there be a majority of intellect on the other side, I fail to see it, but I cannot fail to see that the people of Ireland sent a majority of representatives to ask for their country Home Rule. We are told that we would insult the Mother Country by discussing this question. It is not an insult to the Mother Country to tell her what we think of her policy, especially when that policy has an indirect bearing upon the well-being of this country. One of the principal arguments used by hon. members, and also by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in support of their contention that this Parliament should not deal with this question, was that this measure of Home Rule is supported by the National League, composed, as they say, of men enemies of England and of conspirators. They accuse the members of the National League of being in sympathy with crime, of having, as one hon. gentleman said, shot down an innocent man. My opinion is that, owing to the discontent in Ireland, discontent brought about by centuries of misrule, it is well that such a body as the National League is in existence. I believe the National League in Ireland to-day are as good conservators of law and order in that country as is the Government of the day. The hon.

gentleman has also repeated the statements made with regard to Mr. Parnell, and they have brought before this House the charge made against Mr. Parnell in the *London Times*. Well, I think Mr. Parnell's record warrants me in saying and in believing that that charge is as false and as infamous as other charges of a similar character which have been made against Mr. Parnell. Mr. Parnell has denied it, and denied it in the most emphatic terms, and he has gone further and has said that, if the opportunity were offered him, he would have stood between the assassin's knife and the assassin's victim; and yet we are told, on the authority of the *London Times*, that Mr. Parnell sympathised with crime, and not only that but approved of the act by which two distinguished gentlemen lost their lives. These are the statements and the slanders that, year after year, generation after generation, nay, century after century, have been levelled against Irishmen; these are the charges and statements that have infused into the English mind that prejudice with which it is now so saturated and which fails to see in Irishmen or in Ireland any good whatever. The hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has spoken of the proposed mission of Mr. O'Brien to this country. I will not here express an opinion as to the advisability or inadvisability of Mr. O'Brien coming to this country, but this I will say, that I think it is quite out of place, but quite in keeping with the character of those who are called, and justly called, anti-Irishmen, for the hon. member for Muskoka to say that, when Mr. O'Brien comes to this country, he will not require police surveillance but he will require police protection. Is that the kind of language that is calculated to promote harmony and goodwill in this country? The hon. gentleman must know that language of that kind is calculated to inflame the minds of perhaps unthinking people, and I think that the hon. gentleman should have hesitated before he used it. However, coming from him, I do not attach to it as much weight as I would if it had come from any other source. We all know that hon. gentleman's impulsive character. We all know his warlike spirit. In fact, like the typical Irishman, he has always a shillelagh in his hand. The hon. gentleman, I think, has gone out of his way in introducing into this discussion the name of the Archbishop of Toronto, and in parading to the House something that he says occurred in Toronto or in Ontario. That, I think, also was in bad taste on the part of the hon. gentleman. Archbishop Lynch needs no defender, but, if he should need any defence at all, I, as a member from New Brunswick, will leave that defence to a member from Ontario. Now, with regard to this question of Home Rule, what does Ireland ask? Does she ask, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, entire separation? Does she seek to break up, if I may use the expression, the unity of the Empire? No, Sir. On the contrary, so far as I know, so far as my reading has given me information, all that Ireland asks is a Parliament of her own, all that Ireland asks is to be allowed to legislate on Irish matters, and that she shall not be compelled, as she is now, and has been for sometime back, to go to the Imperial Parliament to have Irish questions discussed and to have Irish legislation enacted. Ireland asks only that she may be permitted to manage her own affairs. As to the particulars of any measure or as to the form of any particular measure, this House is not called upon to give any opinion. If I were allowed to give an expression of opinion, I would say that I believe that the best form of Government for Ireland, the best shape that Home Rule could take for Ireland, would be to give her such a Parliament as New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec, and the other Provinces have with relation to the Dominion of Canada. While that may be my opinion, and I am strongly of that

Mr. BURNS.

opinion, it is not for me to set up my judgment against those who are on the spot and who know better than I do what suits them best. There is an impression in the mind of the average English statesman and the average English politician that, once grant Home Rule to Ireland, once give to Ireland a Parliament of her own, and you lead to separation. A very few months ago, when on the other side of the water, I was travelling with a gentleman who occupied rather a high position in Ireland. The conversation turned upon this question of Home Rule. I found, after a very few words with him, that though he was an Irishman he was opposed to Home Rule, and what do you think were the grounds of his opposition? They were these. He said: Once you give a Parliament to Ireland you place weapons in the hands of Irishmen, and with these weapons they will fight for entire separation from the United Kingdom. I asked him how he attempted to prove that. He said: Why, once you give Ireland a Parliament of her own, you give her the control of the militia or of the military; you give her control of the revenues, and she will at once use the control she gets in the way indicated, that is, in attempting to secure entire separation. I asked him if it had ever occurred to him that the giving of a Parliament to Ireland to deal with Irish questions solely did not necessarily mean giving to Ireland the control of the militia or of the revenues. Why, he said, it follows as a matter of course, does it not? I said: The best way I can show you that you are wrong is by giving you information as regards our Federal system in Canada; and I pointed out to him the relations the Provinces bear to the Dominion as a whole, and how the Dominion controls the militia and controls the revenues, giving to the Provinces a subsidy, and I then pointed out to him that his fears were entirely groundless, and that if these were the only fears he had, he could rest easy. He acknowledged to me immediately that if Ireland could get a Parliament of that kind, he and others would be perfectly satisfied. My hon. friend from Muskoka has spoken of the tenantry of Ireland as occupying a better position than that of any other tenantry in the world. Well, if that is so, there certainly must be something very wrong about them. Any person who travels through Ireland, who has read of the distress in Ireland, must come to the conclusion that the tenantry in that country are in a very impoverished condition indeed. Now, why is it that Irishmen in Canada and other portions of the British Empire are contented, while discontent prevails in Ireland? It is because, as was pointed out by a speaker who preceded me, they enjoy the blessings and the privileges of Home Rule. We find that the men who were, in years gone by, most pronounced against English rule, who were, in fact, in arms against the Imperial authorities in Ireland, not only became loyal subjects of the Crown, but in a short time attained to some of the highest positions in the gift of the Crown—I need only mention the names of the late D'Arcy McGee, in Canada, and Charles Gavin Duffy, in Australia. That shows that Irishmen have no innate disloyalty, but when they are treated fairly they are as loyal as the men in any other portion of the Empire. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Carran), in introducing these resolutions, has so exhausted the subject that very little remains to be said. He has pointed out the great number of coercive measures introduced in the Imperial Parliament since the beginning of this century. Surely after all these coercive measures, the fact that they have not been able to allay discontent and disloyalty among the people of Ireland, proves conclusively that some other measure must be tried. If the Imperial Parliament give to the people of Ireland what they ask within reason, they will find that the Irish people in a short time will become the strong right arm of the Empire, and instead of having to keep an army of regular troops and thousands of police

patrolling the whole of Ireland, England will find that in a very few years, Ireland will become a source of strength; she will find that Irishmen the world over, whether in the United States or Ireland, will become better disposed towards her, and she will find in the future a force and a body that she can rely upon whenever dangers threaten the Empire. In days past, Irishmen have freely shed their blood and spent their treasure in building up and preserving the greatness of the Empire, and now there is no reason at all why Irishmen should attempt to cut loose from the Empire, which is as much their creation as it is the creation of Englishmen. Why is it that the Irishmen of Canada and Australia are perfectly contented, while those who live in the United States, or, at all events, some of them, nourish a bitter feeling against everything British? It is because the latter were driven from their homes, and because they have still rankling in their hearts memories of the sufferings they and their people have undergone for centuries, while their hard earnings have to go back to Ireland to support friends whom they left behind, unable to come here, perhaps, on account of their poverty. I say, in conclusion, that this Parliament has a perfect right to pronounce upon the policy of the English Government, because that policy affects us very materially indeed on account of the large Irish population to the south of us. Here in Canada we have a large loyal population, whose sympathies for their native country ought to be recognised by the Parliament of Canada. The Irish people never got from the Imperial Government anything in the shape of remedial legislation except after long agitation. For instance, the Penal Code and the disestablishment of the Irish Church were only brought about after long agitation, and so I believe in the case of Home Rule, the agitation will ultimately prevail, because the Irish people in Canada are a unit with the Irish people at home, and these are supported by a large minority, at least, of the people of England, and by a majority of the people of Scotland and Wales, indeed the whole civilised world sympathises with Ireland in her effort to obtain Home Rule. I cannot but believe that the opinion of the Canadian Parliament will have some weight with the Imperial Government towards granting to Ireland Home Rule, and therefore support the resolutions.

Mr. BERGIN. I move that the debate be adjourned and made the First order of the day for Tuesday next.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh no, it is too early.

Mr. BERGIN. The question before the House involves Home Rule for Ireland, and a protest to the amendment to the Crimes Act known as the Coercion Bill now before the Imperial Parliament, and we are asked in this Parliament to pronounce once again an opinion in favor of Home Rule and to protest against coercion. We are told by the hon. gentlemen who oppose these resolutions that it is no business of ours here in Canada to interfere in any way either by protest, by resolution or by petition in the matter. We are told that it is an impertinence, that those questions concern the Imperial Parliament alone. Well, I do not agree with hon. gentlemen who hold those views. I believe that we, as the fellow-subjects of the Irish people, have a right to express our opinion in this Parliament, and that it is our duty to say to the people of England that our fellow-countrymen in Ireland are entitled to the same ratio of liberty we in this country possess. I believe we ought on every occasion, in season and out of season, to lay at the foot of the Throne the feelings we entertain towards our fellow-countrymen in Ireland, and the opinions we hold as to the legislation of the Imperial Parliament as regards Ireland. We, in this country, who have studied the history of the Irish people, who have looked into its legislation, who have seen the effect of that legislation, who know what the suffering of that country has been,

who know how discontent and misery reign there, would be less than human if we did not express upon an occasion like this—when that country is again threatened with a Coercion Bill—our opinions, and express them strongly, too. We, who have studied this question, know that the legislation of the Imperial Parliament towards Ireland has been largely in the interest of a class. We know that it has not been in the interest of the masses of the Irish people. We know that the people of Ireland are the most misery-cursed upon the face of the globe. We know that instead of giving self-government to Ireland, instead of giving the people a Parliament of their own, instead of giving them good laws, or the power to make good laws, the British Government have meted out to them, year after year since the Union, everything but that which the people of Ireland desire. The Habeas Corpus Act has been suspended, jury trials have been taken away, martial law has been enforced, the militia, the police, the bayonet have been the means used to make the people obedient to the law. And why have they not been obedient to the law? Because the laws were such that it was impossible the people could obey them. If the people had been entrusted with the making of their own laws there would have been no discontent in Ireland. I have often met with the statement that the Irish people were incapable of self-government, and that they could not be entrusted to make laws for themselves. Why, the history of this Dominion, the history of every Province in the Dominion, the history of every Colony in the British Empire, the history of the Empire itself and of the United States, go to show that among the brightest and ablest men the Empire has produced are the sons of that despised island. The greatest soldiers of the British Empire have been Irishmen; her greatest orators, statesmen and poets have been Irishmen. Why, the very fact that Charles Stewart Parnell, who only a few years ago made his entrance into the Imperial Parliament without a follower at his back, has compelled that Parliament to take the position it takes today; that he has compelled the greatest statesman England has seen, during the past two centuries at least, to be practically his follower, is a proof that Irishmen are fit, not only to govern themselves, but to govern any country in the world. We have been told here tonight that the men who have accomplished such legislative wonders within the past few years in the British Parliament are murderers. We have been told they are not fit to associate with Christians. This is the sort of language which has been applied to them. The same old stale trick, which for years and years was made to do duty in Ireland, when the constable and the soldier were sent to find papers under the thatch, has been employed towards Charles Stewart Parnell, and a clumsy forgery has been made to do duty in this House and in Great Britain against him. The signature upon which these men rely is not placed even at the foot of the awkward forgery they produced, but it is upon the top of another page; and we are asked upon such a statement as that to find Mr. Parnell guilty of a crime that would disgrace humanity. Is it to be believed by us who have watched that man's career since the time he entered public life, that a public man, who has conducted himself with such prudence and care, who has avoided giving offence, who has shown himself gentle as a woman, should have been guilty of writing such a document as that which is placed at his door? And more extraordinary than all, the leader of the Imperial Government says that until Mr. Parnell has gone into the witness box and sworn that he did not write the letter he must be deemed to be guilty. This is a novel doctrine to be laid down by British statesmen to the British Parliament and the British people. I, in my innocence, have always believed that until a man had been proved guilty we were bound to believe him to be innocent. But one law for an

Irishman and another law for the rest of the world. That which would be a bad law against the Premier of this country or any member of this Parliament is good law as against Charles Stewart Parnell or any man who advocates the cause of Ireland. And we are told that regarding this Coercion Bill, against which we are about to protest to-night, we are not able to speak because we know nothing about it, except that which has reached us through the telegraph, and that none of the papers are before us; and yet the hon. gentlemen who made the statement must have known, if they had gone to the library, that the Coercion Bill, every line and every letter of it, has been for days and days in the reading room of the House and also a full report of the discussion upon its first reading. We have before us all the information necessary to enable us to deal with this measure, and we have before us information, unfortunately, which shows that the Government in introducing that Bill was unable to produce to Parliament any justification for that measure. They were challenged to show to the House of Commons that there had been an increase of crime in Ireland. Were they able to show it? No; but they replied that the National League has assumed the place of law in Ireland. Well, if you take the two statements together, that crime has decreased since the law has been displaced as they allege by the National League, you must admit that the National League has been a blessing to Ireland and has done for it what the Parliament of England has failed to do. It shows that the efforts of the National League have been directed in the interest of law and order, and when we have before us the practical results of eighty-seven years of legislation for Ireland by the British Parliament, and observe that year after year the British Government have asked for extraordinary powers to enable them to enforce the law, we cannot help asking ourselves whether it would not have been well, even if only for a change and for a single year, to have tried conciliatory measures. Is it necessary always that men should be persecuted and hounded to the death? Is it necessary always that men should not be able to walk abroad in the noon-day without being shadowed by detectives or feeling that they may be at any moment in the hands of the myrmidons of the law. Would it not be well for once that men should have a feeling of security? Would it not be well for once that the Government should see that the landlord class, living upon the peasantry should not be allowed to exact from them one single cent of rent more than the land was able to produce. This, Sir, is the secret of the terrible difficulties in Ireland. The landlord class have had no bowels. If you believe that the landlord class in Ireland are different from what I state them to be, let me read to you what the *London Times* has said of that class, and I ask you—with the knowledge that it is as the *London Times* has depicted it—how can we have any hope for Ireland while legislation is directed in their interest? Speaking of the landlord class the *London Times* said:

“It is no earthly use to go on abusing the Irish landlords. Their names stink already to the ends of the earth. We might as well go on forever on the vices of tigers and wolves as to be saying every day what we think of a class who for selfishness and cruelty has no parallel, and never had a parallel, in the civilized world.”

This is the class of people for whom legislation is sought to-day. This is the class of people in whose interests the Coercion Bill is urged to-day. This is the class of people against whom we protest to-day. It is because of their cruelty, their heartlessness to the people of Ireland that the necessity for this Coercion Bill arises. Sir, I was somewhat astonished upon reading the Bill, and reading the report of some of the speeches made by prominent men in England, in connection with this Bill the other day, to find that one of the strongest excuses given by them for this Bill was, that they must enforce the law and afterwards they would consider what measures of relief they would

Mr. BERGIN.

give to the people of Ireland. Enforce the law first! Why, Sir, they have been enforcing the law in its most terrible forms for eighty odd years, and, Sir, they are no nearer to the pacification of Ireland than they were upon the first day. During all these years the people of Ireland have been suffering. It is not many years ago that Ireland numbered nearly nine millions of people, and under the influence of these laws to-day she does not number five millions of people. This ought, I think, to cause every man, no matter what prejudices he may have in favor of a class, or against a class, to give careful thought to this question, and ask himself whether legislation which has lessened the population of a country in a little over one-quarter of a century over four millions of people, or nearly four-fifths, is legislation which ought to be encouraged. I say to the members of this House that if we refrain from expressing an opinion on this question, we shall not be doing our duty to our country, we shall not be doing our duty to our fellow-subjects in Ireland, we shall not be doing our duty to the Empire. Why, Sir, the great thorn in the side of the Empire to-day is Ireland, and because of the legislation at Westminster. If Ireland were given that which she asks—a proper measure of Home Rule—instead of being a thorn in the side of Britain, she would be the brightest jewel in her Crown; the Irish people would in the future be the most loyal people to the Crown. Even in the past, despite all her misery, despite all the persecutions, despite the poverty, despite the bad laws, she has, upon every occasion when England was in the hour of trial, stood loyal and true to the Empire, and where the battle was thickest there were to be found Irishmen fighting in defence of the flag of the Empire. Is it not worth while, to retain the loyalty and affection of so brave, so generous a people, to do them simple justice? Why, Sir, persecute them? Why should Great Britain, which claims to be the mother of civilisation, which claims to have given liberty to the greater portion of the globe, refuse to give it to the suffering sister at her side? Why, Sir, we say, should not we join our voices to those of the people of Ireland in asking from the Imperial Parliament that which we have to-day ourselves? We experience here in these Provinces the benefits of Home Rule; and we sometimes say to ourselves, when considering this question, that perhaps we would not have this same measure of Home Rule that we now enjoy if we were as near Great Britain and as far from the United States as Ireland is to-day. Sir, it may not be so, but unfortunately the sons of Ireland who are living in the United States think so, and because of that, they have gone to that land instead of coming here. Canada was their natural home, because Irishmen are naturally Imperialists; Irishmen are not naturally Republicans; Irishmen would prefer to live in Canada to living in the United States; but with the experience they had at home they went to the United States to escape the thralldom they suffered from, and they and their children after them have been sending money and advice to the people of Ireland, asking them to come to the United States, with the result that Canada has not had her share of those who left Ireland for foreign soil. Is it not worth our while to do what we can, by saying to Irishmen that we sympathise with them in their trouble, to direct immigration to these shores? Is it not worth while also to consider—the question was proposed here to-night—whether we ought not to endeavor to make them friendly to us in a greater degree than they have ever been before? We are alongside a nation which to-day is friendly, but to-morrow may be strongly inimical, which to-morrow may be ready to measure swords with us. When I read the letter of President Cleveland the other day, it struck me, reading between the lines, that President Cleveland would not be at all averse, should it be necessary in what he believed to be his interest and the interest of the United States, to take issue with us

in a way we should not at all desire. And, Sir, should that day ever come, are we not building up in the United States by such laws, a hostile people, who, under other circumstances, would be our friends? And, Sir, we will regret the day, should this thing continue, that we have sent the bravest, best, and most loyal of our sons to a country, where, in the time of trial, they can be of no aid or assistance to us. Amongst the arguments offered to-night—if I may call them arguments—on behalf of the gentlemen who opposed those resolutions, was the statement, made I think by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that there were 1,500,000 people in Ireland who, if Home Rule were granted to that unhappy country, would not submit to it. That is the sort of language I would expect from such loyalists as he. Just such men as he are the men who would be entrusted with the administration of this Coercion Act in Ireland—men who tell you that if Home Rule were granted by the Imperial Parliament, a million and a half of the Irish people would not submit to it. This I think affords a perfect answer to the claim of loyalty made by them. We have been told, Sir, that it is very probable that if we send resolutions of this kind to the Imperial Parliament, this Parliament will be snubbed again, as it was in 1882. Well, Sir, in a good cause we can afford to be snubbed; and if these resolutions are sent to England and laid at the foot of the Throne, there can be no doubt, I think, that they will produce a very great effect. It cannot be that England will be insensible year after year to the expressions of the people of Canada upon this subject. We know that since the Home Rule question was first agitated, an immense change has taken place in public opinion. We know that since this Coercion Bill was introduced a vast change also has taken place in public opinion; and, Sir, I venture to say without fear of contradiction, that if there were a new election to-morrow, the Liberal-Unionists who are associated with the Government to-day would not be returned to assist them again. Why, Sir, these men were all returned to Parliament, even including Lord Randolph Churchill and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, by protesting that they would oppose coercion, and yet to-day they are found advocating and supporting it. I heard a gentleman to-night giving the opinion of Lord Randolph Churchill in support of one of his views. Why, Sir, Lord Randolph Churchill has held opinions on both sides of every question, and it is hard to say on which side of any question he is to be found now, and he is the kind of authority the people of this country are asked to accept. Now, in closing, I will say that I am convinced not only that it is the duty of this Parliament upon an occasion like this to show its sympathy with our fellow-subjects, but to speak out emphatically. It is our duty to show by no uncertain sound the position we take on a great question like this. For this reason I not only support the resolutions of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, but I support them as strongly as I know how. I believe that impertinent as some hon. gentlemen say we are in urging our views, still there are men in the Imperial Parliament who will look into the debates of this Chamber, and will pay some attention to the utterances of the members of this House.

Mr. JONES. The resolution moved by the hon. member for Montreal Centre contains sentiments which I think may fairly be supported and endorsed by every well-wisher of his country. The resolution traces the action of this House from 1882 to 1886, and goes on to point out the course pursued and the policy recommended on several occasions during that period. It then goes on to express the hope—

“That there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, whilst satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.”

Now, I do not see in that sentiment anything that can be taken exception to by any hon. gentleman who, surveying the field of politics in England, the United States and Canada, perceives the position which this question has assumed. We have seen during many years past the efforts which the people of Ireland have been making for self-government. We have seen the efforts which have been made by Mr. Gladstone and his friends year after year, under difficult and trying circumstances, to go as far as they could carry the people of England with them in endeavoring to meet the just aspirations of the people of Ireland. We have seen the difficulties that have been thrown in the way of that right hon. gentleman, and we see to-day that he is still following in the line which he laid out for himself, and is conducting the people of England up to the realisation of the fact that a measure of Home Rule of some kind is a necessity for the peace of the country. During the last elections, when the Government of that right hon. gentleman was on trial, it received an emphatic endorsement from Scotland and Wales; and, so far as we can judge from the increased interest that is taken in England in this question, and the education which is going on among them with reference to it, we may reasonably hope that at no distant day the electors of England will follow the course which the people of Scotland and Wales have already taken on that question. Such being the case, it is the duty of every good citizen, here and elsewhere, to endeavor, by his counsel and influence, to contribute as far as he can to bring about a settlement of this question. There is another reason why I think at the present time it is particularly opportune that this measure should be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Reference has been made to the condition of public opinion in the United States, with the people of which we are so closely allied. Looking at the action taken by those people in the United States who have come from the Old Country, I say it would be of the greatest importance that that element, so numerous and influential in the neighboring Republic, instead of being, as they are to-day, a standing menace against Great Britain and her colonies, should be brought into a position to acknowledge that Great Britain and her colonies have made an honest effort to place the people of Ireland in the position which they and we think they should occupy. No doubt it is a very difficult problem to solve. No doubt that, unaccustomed as we are to the land restriction and other restrictions from which the people of Ireland have so long suffered, it is almost impossible for us to realise to its fullest extent the difficulties under which those people suffer. Therefore we can make great allowance for the excitement at times which characterises their efforts and those of their representatives in Parliament. We must all regret the excitement which has led to crimes and outrages of the most serious character, but we can sympathise nevertheless with the people in all constitutional agitation, and we can say to them that here, in this Parliament of the British Empire, we are watching their efforts with great anxiety and hope that they may be crowned with success. We may, perhaps not unjustly, point to the Dominion of Canada as an illustration of the benefits of Home Rule, and say that the Home Rule which we enjoy in the Dominion has been satisfactory to the majority of the people; but if there are people in this Dominion who take exception to the present position of affairs, and who think, like the people of Ireland, that a larger measure of Home Rule should be extended to them under the British Crown, I do not know that we, any more than the people of Ireland, lay ourselves open to the charge made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) the other night. He charged that any one who sought, as people in a certain part of the Dominion have been seeking, for constitutional changes in a constitutional

way, would lay themselves open to the charge of disloyalty or dishonesty in their public character. I was rather surprised when I heard those words fall from my worthy colleague during the discussion last night. Fortunately the opinion of my hon. friend, worthy as it may be of acceptance here and elsewhere on many public questions, does not alter the case, and I think that when the hon. gentleman comes to recollect that when there were people in the Province of Nova Scotia, equally prominent as himself in all the various positions of life, social, commercial and political, he will, in his sober moments, admit that it was, if not unparliamentary language, language which he in his calmer moments will regret. The position of the Irish people in this country is one that we may point to with the greatest satisfaction. I come from the city of Halifax where one-half of our population are natives or descendants of the old land, and I can point to that city as an illustration of a city where the various elements work together and co-operate in every public enterprise, social and commercial. I can point to the fact that the Irish Catholics and Protestants live there in good fellowship, side by side; but I do not forget the day, a long time ago, when that same happy feeling did not exist. The city of Halifax, thanks, however, to that great and eminent and ever-to-be-regretted Bishop Connelly, and the eminent men who have succeeded him, we have been able to preserve in Halifax the cordial and friendly relations between the Catholics and Protestants which characterises that city to day. If, under these circumstances, Irishmen and the descendants of Irishmen can live and flourish in this country, there surely must be something wrong why in the Old Country they cannot attain the same positions or the same prosperity as they do here. I think we could have no stronger illustration as to the necessity of some important change, than that great fact that when Irishmen leave the Old Country and go to the United States or British America, they speedily become among the most prominent figures in political and commercial life. The question, therefore, on the present occasion, is one which I consider eminently in the interest of the Empire at large; and it is for this reason that I have always raised my voice, whenever I had the occasion, in favor of some measure of Home Rule, which, while it would preserve the integrity of the Empire, would be satisfactory to the Irish people at large. A measure of Home Rule of some kind is admitted to be a necessity. No one can suppose at present that the question of Home Rule is decided in the negative forever. On the contrary, no matter with whom we may be discussing this question, be he for or against the principle of Home Rule, he will always admit, before he closes the conversation, that the only question is the extent of Home Rule to be granted. It is our duty, therefore, to assist the British Government, so far as we are able, to show our sympathy with these people. It is our duty to show that the people of this country, who are already alive to the position which the Irish occupy on this continent, ask the British Government to endeavor, so far as is consistent with the integrity of the Empire, to have that question settled at once and forever. We think it is necessary for another reason. It has been the proud boast of England that she has not only been the mother of civilisation, but of political and religious liberty, and it is a blot, as has been most properly said, on the civilisation of the 19th century, that any one from any other part of the world may be able to say to England, when she tenders advice, as she has done on other occasions, as quoted by the hon. member to-night: You had better look at home, you had better settle your own domestic affairs, you had better reconcile the difficulties in Ireland and make your people contented with their condition there before you venture to mix yourself in our European politics, or advise us with reference to the Government of our people here. It would remove a blot from the

Mr. JONES.

British honor to day if the Government were in a position to say and to realise the great fact that their people at home and abroad were not only prosperous but were happy, and above all, were contented. It has been said, that at this jubilee celebration of Her Majesty's glorious reign, it would be a happy occasion if these changes could be made, and it does seem as if the opportunity was thrown in the way, and that the great events which have been going on for a number of years past, were about to receive their fulfilment in this year of the jubilee, and I have no doubt that the Government of Great Britain, charged with the administration of public affairs, will make a supreme effort to bring about such a change if it is possible. They cannot bring it about by the means which they have proposed—that is quite certain. They will have to change their policy very much from that indicated up to the present time, but there is time yet for a change, and I hope and believe that there still is among the people of England, as a whole, that sincere desire for a settlement of this great question, which will speedily bring about a desirable change and a more wholesome tone in public opinion in that country. On many occasions throughout this Dominion and throughout this continent expressions of sympathy have gone forth towards the people of Ireland. They have been encouraged by messages and by resolutions from this House, and from the various Legislatures of the Dominion, to persist in their constitutional efforts, and if this is brought about, as we hope it speedily may be, we shall feel a proud satisfaction in knowing that the opinion which has gone from this Legislature on many occasions, and from the various Legislatures of the Dominion, has been in some way a factor in such a desirable consummation. It is with such a desire that I express my cordial opinion in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I can understand some of the objections which were taken by the hon. gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who certainly placed his arguments in a very fair and gentlemanly tone, but they were from a standpoint which is among the things of the past. We have to recognise the condition of affairs to-day, and, whatever may have existed in past years, we have to deal with a condition of affairs in Ireland which cannot be ignored, and, therefore, under those circumstances, it is in the interests of the British race all over the world, in the Old Country and in her colonies, that the people of the colonies of Irish extraction, as well as those of us who are accustomed to a large measure of home government, should see this question settled and see it speedily disposed of. Under those circumstances, I shall most cordially support the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre.

Mr. WELSH. I am a new member—I was going to say a young member, but that would not be the truth—but I cannot let this resolution pass without saying a few words on it. I have heard it discussed from various standpoints to-night, but the speech of my hon. friend, the member for Halifax, pleased me the best of any yet. His speech tallies with my sentiments to the letter. I am an advocate for Home Rule. I was always an advocate for repeal in the O'Connell time, and I think he put the principle very justly. His advice was—agitation, but without a drop of bloodshed, and that is my view. The only thing I deprecate is the shedding of blood. I am opposed to assassinations or anything of that kind, but I can heartily vote for the measure before the House, because I find it sympathising with the people of Ireland in the state they are in, and recommending that a measure of Home Rule be granted as far as possible maintaining the integrity of the Empire. I admire that in the resolution, and, if that was not in the resolution, I should not support it. As I have said before, I quite agree with the sentiments of my hon. friend the member for Halifax, but this matter which has been

brought before the House has reminded me of what took place in Prince Edward Island some years ago. Prince Edward Island was a small colony of some sixty-seven townships. It was granted in the time of King George III to servants of the Crown for services performed, and on certain conditions. Those proprietors, as they were then called, were bound to settle the land and perform certain other conditions. They failed to perform those conditions, and immigrants came to the island, 3,000 or 4,000 from the Highlands of Scotland were located in the backwoods, and granted twenty-year leases, and by the time they cleared the land and got little houses built the landlord came down and said: You must pay double rent. This sort of thing went on with the Irish and English immigrants until every fall you would find, if you went into the country, the landlord's agent going around with a lot of bailiffs distraining and seizing the people's stuff for rent. It became intolerable, and the people would not put up with it. They formed tenants' leagues and they agitated and refused to pay those rents. The population was small at that time, I think only 88,000 or 90,000. It was then a Crown colony. We were governed by England altogether. We had not the boon of responsible government at that time, and the officials were sent out from England, and everything was under the control of the British Government, and we considered the Government almost in the light of an alien government. Then the people agitated for the boon of responsible government. I heard the other night here the honored name of Joseph Howe spoken of as a patriot and a friend of Nova Scotia. I may well couple with his name that of the Hon. George Coles, and the Hon. Edward Whalan, also an Irishman, who at that time agitated for responsible government, and after considerable difficulty we obtained the boon, we obtained self-government such as, I take it, we now ask to be granted to Ireland. Well, as soon as responsible government was granted to Prince Edward Island, the Government at once said: This country cannot prosper under this system of landlordism and tyranny, for it was no better than tyranny and oppression. They agitated to purchase the landlords out, and without any help they voted a certain sum of money and voted the Land Purchase Act, whereby they were authorised to purchase the land from the proprietors by voluntary agreement between them, and re-selling to the tenant, giving him time to pay the money. That was very satisfactory and worked well, and we obtained a great portion of the land under that system. After we entered Confederation the people were opposed to the landlords and their schemes; they turned to, and they got well educated to that, both Conservatives and Liberals joined together, and by a unanimous vote of the House we passed the compulsory Land Purchase Bill, and purchased all the land of the proprietors by an honorable and equitable arrangement. We appointed arbitrators, one for the Island, the proprietors appointed another, and the Dominion Government appointed a third, who was the Hon. Hugh Childers. He came out to this country and settled that question. He valued the land, and capitalised the rents, and gave them an amount equal to 5 per cent. interest, and now Prince Edward Island is enjoying free land. There is no such thing as landlordism there, and we have peace and contentment throughout our borders. I wonder that any man living in this free Dominion—I would be astonished if there was an Irishman on the floor of this House who would stand up and vote against these resolutions. An hon. gentleman spoke to-night—I am not quite certain that I heard him correctly—but I think he stated that there were a million and a half of people in Ireland who are opposed to this scheme. Well, now, if three million and a-half of the people of Canada voted for a certain measure, and a million and a-half were opposed to it, which side do you think ought to

carry? The minority does not reign here, they would object to it. Now, when Parnell commenced this agitation he had only three or four supporters, but now we find that he has some eighty-five members at his back in the English House of Commons. Well, how many members are returned from Ireland opposed to that? Not very many; there has been a cry got up that the North of Ireland objects to this scheme, but we see by the elections that the North of Ireland is coming round to Home Rule almost as much as the other parts. Londonderry is represented by the celebrated historian Justin McCarthy. We see that Belfast is represented also by a Home Ruler. A change is gradually coming over the people, and they are becoming almost unanimous. It was a new thing for the people of England when Mr. Gladstone brought forward his measure. But we already see that the people of Scotland, Wales and Ireland are in favor of it, and I venture to say that in less than two or three years we will find Home Rule an accomplished fact. Now, I shall support the resolutions. I noticed that one hon. gentleman said, if I heard him aright—and I do not hear very well from my desk—that some one had moved a resolution of this kind to catch votes. I am not standing here to catch votes, anyhow, because the district I represent is mostly composed of Scotchmen and Englishmen, and all the meetings I held I took good very care to give them my views on Home Rule, to tell them I was a Home Ruler—in fact that I was an Irishman. I was not born in Ireland, but I have been there time and again for fifty years. I was taken home when I was a boy, and I suppose I have been fifty times through Ireland and I know it well. They are a warm-hearted people—we are a warm-hearted people, rather we are a little impulsive and all that sort of thing, but at bottom we will compare favorably with our neighbors. I will not occupy your attention any longer, but there are some Irishmen in Prince Edward Island, and we naturally sympathise with the country of our forefathers, and we would like to see a happy and united people. Now, I am certain of this much, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, that if it was put to a vote there, three-fifths of the people, English and Scotch, would vote for Home Rule, and I will tell you more than that Mr. Speaker—if you were just to put Prince Edward Island back in the same position it was forty years ago, and to put the landlords around the county again—click!!

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If it is the desire of the House to adjourn I will not oppose it, but I will suggest that at the end of this motion it should be added that this debate be adjourned until to-morrow, to be then the First Order of the Day.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—THE FISHERY PAPERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the Ministry to the fact that the fishery papers have not yet been laid upon the Table, though I observe by to-day's papers that very important additional papers have been presented to the Imperial House of Commons, containing communications from the Government of the United States and also from the Government of Canada, giving the joint views of the British and Canadian Governments. This question, however deeply it affects the Empire, affects more deeply that part of the Empire which we are particularly acting for, and I think we ought to receive, at any rate as soon as they receive in their Parliament, the news of the papers which so momentarily affect our own interests. I therefore hope that there will be no further delay in laying the papers on our Table also.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated yesterday, I believe, that the papers would be brought down probably to-morrow, but at the furthest on Monday next. Of course, that will be done.

Mr. JONES. I desire to ask if any report has been received from the Commissioner sent to the West Indies, and if so when it will be laid before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in reply to the hon. member, that a report has not yet been received, but I expect the Commissioner will return to Ottawa in a few days and complete his report, when it will be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. JONES. Without any motion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Without any motion, of course.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved :

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Friday the 13th May next, and that the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Friday, the 20th May next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Ontario Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 12) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the St. Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. Denison.)

ADDITIONS TO STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By arrangement with the hon. gentlemen opposite, I move :

That Messrs. McCulla, Daly and Rinfret be added to the Standing Committee on Railways, Mr. Borden to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and Messrs. Guillet and Sutherland to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 16) intituled : "An Act respecting the Banff National Park." He said : This is a Bill fixing the bound-

Mr. BLAKE.

aries of the park, and giving power to the Government to adopt rules and regulations for proper order in the park after it is established.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

N. W. T.—SENATE REPRESENTATION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Senate. He said : This is simply to give two members of the Senate to the North-West Territories.

Mr. BLAKE. On what authority does the hon. gentleman ask this Parliament so to alter the constitution of the Senate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Imperial Act provides power to this Parliament to give representation in the Senate or the House of Commons to the North-West Territories.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the late Act. Did our Address cover it? My impression is that the Address which we passed merely invited the Imperial Government to deal with the question of representation in the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say, but I am almost positive the Imperial Act gives us this power.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Act respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. He said : The object of this Bill is to enable appeals to be brought to the Supreme Court from those cases originating in the County Courts, where there is concurrent jurisdiction in the County Court and the Supreme Court of the Province. In some of the Provinces, the Supreme and County Courts have concurrent jurisdiction in certain cases, and at present, while appeal will lie from the Supreme Court of the Province to the Supreme Court of Canada in cases first instituted in the Supreme Court of the Province, no appeal will lie in such cases which are first instituted in the County Court of the Province.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. Curran (p. 46) on the subject of Home Rule in Ireland, and the proposed motion of Mr. McNeill (p. 54) in amendment thereto.

Mr. LAURIER. As this House has already twice expressed its sympathy with Ireland in the cause of Home Rule, there would not be, under ordinary circumstances, any occasion for additional expression of views and wishes already well known. But the circumstances to-day are not ordinary; they are even more painful and deplorable than the ordinary circumstances of that unhappy land. A new calamity menaces it, a calamity of so grave a character that it calls for an additional expression of the sympathy, not only of those who love Ireland, but of those as well who love England and fair play and are proud of her name. It must be admitted that it is a most evil day indeed, not only for Ireland but for England as well, when in this Jubilee year, in any part of the British Empire, a civilised people is to be subjected to laws so cruel as those contemplated to be imposed upon the people of Ireland. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who address-

ed the House yesterday, concluded an able and moderate speech which was directed mostly to establish the proposition that coercion in Ireland was necessary, by proposing a resolution to the effect that the Parliament of Canada should not express any opinion as to the course of Imperial legislation, because our Parliament had not the requisite information upon which to offer an opinion; but the hon. gentleman himself must have thought we had sufficient information, since he came to the conclusion, in his speech if not in his motion, that coercion was necessary for Ireland. On the other hand, the friends of Ireland, with the same information at their command as the hon. gentleman has, may come to a different conclusion, and believe that the true course to be followed is not the course of coercion, but that of freedom. But, moreover, Mr. Gladstone, fighting on behalf of the Irish people, invites all those who sympathise with Ireland to record their sympathy with the struggle now being made. In a late letter he speaks as follows:—

“I attach very high value and importance to the manifestations, now incessant, of American as well as Colonial sympathy with the Irish people in the crisis created by the causeless, insulting and insidious Bill at present before Parliament.”

Well, if the advice of the friends of Ireland may be of value to those who are now engaged in fighting her battle, it seems to me that the advice of all those subjects of Her Majesty, who have enjoyed the benefits of Home Rule for fifty years, may be of still greater value from their experience of the blessings of Home Rule; and in that view I say emphatically that the suggestions of no class of Her Majesty's colonial subjects, as to the blessings of Home Rule, may be more profitable than the suggestions of Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. And, speaking as a French Canadian, I cannot help comparing the history of my own country with the history of Ireland to-day. I see much similitude between the situation of Ireland to-day and the situation of Canada, and especially Lower Canada, fifty years ago. It seems to me that the public men who to-day have to deal with the cause of Ireland are hampered by a distrust of the Irish people in the same way as the public men who had to deal with the cause of Canada fifty years ago were hampered by a distrust of the people of Canada. There are only two ways of governing men—by despotism, or coercion if you choose to call it by that name, or by freedom. You can coerce an inferior and an uncivilised race, but never a proud and self-respecting people. Coercion has been tried, not once or twice, but times almost without number, in Ireland, and it has failed every time; and, if tried again, it must fail as it did before. The Irish people would not be the proud people that they are, if they were to be cowered by coercion into abandoning one single iota of what they deem to be their just rights. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said yesterday that coercion had been successful. At least I understood him to say so in regard to the last Coercion Bill, that it suppressed crime. How can such language be held? If coercion had been successful in Ireland, how is it that the fate of Ireland is what it is to-day? The hon. gentleman himself devoted the greater part of his speech to demonstrate that crime to-day is rampant in Ireland. Coercion can punish crime, it can crush out all expressions of public opinion, it can choke in the throat even before they are uttered all words of complaint or remonstrance, but it cannot breed contentment and affection in the hearts of the people for the Government, it cannot induce that cheerfulness and allegiance which should be the aim towards which every Government should tend. What is wanted to-day in Ireland is not a law to punish crime, but a state of things which will suppress crime by suppressing the motive for crime, the motive for agrarian crime, which is the only crime existing in Ireland. What is wanted is a state of things which will bring con-

tentment to the hearts of the people, a state of things which will make the people happy and proud of their allegiance. This is what is wanted to-day in Ireland, and, since it is proved, and proved, it seems to me, beyond dispute, that coercion has failed as often as it has been tried, I ask of those who to-day support coercion, not only in this Parliament but out of this Parliament, if it would not be well to try the other method of governing men, the method of freedom? Strange to say, all those who to-day oppose Home Rule, whether on this continent or on the other continent, all those who to-day advocate coercion must admit, and they do admit with more or less reluctance, that some kind of local government should be granted to Ireland. Even the hon. gentleman who placed in your hands the amendment you now have, though his speech was devoted to the proposition that coercion was necessary, still in his amendment adhered to the resolutions in favor of Home Rule which were passed by this House. This is not unusual. All these statesmen, as far as my knowledge goes, in England or out of England, who have treated that subject and have come to the conclusion that coercion was necessary, at the same time have said that, after all, the present state of things was intolerable, and that some kind of local government should be devised for Ireland. At the same time they are misty in their views. While stating that in one breath, they stifle it in the next; whilst admitting that Ireland should have some kind of local administration, still they all conclude their utterances by stating that, after all, the Imperial Parliament should have absolute control even over local matters. And what is the secret of it all? The secret is that the men who deal with that question and oppose Mr. Gladstone at this moment, distrust the people of Ireland, and one and all believe that, if anything like legislative independence were given to the people of Ireland, the people of Ireland would simply make it a stepping stone towards effecting complete separation from the Empire. As far as that goes, I am reminded of the history of my own country, of the history of Canada, and especially of Lower Canada. The hon. gentleman who seconded the Address the other day, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in an able and well-tempered speech, referred to the fact, that in the first year of Her Majesty's reign there was rebellion in these Provinces. He took some pride in saying that there had been no rebellion in the Maritime Provinces. That is so. There was no rebellion in the Maritime Provinces, but there was discontent in the Maritime Provinces, there was agitation in the Maritime Provinces, and what was the cause of it? The discontent and the agitation arose from the fact that the people of the Maritime Provinces, in common with the people of all the British Provinces, demanded at that time more extended local liberty. There was the same discontent throughout the length and breadth of Upper Canada. There was even rebellion in Upper Canada, though it was restricted within narrow limits. But there was rebellion throughout Lower Canada, rebellion which was profound, bitter and deep-rooted. We have heard of late that rebellion may exist without cause, that it may exist out of sheer malice, and mere wantonness; but the Government of England did not believe so. The Government of England thought that, since the people of the British colonies had risen in arms against the Government, there must be some cause for that uprising, and they sent out one of the most eminent men of his day, Lord Durham, to investigate the cause of that rebellion. Lord Durham came here, he did his work, and he did it well, he investigated the causes which had led to the rebellion in Lower Canada, and to the rebellion in Upper Canada, and which had spread discontent all over British territory in America, and he reported to his Government. It is not my duty to-day to review the report of Lord Durham at length. If that were my duty,

I should have to take most serious exception to some of the conclusions at which he arrived, especially as they affected my own countrymen, of French origin; but I am speaking to-day only of the general causes, which, in the opinion of Lord Durham, led to rebellion in two of the Provinces, and to general discontent all over the Provinces, and to the remedy which he then suggested. Lord Durham laid down as the cause of that rebellion and discontent the fact that the aspirations of the people for freedom of local government were continually checked by the conduct of the Colonial Office, and he suggested as a remedy that the Provinces should be allowed the most complete legislative independence. He said that legislative independence should be even given to those colonies which, at that time, were in the throes of civil war. His idea was that, if the aspirations of the people for absolute, untrammelled freedom of local government continued to be checked by the Colonial Office, the irritation produced by that course would lead the people to ask not only for local freedom, but for absolute severance from the Empire. Whereas if the wishes of the people for local government were granted, if they had absolute legislative independence in their local affairs, their local interests and their Imperial pride would be at once gratified, and the flag which protected their local liberties, and recalled to them so many glorious associations, would be made all the dearer to their hearts. It was a bold conclusion, so bold, indeed, that the most liberal-minded statesman of the day in England shrank from it, in the same manner that to-day the most liberal-minded men in England shrink from applying the same doctrine to the government of Ireland. Lord John Russell, who was at that time Colonial Secretary, and one of the most liberal-minded men of his day, had to review the report made by Lord Durham. He agreed in almost everything that Lord Durham had said, except in the particular of giving free and independent legislatures to the colonies. Upon that subject he spoke as follows:—

"It does not appear to me that you can subject the Executive Council of Canada to the responsibility which is fairly demanded of the Ministers of the Executive Power in this country.

And after having dilated at length upon this idea, he concluded as follows:—

"I know no reason why the Legislative Assembly, whether of each, separately, or of both Provinces united, should not be listened to with deference; but I am not prepared to lay down a principle, and a new principle, for the future government of the colonies, that we ought to subject the Executive there to the same restrictions which prevail in this country."

Speaking of the impossibility which existed in his mind of granting the same amount of legislative independence to the colonies that existed in the Mother Country, he made these other remarks:

"But the Governor of Canada is acting not in that high and unassailable position in which the Sovereign of this country is placed. He is a governor receiving instructions from the Crown on the responsibility of a Secretary of State. Here, then, at once, is an obvious and complete difference between the Executive of this country and the Executive of a colony. The Governor might ask the Executive Council to propose a certain measure. They might say they could not propose it unless the members of the House of Assembly would adopt it. But the Governor might reply that he had received instructions from home commanding him to propose that measure. How, in that case, is he to proceed? Either one power or the other must be set aside. Either the Government must control the House of Assembly, or else the governor must become a mere cipher in the hands of the Assembly, and not attempt to carry into effect the measures commanded by the Home Government."

So, then, such a liberal-minded man as Lord John Russell could not see his way to adopt the conclusion of Lord Durham, and to grant absolute legislative independence and responsible government to a colony. To him the obstacles seemed to be insurmountable. We are aware that those views of Lord John Russell prevailed for some years. The government of the colonies was attempted to be carried on for some time upon the lines here traced by Lord John Russell, that is to say, upon the old line, not upon the

Mr. LAURIER.

lines traced by Lord Durham; not upon the view that responsible government should be granted to the colony. It is a well-known fact that during those years this country had no peace; it is a well-known fact that during all that time an agitation was constantly kept up, and the country led a miserable life and made no progress. But at last a master-mind came to this country in the person of Lord Elgin, and he did not shrink from giving us the absolute legislative independence for which the country had been asking, and which had been recommended to the statesmen of Great Britain, but which they deemed to be inconsistent with the interest of the Empire to grant. Lord Elgin did not hesitate to subject the Ministry of the country to the same responsibilities and the same restrictions that prevailed in England. We know that he did this in spite of all the reports of the Tory party in England, who at that time fought against Canadian freedom with the same bitterness and violence with which they are now fighting against Irish freedom. But notwithstanding all these efforts Lord Elgin's view prevailed. England granted the most complete legislative independence, and responsible government was introduced into the Provinces as absolutely and as completely as it is carried out in England. Did any of the dangers which were expected to follow from this course, arise? Did the Imperial interests suffer from that course? On the contrary, no Imperial interest suffered, and the agitation which had been going on for local freedom, immediately ceased; immediately contentment prevailed where there had been discontent, and loyalty followed where there had been disloyalty before. And to-day, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, in this, the Jubilee year of Her Majesty's reign, there is not in this broad Empire an inch of ground where there is a more dutiful and more loving allegiance than in this very country where fifty years ago rebellion was bitter and deep-rooted. That is the effect of liberty, that is the effect of local freedom granted to Canada. What would be the condition of Canada to-day if this course had not been followed, if the old practice had been followed of keeping the people under subjection, of refusing them those local liberties for which they were clamoring? Our condition to-day would be the condition of Ireland to-day, that of sullen discontent and agitation, a constant praying for reforms which were never granted. Sir, there is no rebellion to-day in Ireland, it is true but is there contentment? Is there cheerfulness of heart in the allegiance which they owe to the Crown of England? Sir, the condition of the Irish people to-day is about the most miserable of any people in Europe. Must this last for ever? Is there no remedy to such a state of things? It has lasted already for seven long years, and shall we be told to-day that there is no remedy for the evil? I say, in view of our own experience, there is a remedy, and that remedy is not coercion, but freedom. Let the English Government treat the Irish people as they have treated the Canadian people. Let them trust the Irish people as they have trusted the Canadian people. Let them appeal to their hearts, to their gratitude, to their nobler sentiments. Let them loosen the grip in which they now hold that unfortunate land, let them give them some measure of local liberty, let them restore the Parliament on College Green, and I venture to say that this long accumulated bitterness caused by ages of oppression will melt away in a very few years; I venture to say that after that, the bond of union between England and Ireland will be stronger than it ever was before. It will not be a bond of union based upon physical force, but it will be a bond of union based upon mutual affection and respect. Sir, we will be told, perhaps, "Oh, but there are demagogues in Ireland who would prevent such a course." There may be demagogues in Ireland; but demagogues in a free and happy country are not dangerous, it is the tyranny of a Government that makes demagogues danger-

ous and powerful. We will be told again, "But there are men in Ireland who would not be content with local liberty, who would aspire to a complete separation of Ireland from the Empire." That may be true; I dare say it is true. But I say again that if there are such men, and I believe there are such men, their power would not last one minute after Ireland had obtained that local liberty which she now asks; yes, their power would not last, because either they would themselves have to be reconciled to the existing state of things, or their power would be gone. Just take the example of Papineau in Lower Canada. There was never a man in any nation who commanded a greater sway over the hearts and minds of his fellow-countrymen than did Papineau before the years of the rebellion of 1837. Yet after the rebellion, after we had been granted responsible government, Papineau attempted an agitation with the people of Lower Canada to induce them to repeal the Act of Union, and that agitation fell perfectly flat; the same men who a few years before would have shed their blood at his command were no longer responsive to his voice. What was the reason? The simple reason was, that the people had obtained local liberties which secured and protected them, and they were reconciled and satisfied with their condition. Such would be the result, I venture to say, if the same policy were followed in Ireland that was followed in Lower Canada; and such being the case it behoves us, not only does it behove us but it seems to me it is our duty, our bounden duty, as members of this great Empire, to strain every nerve in order to strengthen the hands of those struggling in the cause of Ireland, and to show by our living experience that in order to make the Government of Ireland strong it is necessary simply to make the people free.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The discussion of the resolution proposed by the hon. member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), has been one of a very instructive and entertaining character. We have had some admirable speeches on this question, and the question certainly from its importance should call for the best abilities of members of this House. The question as to the right or as to the propriety of introducing matters of this character in this House has been discussed over and over again. In 1882 the present Minister of Inland Revenue thought it his duty to introduce into this House resolutions, not exactly similar in character to the resolution before the House at the present time, but he introduced resolutions, and members of this House at that time, not only on the side to which I belong, but on the other side, concurred in the soundness of the views he then held. It was not charged against the hon. gentleman then that he introduced the resolutions for the purpose of making political capital, but that he introduced them with a view of striving, as far as this Parliament could strive, to ameliorate the condition of affairs in Ireland. It is true that on that occasion he was ably supported by the present leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman delivered a speech on that occasion which was exhaustive, and which gave a full and complete review of the situation of Ireland and showed it was the duty of every man, whether he sprung from England, Ireland or Scotland or from Canada, to extend his sympathies to the down-trodden and oppressed people of Ireland. The present Prime Minister on that occasion supported the resolution, and it was adopted in the House without question. It was regarded by the friends of Ireland and by the people of Ireland as a wholesome indication that the Irish people living in Canada had not forgotten the land of their birth, and looked upon the condition of the people of Ireland with the greatest degree of interest. It is impossible for a country to flourish without contentment, and unless measures are devised for the purpose of securing contentment in Ireland it is impossible for that country to flourish. It is sad to contemplate the condition of affairs

in Ireland; to reflect that its population is not as great, and certainly not greater than it was fifty or a hundred years ago. Witness the famine that has prevailed in Ireland, in a land beautiful, with a climate good, with a soil productive, and you can be led to no other conclusion than that the law governing Ireland has not been a right law. It was, therefore, not to be wondered at that in this House of Commons in the most important dependency of the Empire, resolutions were introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue. But what do we find? Time passes. The condition of Ireland is changed. One of the great parties in England takes up this question of Home Rule for Ireland, and makes an attempt to strike off the fetters that have bound down the people for many centuries; and at a time when the measure was on its trial before the Imperial Parliament, and when the nations of the world were watching the great struggle going on, it was but natural that the leader of the Opposition should rise in this House and propose a resolution calculated to strengthen the leader of the Imperial Government, Mr. Gladstone, who had introduced the Home Rule measure into the Imperial Parliament. It is sad to contemplate the acrimony of party in this country. The hon. gentleman was maligned and abused in every conceivable manner, although he had introduced a resolution similar in character and import, and having for its object the same glorious result, as the resolution previously introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue. It was thought the resolution was rather out of place, and motives were assigned to him anything but honorable with respect to its introduction. What did the majority in this House at that time do? They endeavored to weaken the power and force of that resolution. The supporters of the Government stated it here in this House; they declared that such was their intention. Now, I have here a copy of a newspaper that supported the Government at that time, and that supports it at the present time—the *Toronto Week*—and in speaking of the resolution which was introduced by the leader of the Opposition, on that occasion it said this:

"We are sure that the Ministers would gladly have shelved it had it been possible. As it was not possible they did their best to nullify it, and they succeeded admirably. This strategy has been made a ground of censure; it is, in fact, a reason for admiration and approval."

That is to say, the influence of the resolution moved by the leader of the Opposition on that occasion was nullified by the amendment proposed by the Minister of Inland Revenue, who himself, a few years before, had proposed a similar resolution. Did we not also find that every enemy of Ireland, not only on this side but on the other side of the Atlantic, rejoiced when the resolutions proposed by the leader of the Opposition were defeated in this House. Yet this same gentleman—the Minister of Inland Revenue—only four years before had supported resolutions similar in import and character, and couched in almost the same language. As to the propriety of introducing these resolutions, we have the authority of the Minister of Justice himself, who, in speaking of this question, new as he was to this House, and probably new to the condition of affairs in Ireland, in his new found zeal for those friends with whom he is now allied, spoke as follows:—

"Let me ask this House where were the friends of liberty and freedom, who are so boastfully declaring this evening that only within their ranks are true Liberals to be found—where they were when those sentiments were pressed on this House, and why did they not meet, as now, and put forth their leader to ask the House to proclaim that the sentiments of liberty and freedom they are so proud to advance to-night should then be advanced in favor of the cause which had few friends, and of the men who were actually immured in dungeons in Ireland in 1882."

I am astonished at the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to hold fair play and right of action as a perfect jewel, who is administering the Department in which justice is supposed to preside, making a statement of that character after the eloquent and convincing speech made by the leader of the

Opposition in 1882. He then imagined that the Liberals thought that the measure was sure of being carried at that time, and that they would go with the current. Now, it appears the measure has failed: the Bill which was proposed by Mr. Gladstone has not been carried, and here you find the friends of Ireland, those who are willing to aid her to strike off her shackles, laboring and sending up their voices and passing resolutions in favor of Ireland still. He went on to say:

"The position in which that cause stands to-day is very different. It is the hour of success, notwithstanding that some hon. members on this side of the House doubt the immediate and perhaps the eventual success of the cause in favor of which this struggle has taken place. This much at least has been achieved, that the principle of some liberal measure of Home Rule for Ireland has received far wider acceptance in the United Kingdom than any one anticipated in 1882. The friends of that cause, who were then imprisoned, are leading a most influential party which actually holds the balance of power in the British Parliament; and it is only when the cause may be said to have triumphed—when, at any rate, it has advanced so far that the success of some such a measure, consistent with the safety of the Empire, and the rights of all classes, is assured—then it is that those friends of freedom, who combine within their own ranks and caucus alone sentiments of liberty, are willing to come forward and ask this House to adopt resolutions in sympathy with the cause which has achieved such triumph."

But while speaking on that question the Minister of Justice in his love for Ireland was willing to vote against the resolution of my hon. friend, and vote for the amendment which, the *Week* says, had a tendency to minimise the influence which it was intended to possess, vote for a resolution which these hon. gentlemen expected was calculated to destroy the cause not only here but on the other side of the Atlantic, and which had that effect. Now, I would just like to show the Minister of Justice and other members of this House the position which was taken by the leader of the Opposition in 1882 on that question.—

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will probably speak loud enough to make you hear, and I am not ashamed to speak on behalf of this cause. I find there are many members in this House either ashamed or afraid to speak on it. I find that not a member of the Government has said a word on these resolutions. Why is this? I will read you some extracts from the speech of Mr. Blake to which I have referred—I will not read the whole speech:

"Now, Sir, there is another reason why we should interfere—we can speak with authority on this subject; we are Federalists ourselves; we are experienced in the benefits of Home Rule; we know what it means; we know that it is our most precious possession; we know that there is nothing that we will part with with greater reluctance or greater difficulty than our portion of Home Rule; we know that there is nothing we would sacrifice to retain our portion of Home Rule, whether you revert to that portion which the Dominion has in relation to the Empire, or that portion which the Provinces have in relation to the Dominion."

Speaking again in relation to the subject he said:

"We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that its best security is to be found in a united Irish people managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no if's or and's in the expression of the views of the Canadian people on this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire, that we can agitate or act with effect in dealing with this matter."

He said further:

"I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government, politely, that, in their opinion, as 4,000,000 of British subjects, they believe that the integrity of the Empire demands self-government for Ireland. So with reference to the clause that speaks of those men being deprived of the constitutional right of trial by jury, I do not understand them to invite the clemency of the Crown, I do not understand them to be charged with political offences. I understand them to be imprisoned under a law which does not call on the Government to charge them with any crime whatever. What we ought to have asked for those gentlemen is the restoration of the *habeas corpus* and a trial by their peers of any charge which the Government in England may think fit to make against them. It is not an application for clemency and mercy that they demand and that we should express, but a hope that the ordinary constitutional right of every British subject may be extended to these particular British

Mr. LANDERKIN.

subjects—namely, the right of *habeas corpus* and of trial by their peers for any offence with which they may be charged against the law of the land to which they belong."

That was the spirit of the resolution which the leader of the Opposition proposed in 1886; that was the spirit of the resolution which was voted down by the majority of this House at that time. It was voted down by the assistance of the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Justice, although I believe both claim to be either Irish or of Irish descent. Speaking about our rights to discuss this question, the leader of the Opposition said:

"We have a right respectfully to approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of her Prime Minister, whose sentiments are not hostile to reform. We have a right to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained, to attainment of rights too long denied, and so to enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form a part."

Now, we find in the *Hansard* of the period the views of parties in this House. We find that while the Minister of Inland Revenue introduced resolutions to this effect, the friends of liberty on this side of the House voted unanimously in support of them; but when that hon. gentleman got into the Cabinet, when the shadows of the castle fell upon him, whether he was timid or whatever was the cause, we find him turning around and introducing an amendment which we believe had the effect of lessening the power and force of the action of this House which would have been secured by the resolutions of the hon. leader of the Opposition. On that occasion I think we heard the voice of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt). Why is he so silent on this question now? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when up in his riding gave a powerful utterance against measures such as that proposed by my hon. friend for Montreal Centre. When he comes to this House, and is surrounded by representatives from all portions of the country, why has he not the courage of his convictions?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would ask the hon. gentleman to specify when and where.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Haldimand, for example.

Mr. McCARTHY. There was nothing about Home Rule at Haldimand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A good deal, I think.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is certainly a poser. If I do the hon. gentleman any wrong, I do not do it intentionally. If the hon. gentleman's speech was not against Home Rule in Ireland, it was certainly against French rule in Quebec; but if the hon. gentleman has anything in addition to his eminent qualities, he has it from the rapidity with which he has ridden this Protestant horse throughout the country. He did that in Haldimand, but did not do it very successfully. It is said he was unhorsed there. It is said the First Minister also fell from his horse there, and the record shows where he fell. Now, if this question is ripe we should support it, irrespective of the political consequences that may follow. I believe the course I take does not conduce so much to my political advantage as would the opposite course; but while a British subject languishes by reason of bad law, I believe it to be my duty as a Liberal, in this House and everywhere else, to raise my voice against oppression. We sometimes hear the taunt thrown out that the Irish people are not capable of self-government. I do not agree with that statement. If you make the Irish people responsible for order, they will be orderly; if you give them local self-government, they will govern themselves. I think it was the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) who said that the people of Ireland possess the same liberties as the people of England—that they have the same tenant-right

laws as the people of England. I deny this on a very eminent authority; I deny further that Ulster has the same tenant law as Munster; I deny it on the authority of Joseph Cowen, the member for Newcastle. If there are inequalities in the laws governing Ireland, if there is one law for one portion of the people and another for another portion, it is not to be wondered that there is discontent, although crime is not more prevalent in Ireland to-day than in any other portion of the British Empire. The laws which govern the people of Ireland are a disgrace to civilisation. They are given coercion law after coercion law. Since the union of Ireland with England there have been, I believe, eighty-seven coercion laws; and what do these coercion laws mean? They mean the suspension of the ordinary laws. They mean that a subject may be thrown into prison and tried how and when and where the Government see fit to try him. To show you some of the effects produced by the system prevailing in Ireland, I will just read a short extract from the history of Ireland by T. P. O'Connor. Speaking of the power the landlords held over their tenantry under the protection of the strong arm of the law, he says:

"There was in connection with most of the properties a code for the regulation of the tenantry which went under the name of 'office rules.' These rules dogged every action of the tenant's life. A minute system of fines existed. Take these for instances: William Bewley, a tenant on one of the estates of Lord Leitrim, was fined £11 because he sold hay contrary to the rules of the estate; Lord Leitrim himself visited this man's house in order to find fault with him, and the sight of this dreaded landlord and his brutal language drove Bewley's daughter insane. The widowed mother of the Rev. Mr. Lavelle, a well-known Catholic priest, was evicted because, contrary to the rules of the estate, she took in her son-in-law and daughter for companionship. A tenant on Lord Lucan's estate was fined 10s. for being three days late in the paying of his rent, and another tenant was fined 14s. 8d. for receiving a tenant's daughter into his house while her husband was in England. On the Ormsby estate in County Mayo this system of petty fining reached its highest development. Thus, a woman named Ann Cassidy could recall the infliction of the following fines upon her husband: 5s. for being absent from duty work one day; 10s. for a similar offence; 2s. 6d. for being absent from duty work on the day of his child's burial; 2s. 6d. because a pig rooted part of his land; 2s. 6d. for allowing an ass to stray on the road; 10s. 6d. because the top stone of a gable was not rightly whitewashed. James Sheering, formerly a tenant on the Ormsby estate, was fined 10s. for cutting a branch from an ash tree which he himself had planted; 5s. because a pig strayed back into a house from which he had been evicted, and 1s. 6d. because a horse was allowed out on the road. Margaret Conlon described how, on the same estate, her husband was fined 7s. 6d. for not making a drain at a time when he was engaged in mowing for the landlord; 12s. 6d. for changing a window from one side of the house to the other in order to get more light, and 2s. 6d. for being too late at his work."

I might go on reading of similar instances to show that we must necessarily feel an interest in the people of Ireland who are so down-trodden. It is not to be wondered that so strong a sympathy exists for Mr. Gladstone, who is endeavoring, in spite of prejudice and superstition, to strike off the shackles which have bound the Irish people so long. Now, speaking about the troubles of Irishmen, Mr. Joseph Cowen says:

"The Irishman's troubles are not listened to, and his miseries have not infrequently been mocked. The unsympathetic snarl with which the English press usually receives Irish proposals for a reform tends much to embitter the relations between the two people. Our illustrated papers seldom portray an Irish peasant in any other character except that of a scoundrel, a skulk, or a coward. Yet, amongst the people thus so shamefully lampooned, there is less crime—as crime is commonly counted—than amongst any other people in Christendom. There is no race whose daughters are so virtuous, or whose sons are more valiant. The annals of France, and Spain, and Austria, of England and America, are crowded with the achievements of brilliant captains who have sprung from Irish stock. No people are more prosperous away from their own country, and few have a higher sense of veneration. And yet a race with all these fine qualities, we cannot manage. Our fundamental error, in my judgment, is our reluctance to realise the difference between the two people. We treat peculiarities that to the Irish are dear and sacred, with contempt, and sometimes with scorn. We concede their demands from necessity, not from justice. They appeal only to our fears, and we yield only to their force."

Speaking to a number of tenants in Ireland, he said:

"The standing complaint of the Irish farmer is his sense of insecurity. There are 800,000 tenants-at-will in Ireland, and they are in daily fear

either of their rents being raised or of being evicted. This stops improvement, paralyses effort, and stereotypes a bad system of agriculture, from which both the nation and the occupier suffer. The compensation for eviction got under the Land Act is little relief to a cottier. It may help him to emigrate, but nothing more. To remove the feeling of distrust, it is proposed to extend some form of the Ulster custom to the rest of Ireland."

Speaking about the difference between the Ulster and Munster system, he said:

"Whether Ulster prosperity is the result of the system, or the system is the outcome of the prosperity, certain it is that prosperity and tenant-right in Ireland are nearly conterminous. There is the exception of Donegal, it is true, but that county is peculiarly placed. An agent of the Marquis of Londonderry, being asked before the Devon Commission what would be the effect of treating the tenantry in Ulster as the tenantry of Munster were treated, replied: 'You would soon have a Tipperary in Down.' The agent of Lord Lurgan said before the same Commission he did not believe that there was a force at the disposal of the Horse Guards sufficient to keep the peace in Protestant and Tory Ulster if any disturbance of the Ulster custom should be attempted. If tenant-right secures peace in Down, and if the absence of tenant-right produces disturbance in Kerry, it is not unreasonable to try the specific in the south that cures the troubles in the north."

When we find these things existing in Ireland; when we, in this British Parliament, feel constrained to introduce resolutions of sympathy with the Irish people, we are pained and grieved to find that a number of members of this House should endeavor to minimise the force and effect and influence of those resolutions, as was done during the late Session. Speaking about the laws that have been given to Ireland, he said:

"All our changes, notwithstanding, the mass of the Irish people are as much outside the ruling pale as they were in the days of the avowed ascendancy. We have never incorporated them. It is not their positive suffering, but the sense of exclusion and injustice, that is so insufferable. We do not trust them, and they do not trust us. Time has not drawn his oblivious veil over a dishonoring and disastrous past. Seven-tenths of the Irish people are of one race, religion, and order of politics. Three-tenths are of another. The three-tenths monopolise the places of trust and authority, and the seven-tenths protest and agitate, and would rebel if they could. This is the political grievance. All our concessions have come too late. They have either been extorted by embarrassment or by fear. They have allayed no resentment, or evoked no friendship. The social difficulty springs from imperfect sympathy. We live under a bourgeois oligarchy, tempered by aristocratic influences and prepossessions."

Having given some attention to this question of Home Rule, having given some attention to the coercive measures employed by the British Parliament against Ireland, it was only natural that, when the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) introduced his resolutions, I should venture to say a few words on the subject. I regret we have not had some expression of the views of leading members of the House, on the Government side, in regard to this question. They should let us know what stand they intend to take, whether or not they will vote in favor of striking off the shackles of the Irish people. I hope that before the debate closes the Government will define its position in regard to this question, and we will ascertain whether or not they sympathise with the people of Ireland and the people of Britain, or with Mr. Gladstone who, we hope, will in a not very distant day succeed in giving to Ireland a measure of Home Rule that will be just and fair to all classes in Ireland, that will strike off the burdens and the shackles that have been imposed on the Irish people, and make them a free people, living in a free land, enjoying the happiness and prosperity which has been denied them under the system that has prevailed there so long. I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and I regret that the hon. gentleman's zeal at the present time did not also exist during last Session. I regret that then he had not greater regard for the condition of Ireland, because otherwise he would not have striven as he did to minimise the effect of the resolution introduced by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, arose, I rose at the same time to ask for some ex-

pression from the Treasury benches as to the course the Government intended to take. Will the hon. the leader of the Government kindly enlighten us as to the course he proposes to take, as I may be led into error for want of that light? I am sorry that those who are charged by the majority of the House with the conduct of affairs, should not have thought fit to give to the House any expression of opinion as to the course they think fit to take on this occasion. I make this appeal in no hostile spirit, but in recognition of the duties of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and I think I might better be answered than by the scornful nod of negation with which the First Minister chooses to honor me, in reply. I do not intend to embarrass or accentuate any of the phases of this discussion with anything which approaches to censure, or incrimination, or misrepresentation of motive. I was not insensible to the even-handed justice which the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) dealt out to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and myself. To the hon. member for Montreal Centre he paid a well-deserved compliment; against myself he levelled an ill-deserved insinuation. I suppose the hon. member for Montreal was very much elated by the compliment; I can assure the hon. gentleman that I was not very much depressed by the insinuation, and I pass it by. I am sorry that we should resume at this time this discussion under the circumstances in which the question stands. I very well remember last Session when we were told, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has said, by the Minister of Justice that, in the hour of distress and of difficulty, we had not been anxious to assist in securing relief, but that in the day of triumph, when light had dawned, when the full sun was about to appear, when the battle had been fought, when the victory was almost won, we were indeed ardent and active. I took a different, and I am sorry to say a truer view of the situation as it stood. I felt that the battle had not been fought, I felt that the victory had not been won, I felt that the situation was an extremely critical one. My earnest desire was, not that the measure in its precise terms and in all its details which, at that time, was hanging in the balance in the Imperial Parliament should pass—no, I declared then, as I now repeat, that I regarded that measure in more than one detail, and notably with reference to some of the distributions of power, as defective—but my desire was that, in the view which Mr. Gladstone had at that time put forward, that the vote upon the second reading of that Bill should be taken only as an affirmation by the House of Commons of their adoption of the principle of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, every thing that we could do should be done, in order to further an affirmative result upon that division; knowing that, according to the pledge of the First Minister, the Bill would proceed no further; knowing that the interval would be devoted to further discussion and to familiarisation of the mind of the country with the whole question; knowing that, in the fall Session which he proposed in that event to hold, the Bill, with such alterations as further discussion and further consideration would produce, would be re-submitted; knowing that at that time, with all that advantage, there would be that further discussion in the House, and that then perhaps, after all—and I should not have at all regretted it—then, after that period of preparation for dealing with the measure, an appeal would be made to the people. But the consequences which I dreaded were that the First Minister's Bill might not even receive, in the sense in which he asked it should receive, a second reading, and that the result of that would be a precipitate and premature dissolution and a submission of that great question to the judgment of the people of the United Kingdom before there was that opportunity of enlightening and instructing them, and while the measure was in a position, as it obviously was in a position, less favorable than

Mr. BLAKE.

a few months of time might have made it for a judgment in favor of the views of the Minister. Those provisions of mine, which made me so anxious that our voice should speak in support of the principle of the Bill, have been unhappily verified, and, instead of being able to-day to congratulate ourselves upon that bright sunshine which the hon. the Minister of Justice told us we were to see over Ireland, we find ourselves face to face with a situation much more deplorable than existed upon the former occasion, and we find now that all that we could do, all that we could say, to promote the second reading of that Bill would have been things done and things said which not merely might be, but most certainly would have been, essential and important to the attainment of the end which to the great majority of us was held dear. Now, in this new Parliament, I think it quite fitting that we should ascertain, coming as we do fresh from the people, the sense of the representatives of the Canadian people upon the question—not only upon the question accentuated as it is by the measure now before the Imperial Parliament, but upon the question of the remedy and relief to which we have directed our attention in the year 1882 and in the year 1886. The Parliament which acted in the year 1882 was a moribund Parliament; the Parliament which acted in the year 1886 was a moribund Parliament; the Parliament which is now called to speak is a Parliament fresh from the constituencies of Canada, and I hope that, fresh as it comes from the constituencies of Canada, just fresh from contact with the people and somewhat freer than in four years hence it may be in some quarters from apprehensions of a resumption of that contact, that voice will be as clear and as decided and as nearly approaching unanimity as on former occasions, in the direction of relief to the people of Ireland and to the Empire of which Ireland and Canada form part. I do not disguise from you that nothing which has occurred has in the slightest degree altered my own opinion that the Parliament of Canada took the appropriate course in the year 1882, when, with the advice and assent of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, we assumed and acted upon our right respectfully to address the Executive head of the Empire upon this subject. You may say this is a question of form. It is not a question of form only. *La forme c'est la forme*. If it be a form, there is in it a large measure of substance. I regard it as a respectful but firm assertion on our side, in the imperfect condition of the organisation of the Empire, of our right respectfully to tender to the supreme and central authorities our opinions upon those questions which are connected with the well-being of the Empire in which we may be said to have a direct and an indirect interest sufficiently important and material to justify such intervention; and for my part I very much prefer the language of representation, the language of hope, the language of request, to the language of resolution, of remonstrance, and of protest. I prefer the recognition that we are, according as we may choose to call ourselves, children of the same family addressing the parent, members of the same family addressing our connections, subjects of the same Empire communicating in that more intimate, direct course in which such a relation entitles us to communicate with the Executive head upon the affairs of the Empire, occupying towards the central authority and the Executive head of that Empire a closer relation, a director power, a responsibility as well as a right extremely different from those which are occupied by any foreign community, from the position of the State of Maine or the State of Massachusetts, for example. I do not think that, in so far as the vindication of such our right is concerned, it depends in the slightest degree upon my word or my opinion. It was the solemn, and apparently the unanimous, determination of this House and of the Senate of Canada, that we had that right and that we should act upon it. But what I say is, that it is to be deplored that the judgment of a Col-

onial Secretary, which directly or indirectly seemed to indicate that this was none or little concern of ours, should be accepted as a bar against our assuming to ourselves the exercise of that right on all fitting occasions. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend upon this occasion—although I think the adoption of the different form which was used last Session has its inconveniences made plain in the resolutions which are before you—further to insist upon that question, whether you call it one of form or one of substance. But I say that that altered form has been the occasion, if not the cause, of some of the criticism which, from unfriendly lips, has proceeded with reference to the language of the hon. gentleman's resolutions. Now, I desire to attract the attention of the hon. gentleman to some of those criticisms in the hope that we may find him, and those who sympathise with him, disposed to address themselves, as I think all who favor this cause ought to address themselves, to the earnest effort to minimise all cause of objection and to produce as nearly as possible unanimity. In that sense and with that object, it is not my intention to move at this time any amendment to the hon. gentleman's motion, but rather simply to state across the floor the difficulties, more or less serious, which have been suggested from several quarters, and in which there appear to be some merit, in the hope that the hon. gentleman will find it consistent with the attitude which I am taking towards his motion, to seek with me some remedy for such of these objections as may be removed, and to make this resolution as accurate and as effective as possible. The statement which is made in the second paragraph of the resolution as to the character of the measure of Home Rule to which we gave our adhesion last Session, has been pointed out not to be, in its present form, accurate. It is so. The statement is that we ask for a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland. That phrase is used in the resolution of last Session, but, as the hon. gentleman who made the criticism remarked, it is used with certain qualifications which are deemed to be of very considerable significance. Now, I think that in a historical statement of facts, it is our duty to attend to a criticism of that description, and to take care that the statement of facts is correct, which may be done by either omitting one of the descriptions of the character of the measure of Home Rule, that one which the hon. gentleman has given, or by inserting the whole of the description which was given in our resolution, so that it may just reappear here what we did agree to last Session. Then the language which is used in that portion of the resolution, the fourth paragraph, which deals with the question of the Coercion Bill, is the language of protest, and more than one hon. gentleman, I think, has pointed out to the hon. member that this is language which implies censure and condemnation. I myself am of opinion that it is language not the best calculated to promote the object which we both have at heart. I am of opinion that it would be much more suitable to adopt the language of hope and request, than the language of protest. You may protest against an accomplished wrong, but you are dealing with that which you deem to be a wrong, and which you hope to avert, and I think the expression of hope would be much more suitable to the occasion, and much less obnoxious to the criticisms, of some degree of weight, which have proceeded from the benches opposite. I, therefore, invite the hon. gentleman, in the spirit which I hope I have made sufficiently plain to him, to make a modification in that respect, and to indicate our hope with reference to the non-adoption of this Bill, rather than our protest against the measure. The hon. gentleman, when he proceeds to deal with the character of the measure of Home Rule, which he asks us to express a hope shall be granted to Ireland, as expressed in the fifth paragraph—that also is open to the criticism which was made from the

opposite benches. We have heretofore, and I think wisely, rather dealt in generalities with reference to the description of the measure of Home Rule to which we address our sympathies, and the proposal of the hon. gentleman is one which I do think,—I have no doubt, without intention—but which I do think is calculated to overload, and embarrass, and render difficult the acceptance of the resolution he asks us to adopt. The hon. gentleman proposes that by a single word, a single phrase, we should invite the Imperial Parliament to give a particular description of constitution to Ireland, namely, the Canadian Constitution. He says we should give the same measure of Home Rule, such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada. Well, now, it would take a long time, and I am sure it would be very needless, to engage in the discussion of what the difficulties are in applying the Canadian constitution to Ireland. But I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that one of the greatest difficulties which the measure of Mr. Gladstone met last Session was this: That it did not provide for continued representation in the Imperial Parliament of the Irish people, in respect of Imperial concerns. Looking at it from an English and Scotch point of view, it was not a question so much of what was given to the people of Ireland to be dealt with by the Parliament at Dublin, as it was the fact that large Imperial concerns were taken over to be dealt with absolutely by a Parliament, no longer of the United Kingdom, but by a Parliament of Great Britain, without any voice of the Irish people in the management of those concerns. The question, for instance, of the Customs and Excise, the question of the fiscal policy, all the questions of foreign relations, the question of defence both by sea and land—all these questions were to be disposed of for the Irish people, but not in any sense by the Irish people. And it was felt, too, that the danger was being run of a further separatist tendency in the ultimate development of that scheme, and that was one of the very great difficulties in the way of the adoption of the scheme by leading English and Scotch Liberals, and by the constituencies of Great Britain. Well, now, we are not here called upon to determine whether that was wise, or whether it was foolish, but is it wise for us—I appeal to the hon. gentleman, whether it is wise for us to undertake by a stroke of our pen, by three words of the English language—to define the precise character of the measure of Home Rule we desire to be given to the people of Ireland? I think not, and therefore I would propose to the hon. gentleman, rather to use once again some of the phrases which we have used before, or equipollent phrases, and not to engage in an excursion in this definition of terms as to the character of the measure of Home Rule which we think ought to be given. Sir, I feel that the Canadian Parliament intervening in this matter acts under a very grave responsibility, and I am anxious that we should not say a word in debate—I am still more anxious that we should record no solemn judgment—which we cannot defend before the Empire and before the world; and therefore I wish that we should be extremely careful as to the language in which we put our deliberate judgment upon this subject. If it were clear that we could cut and dry a constitution for Ireland, none would be better pleased than myself that we should undertake the task. But I do not think it is to be done in the brief deliberation and in the short space of words in which the hon. gentleman has attempted to do it by this short cut of proposing the Canadian scheme. Now, as I have said, if this had been an ordinary occasion, if we had been dealing with a question which is to be disposed of according to the ordinary method of parliamentary tactics, if even I had been adopting the position which was adopted towards myself last Session, I would have proposed before I sat down an amend-

ment to the amendment, proposing changes in this resolution to meet the suggestions which I have made, and proposing also that the whole resolution so changed should be not adopted, but referred at once to a Committee of the Whole House, and that that should be an initiatory step in order that, if there were any other suggestion as to the form and language, it might be freely debated, and that the result of our labors might be as near unanimous as possible. Such is the suggestion which I venture to make to the hon. gentleman, such is the suggestion I have prepared here; but such is the suggestion I make only across the floor, and do not emphasise it by placing it in your hands, Mr. Speaker, because I am exceedingly anxious to leave to the hon. gentleman all that is to be gained by his having taken the first step in this matter, and rather to invite him to pursue the necessary steps to secure the best measure of success than myself to interpose by proposing any different resolution than that which he has brought down. Having said so much I will say this: that I propose myself to adopt the course on this question which I have adopted on two former occasions. Upon each occasion I invited the consideration of the House to what I thought the best thing; upon each occasion I endeavoured to secure the assent of the House to what I thought the best thing; upon each occasion I failed, and, having failed, I accepted in the end what was procurable so long as it was at all consistent with my own view of what was right. I shall continue, therefore, in the course I have followed on former occasions, and if this resolution as it is ultimately framed shall not prove such as wholly to command my assent, I shall yet hope to be able to support it, feeling that anything which is not absolutely wrong will be preferable to a division of opinion on this occasion. Sir, I now turn to a few of the other arguments which were used by those who support the amendment. I was desirous, in the first place, to remove as far as I could the force of such of their arguments as I believed were capable of being eliminated by a fair consideration of the language of the resolution. There are others which are to be dealt with only by argument, but which we cannot remove, I am afraid, by any changes we can make in the terms of the resolution. One hon. gentleman said: "Why are you interfering? this is only a local affair, and it deals only with the administration of justice in Ireland; what have you got to do with it?" Well, we have precedents in that respect, too. There were a few men confined in Kilmainham jail in 1832. That was a local affair. The Habeas Corpus Act had been suspended, and they were in jail. But we all agreed upon that occasion that, notwithstanding it was particularly local, confined to the precincts of Kilmainham, that should not prevent our intervention and our doing what we could to procure the release of the prisoners in that jail. Why is it we interfere? Those of us who think interference or intervention should take place, justify it, because the universal principles of British justice are, as we believe, being violated in that particular locality, and because those who believe in the sacredness and the universal application of those principles of British justice feel that no wound can be inflicted upon them in any part of the Empire without that wound more or less affecting us and affecting the glory of the Empire to which we belong. We feel that every lover of British freedom all over the world is entitled to express an opinion, when he believes the universal principles of British justice are to be abrogated or impaired. Another hon. gentleman said: "But you miscall the Bill: it is not a Coercion Bill, it is only a Bill to change the criminal law." What is in a name? What is the substance of the Bill? Of course, it is a Bill to change the criminal law, but it is in its essence and spirit not merely a Coercion Bill, but a deadly Coercion Bill. It is first of all—and remember that, because it is an important circumstance

Mr. BLAKE.

—a Bill which upon the face of it is designed to be permanent. The declaration of the Secretary of Ireland, in introducing the Bill, was that the Bill was a set purpose of the Government of the day. They propose to make this a permanent record, a permanent institution. It is to answer no temporary exigency, but it is to be the law of the land for Ireland for an indefinite period. Now, what is to be the law of the land for Ireland for an indefinite period? In the first place, a very large number of offences—and some are made offences, as I understand, by this Act—are to be disposed of by two magistrates without a jury, those two magistrates having the power of sentencing to six months' imprisonment with hard labor. The range of offences which is prescribed by that authority is a very wide one. It covers a great many of those classes of offences capable of almost infinite degrees in their seriousness which unfortunately exist in the island of Ireland. It includes criminal conspiracies, boycotting, rioting, offences under the Whiteboy Acts, assaulting officers of the law, taking unlawful possession, and inciting to the above offences. I do not know much about the magistrates who are to try these cases, but I was very much amused, within a day or two, to read some of the letters of application of highly-placed personages for positions of this description for friends and relatives. One was from a former Governor General of Canada, another was from the Knight of Kerry; and those applications for a nephew, or a brother, or a son-in-law. In the description they gave of the qualifications of the individual, of his previous career, of the reasons for seeking the appointment, were not highly calculated, I think, to induce anyone who considered the subject, and supposed that men were appointed upon such recommendations, to hand over so large a part of the liberty of the subject to two magistrates drawn from society by influences such as those. They belong, as we all know, to one class—to that class which is, as a rule, not in sympathy with, but in bitter hostility to the demands of the Irish people. They belong to a class, they are largely scions of, or related to, or influenced by a class which is divided bitterly, not merely by political, but also by the agrarian question itself, from the very persons whom they are called upon to try. They hold office, as I understand, not during good behavior. They are appointees of the Castle; and to hand over to these persons, without a jury, the power to convict and to sentence to six months' imprisonment with hard labor, for all these classes of offences, is, to a very large extent, to actually obliterate the securities for trial which consist in trial by jury. And there are added offences, as I have said. You add the offence of inciting to any of the above offences. Well, now, what does that mean? What may it mean? Why, Sir, an article in a newspaper, a speech, a word in private conversation, a private letter, may be construed into an incitement to enter into conspiracy—an incitement to take unlawful possession. There is no language which can be devised by the wit of man which can be wider; there is no net you can make that is more ample than those words—incitement to commit offences. I am not surprised that Mr. Balfour—as was said here yesterday—should have said that he hoped to prevent the press from participating in these offences by the operation of the Act, though the Act was not directed against the press. Of course, if they know that two magistrates can commit them to jail for six months with hard labor; if it is found that they are inciting to these offences, they do not exactly know how little or how much—the suggestion of a grievance—the suggestion of the necessity of even an innocent organisation—they do not know what language shall be construed into an incitement—they hardly know at what moment, hardly any man who is interested in a popular cause knows at what moment he may not be summoned and find himself confined for six months in jail with hard labor. Then they deal with

very grave offences, some of them the gravest known to the law. There are provisions that if the Irish Attorney General certifies that a fairer trial can be obtained elsewhere than in the locality, he can obtain that change of venue, with the right of appeal, I suppose, against his decision to the court. They go farther, and thus provide that if the Irish and the English Attorney Generals concur that a fairer trial can be had in England than in the locality, the trial is to take place there. That does seem to me a most objectionable provision. It seems to me a dreadful thing to say that, after all these years, it should be possible for any Government to propose that the people of the Kingdom of Ireland should be dragged from their own soil across the channel and tried before English jurors for these offences. It is true, I think, that if it be necessary, in order that justice shall be done—I was going to say, in Ireland—if it be necessary that justice shall be done that trials for these offences shall be had outside of the whole of Ireland, then there is there a dissolution of society; then the law has there no force; then the bands of the law are there broken and dissolved. And if this is the condition of things how has it happened? And is it by measures like these that we are going to produce once again a happier condition? There is still more. The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland may by proclamation make it the law that it is an offence against this Act to have anything to do—wide words again; they may not be the exact words of the Act but they are the language of the Chief Secretary in describing it—anything to do with an association formed for numerous purposes, such as promoting or inciting to acts of violence, interfering with the administration of the law, or disturbing the maintenance of law or order; and it is distinctly stated to be the intention of this proclamation—although when it is proclaimed it shall have some sort of force through the whole kingdom—that it may be limited from time to time so as to affect particular localities, because, says the Chief Secretary, an organisation such as the Land League, which is harmful in one locality may be harmless in another, and therefore it is to be a crime, an offence against the Act, in one part of the island to have anything to do with the association, while it is not to be a crime, or an offence against the Act in another part of the island. Now, this language once again is language of so wide a character as to render the liberty of the subject entirely at the disposition and the particular view and idea of two magistrates, or of any set of two magistrates that may be selected. So that I think these provisions, which do not merely add to the former categories of crime, but which deprive the people of the securities for the administration of justice which they value highly, which we value here so highly, and which leaves the whole matter in such a position that it is more in the discretion of individuals than arranged according to the certainty of the law—these provisions may properly be called a most stringent and extraordinary Coercion Act; and, therefore, it is that I feel that those who objected to this Bill on the ground that it is only an Act about the criminal law have very imperfectly apprehended what are its real bearing and effect. In truth, in the practical operation of it, as you can see by what I have told you, and as you can see also when you reflect that the Chief Secretary who introduced it admitted that ordinary crime was rather at a low ebb than otherwise, and that the difficulty was the power and influence of the organisation against which he contends, it is in truth directed against not merely illegal and criminal acts but also acts of concert and organisation of a political or quasi-political character. And I believe that the almost immediate results of a measure so calamitous will be, as in former times and in other countries they have been, to substitute for open organisation, with all the advantages that dealing with a case in the open light of day gives, the resumption of secret and still more dangerous, still more

obnoxious, still more hurtful, still more difficult methods than those which exist to-day. It is because I believe that the condition of things will be aggravated—enormously aggravated—in the practical working of affairs by the passage of this Act, that I feel so strongly as to its introduction. Then it is said—it was said here—that the situation demands this law. It is admitted that there is less crime than usual, but I quite agree that the conditions of things in Ireland is lamentable. I quite agree that it is most regrettable. I agree that there is some evidence, that there are some cases of conduct which no man can speak of except in terms of the severest condemnation. I agree that there is proof—some proof at any rate—that there are cases in which the organisation which has been effective—as I shall presently point out—for other and more laudable purposes, has been used for purposes which are not so laudable, and under circumstances which did not justify its use. These, Mr. Speaker, are regrettable, but they are also inevitable results from a situation such as that which for a long time has existed in Ireland. You will not find a country condemned to deal with a social condition, with a condition with reference to property and natural rights such as exists in Ireland, condemned to attempt to deal with it by mutual organisation, as they have been dealing with it there, without such excesses being extremely likely and almost inevitable. The people had organised, and any man who considers the situation must recognise the fact that without that organisation on the part of the tenants, there was for them no reasonable hope. You could not hope that, taking each man by himself, the process of law, the process of resistance, the process of declinature, would produce an effect which would remedy the admitted evils under which the people labored. Now, we have evidence on this subject which I think comes from a source most unimpeachable. Sir Redvers Buller, an Englishman, was sent to Ireland especially in order to grapple with this question. He went over very large parts of the country, and familiarised himself with the condition, and the feelings, and the line of action of the people. He made many efforts to compromise difficulties, and to induce reasonable arrangements between landlords and tenants, and he expresses the opinion, which I have declared it appears to me reasonable should be entertained from some of the evidence I have read, that there are cases in which the action of the League is coercive. There are such cases, and let us so deal with them; but what is the general action of the League? Sir Redvers Buller says:

“I think this, and I feel it very strongly, that in this part of the country you will never have peace unless you create some legal equipoise or legal equivalent that will supply the want of freedom of contract now existing between landlord and tenant.”

Even to-day, he declares, it is at the root of the difficulty that no matter what we may say there is not real freedom of contract between the landlord and tenant. Again he says:

“You have got a very ignorant and very poor people, and the law should look to them, instead of which it has looked only to the rich. * * * What we want is a court that would have a certain amount of coercive power over a bad tenant, and a very strong coercive power over bad landlords. * * * The rents are too high. I think it was the pressure of a high rent which produced the agitation and consequent intimidation as to the payment of rent.”

There you have from Sir Redvers Buller himself the source of the agitation and the intimidation. The rents were too high, and that circumstance afforded the cause and lent the strength which was necessary to the agitation, and the intimidation which is a regrettable part of that agitation supervened as a remedy. He was asked:

“Is there any general sympathy with the action of the League among the people?”

“Yes, I think there is sympathy, because they think it has been their salvation.”

That is Sir Redvers Buller's statement, although he says there are cases in which the League has itself intimidated and coerced.

"Nobody did anything for the tenants till the League, and when the landlords could not let their farms, then they were forced to consider the question of reduction."

Organisation amongst the people in a case in which the rents were intolerably high prevented the landlord from being able profitably to evict, because he could not let again, and obliged him to reduce; and when you remember that up to the latest period at which we have returns the cumbersome machinery of the courts established under the recent Act had actually lowered the rents of no less than 187,000 distinct tenancies in Ireland, which must represent at least 1,000,000 souls, apart altogether from voluntary reductions, who can doubt for an instant that that substratum, that moving cause, to which Sir Redvers Buller alludes, an intolerably high rent, subsisted? I do not mean to say that all the land of Ireland is let too high—not at all. It would be grossly unjust to say that there are not in Ireland liberal, just, devoted landlords. I do not mean to say that there does not exist in many cases a relation between landlord and tenant which is enviable and admirable. But you are dealing with the general condition of the whole people; and if there be those difficulties with the great bulk, it is obvious that there is the greater justification for such methods being adopted, though out of the course of the ordinary law, which seem necessary to protect those who have no other protection. Defenceless each poor cottier is by himself in his unorganised action, and the disorders and injustices which have grown out of this effort are not to be a reason for summary condemnations of that system which Sir Redvers Buller tells us the Irish people think has been their salvation. An hon. gentleman said: Oh! we want to have the law obeyed; the law is dissolved; let us procure this obedience to the law, and then let it be amended. I say: No, in the condition of Ireland it is a fatal mistake to propose to enter upon a period of coercion in the hope to reduce the people to absolute submission, and then propound remedial measures. This is not a new mistake, it is the mistake that has been made long ago, and very often. Everybody remembers, I suppose, about the time that Catholic Emancipation was in agitation, the Duke of Wellington wrote, I forget whether to the Chief Secretary or the Viceroy, some suggestion which unhappily for the Duke became public—to the effect that if it could only be agreed between all the world, the people of Ireland included, that the question should be left in oblivion for a generation or a long series of years, a solution might be arrived at. You will never reach a solution by saying we must banish all open signs of discontent and then amend the law. Let us give the rights that ought to be given, and then seek that obedience, that cheerful obedience, which should be expected, and which will be rendered to a just law by a people holding their just rights. After this discussion, in which the hon. gentlemen criticised our proposed action on the ground that this was not a Crimes Act, on the ground that the circumstances justified a Crimes Act, and on the ground that it was a local matter, they proceeded to argue that we do not know enough about the subject to act. There were some gentlemen who brought forward this argument who did seem to exemplify in their own utterances the proof of it. But I do not think we are so ignorant of the general principles and provisions of the Coercion Act or the condition of Ireland, as to disable us from offering some judgment, and perhaps a calmer judgment than those engaged in the heat of this conflict, upon that question. The hon. gentleman says we have not the evidence; but we have the evidence which the Chief Secretary gave and the explanations of that evidence. On that evidence the English House of Commons was asked to act, and we have that evidence here as well.

MR. BLAKE.

I think that, with the exception of those who have raised this point, we do know enough to act. Now, it is suggested that there are those who are interested in this question who are violent enemies of the Empire, and the attempt was made, which I was sorry to hear made, to prejudice a candid and fair discussion of this question by introducing that element. I deplore that there are to-day violent enemies in the Empire of the Irish race. I deeply regret it. It is, I think, one of the signs and marks of humiliation of the British Empire that such should be; but the circumstance that men, owing to events which have transpired for so many years in Ireland, have left her shores, not with feelings of amity or concord, but with feelings of despair and hate—the circumstance that those feelings of despair and hate have received still further accentuation and development, and that even to-day when a large portion of the English people, alive at last to the cause of justice and generosity, is deeply engaged in the effort to do that long-delayed justice, rancor and hate have not ceased to glow in those bosoms—that circumstance, regrettable as it is, must not be suffered to confound in one common mass the whole Irish population abroad and at home, and to mark them with the condemnation which we give to these persistent haters. We must recognise the fact, and hope that even they who have resorted to methods which we abhor, and transactions which we condemn, with every breath of our voices, every pulse of our hearts, and every nerve of our intellects—we must hope that even they will be subdued to a better and clearer sense of public affairs by the persistent efforts now being made to do justice to Ireland. But, surely, the course of justice is not to be delayed, the cause of generosity is not to be impeded because of these unhappy circumstances which have their origin and cause in the past misgovernment of Ireland. Well, if the hon. gentlemen want to increase the area of disaffection and hostility, if they want that these sentiments should grow and be fostered, if they desire that they should assume still larger proportions, let them, so far as their voices have strength, speak the sentiments of the Canadian people, hostile to justice to Ireland, hostile to generosity to Ireland. Let them speak the sentiments of the Canadian people in favor of coercive laws and against remedial laws, let them speak the sentiments of a harsh judgment against the people now dwelling in Ireland, and I can tell them they will very rapidly create an unhappy crop of discontent and disaffection. Other words and other sentiments than these are those we must utter, if we would help and heal instead of increasing the wound or aggravating the difficulty. Then the hon. gentleman brought up the letter attributed to Mr. Parnell, and he declared that the circumstance of that letter being produced was the reason why we ought not to act just now. I have no hesitation in saying that from the moment I read that letter, as well from the general circumstances as from the intrinsic evidence, and from all I know and have learned on the subject, I was convinced that Mr. Parnell never wrote that letter. I do not propose to justify or declare free from absolute suspicion all the course that Mr. Parnell and his friends may, in past times, have taken; but I have ever believed, and I have some opportunities of forming a judgment, derived from sources very remote from Mr. Parnell himself, but still highly authoritative, I have believed for years that there was no man under the control of the British Throne who felt so deep a wound as Mr. Parnell did upon the occasion of the massacre of those two gentlemen in Phoenix Park. It is perfectly obvious that just at that moment there was a crisis in the sentiment of England as to Irish affairs, destined, as far as we could see, to be propitious; it is obvious that the aims and objects of which Mr. Parnell had been tending were apparently approaching some measure of consummation, and who, with the slightest grain of common sense, could doubt that the effect of that dreadful and horrid murder, that awful tragedy, would be to blight all those fair prospects

and to replace them by a fresh and stringent Coercion Act? Who is there who does not know that the obstacle to the remedy and to the relief for Ireland for many years has been the block of public opinion in England and Scotland? And who could not tell such a transaction was the very thing to shock such opinion and render, perhaps, a Coercion Act the only Act you could propose to the Imperial Legislature. Therefore, altogether apart from those feelings of head and heart, which, I am convinced, would have caused Mr. Parnell to shun, and deprecate, and dread, and have nought to do with such a dreadful deed, those who charge him with the slightest complicity in, or favor of, this deed must give him very little credit indeed for the qualities he possesses, in a very uncommon measure, of shrewdness, steadiness, sound judgment, far-sightedness, and a persistent, steady, but not impulsive determination. Therefore, the whole thing is, I think, unworthy of the great journal in which it appeared, and very much more unworthy to be repeated here as a reason why we should stay our hands to seek relief for the Irish people. But another name, after all, is concerned than Mr. Parnell's, in the effort to stay the hand of the Imperial Parliament in passing this Bill—the great name of Gladstone. Therefore, from that point of view, we are to remember that it is not merely the chief of the Irish parliamentary party who is posing, but the chief of the great body of English Liberals, the man whose illustrious life, if it be but prolonged some few years, we may hope will be crowned by a grand measure of justice to Ireland. Then the hon. gentleman dragged into the controversy, the question of the announced visit of Mr. O'Brien here, to discuss some particular cases of eviction. I do not really see that that has anything to do with the question. I regret, if it be the case, that that particular visit, with that particular purpose is to take place. I think it would be a mistake on the part of those in Canada, who desire, as all true friends of Ireland must desire, to avoid any circumstance which may chill the sympathies of the other classes of the population—I say they would act wisely if they would defer or end that visit. I am not here to enter, I think it would be hardly decent to enter, into the slightest discussion of the transactions concerning the tenantry of the illustrious nobleman, with whose case Mr. O'Brien proposes to deal. He is here in a representative capacity. He is the representative of our Sovereign, and I think that if there be examples of evil-dealings on the part of landlords with tenants, those examples which might be presented with the best proof, and with least possible difficulty resulting to the Canadian people, would be examples drawn from other estates than those drawn from those of the Governor General. While I say that, I regretted to hear the observation of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He said, alluding to a statement which I observe in the papers, that the Government of the day has cabled that Mr. O'Brien will be under police surveillance if he should come here, that he would be more in need of police protection. I do not believe that, if Mr. O'Brien came here, he would require either police surveillance or police protection. I am delighted to be able to say that we have been able to discuss this exciting question, in communities in which there is a very great difference of opinion upon it, in the most satisfactory way, without one particle of disturbance. We have had great meetings in the city from which I come on both sides of the question. The views which have been brought forward on each side have been heard without disturbance, without any attempt to prevent the free utterance and expression of the views of each side. The people have been informed of what the views of each side were, and a great step has been gained in the way of tolerant discussion and proper handling of exciting questions. I have no doubt that, in whatever taste we may consider the visit of Mr. O'Brien and his discussion of the affairs of one particular landlord to be, he

will have in Canada—I hope so, at any rate—freedom of speech; he will not be, in the first place, under police surveillance, and, in the next place, that he will require no police protection to enable him to say his say, whatever that say may be. I hope that we shall not import anything of that description which is suggested by the hon. gentleman into our dealing with this matter; but it is of a piece with some other suggestions. We are told by the hon. gentleman, dealing with the question of Home Rule, that Home Rule such as is indicated cannot be obtained without civil war. The advocates of peace, of law, of order declare by their spokesman here that they will not obey a law of the Imperial Parliament should such a law be passed, and the reason is, forsooth, that the Irish are not a homogeneous people. No, they are not a homogeneous people, but a people not homogeneous has lived in peace and amity, in personal, in cordial, in political relations as one country often before; and although I am not here to deny that the bitternesses of this long controversy, complicated as it has been by differences of race, by differences of creed, more and most of all by the land question, and the fact that you have a minority of one race and of one creed very largely the possessors of the soil, and a majority of another race and another creed who are tenants of theirs under very exceptional circumstances, still we have to trust to the Irish people to manage this matter. I do not speak of the Irish people in the sense of the Irish Roman Catholics—I say the whole Irish people. I regard them as one people after all, and I have no doubt, for my part, that an example of tolerance, of generosity, of magnanimity will be set by the numerical majority, and that their natural measure of ascendancy due, not to their possessions, but to their intelligence, their education and their power, will be awarded with a liberal hand to the minority when the measure of Home Rule takes place. These prophets of civil war said something of the same kind when the Church Disestablishment question was in vogue. We were told that the waters of the Boyne were to be reddened with blood; but the Church was disestablished and there was not a shot fired; all was peace, and I believe the cause of Protestantism and the cause of religion benefited greatly. They say that separation is the goal. You may make separation the goal if you persist. It may be that the Irish people may at last despair, as many of them have despaired in the past, and that despair may produce the feeling to which hon. gentlemen referred when they spoke of that feeling of hostility. But I say that separation is not now the goal of the mass of the Irish people. They are simply making a demand for those rights which are their due and for a fair share of self-government and a tolerable condition of existence upon the soil upon which they were born and on which they desire to live. I ask you to listen to the eloquent words in which Mr. Gladstone combatted this argument, because I know it is a plausible and specious one, and I believe that to agree in it would be fatal to the cause it would be designed to serve. If we shrink on this ground, we will be sure to precipitate some effort, abortive it may be, but hardly less calamitous, towards the separation which you dread. Mr. Gladstone says:

“What is there in separation that would tend to make it advantageous to Ireland? As an island with many hundreds of miles of coasts, with a weak marine, and a people far more military than nautical in its habits, of small population and limited in her present resources; why should she expose herself to the risks of invasion and to the certainty of enormous cost in the creation and maintenance of a navy for defence, rather than remain under the shield of the greatest maritime power in the world, bound by every consideration of honor and of interest to guard her? Why should she be supposed desirous to forego the advantage of an absolute community of trade with the greatest among all commercial countries, to become an alien to the market which consumes, say nine-tenths of her produce, and instead of using the broad and universal paths of enterprise now open to her, to carve out for herself new and narrow ways as a third rate state? Why, when her children have now, man by man, the free run of the vast British Empire, upon terms of absolute

equality with every native of Great Britain, should she be deemed so blind as to intend cutting them away from the greatest of all the marts in the world for human enterprise, energy and talent, and to doom them to be strangers among nearly 300,000,000 men with whom they have now a common citizenship? Why is she to be insensible to all the indications nature herself has given of the destiny of Ireland to be our partner in weal and woe, and why should she be ready to enter upon a desperate contest of strength with a people of six times her number, of twelve times her wealth, inferior to her in no single element of courage or tenacity? This people, to whom even justice itself has never yet enabled her to offer an effective military resistance, are now to be frightened out of their propriety lest Ireland should offer them violence, to tear herself away, unattracted to any foreign centre (for there is none), unwarmed by sympathy beyond her shores (for she would have none), unblest by Heaven, and quarrelling suicidally with all that could minister to her material or her political welfare? No; the truth is, and history proves it, England has been strong enough to be, even through a course of generations, unjust to Ireland; and now it is not want of strength that will put a stop to such injustice, but her better will, her better knowledge, the action of the nation substituted for the action of the few, and an improved and improving moral sense in public affairs. What reason here indicates, history proves; for never did separation become a substantive idea in Ireland until the one unhappy period when the warlike instincts of France coincided with that infatuation of the British Government which in Ireland raised tyranny and sanguinary oppression, as well as the basest corruption, to their climax. Only superlative iniquity led Ireland even for a moment to dream of separating. Even then, the remedy would have been worse than the disease. None but the few fanatics of crime dream now of such a thing; and they who imputed to the Irish nation treat it as a nation made up of men who are at once and equally traitors, knaves and fools."

So I say that those considerations which do most deeply affect us all, which affect us all, as I pointed out the other day, in our material condition, which affect our own relations to the power adjoining us, the maintenance of amity and cordiality which ought to be one of the highest objects, as long as it can be honorably obtained, of Canadian statesmanship, which affect us as citizens of the Empire in respect to which we are partners in its prosperity and sharers in its shame, those considerations do justify, nay, I will add that they demand, our action now in such sort as may further the cause which stands in such a critical position to-day. I believe that, if this ill-omened measure which we reprobate should become the law of the land, a period of difficulty and distress for Ireland and for all of us hardly exemplified before will supervene. Let us then do our feeble best to avert it. I believe that the postponement for any long period of a measure of Home Rule will make that measure much less valuable for the great and chief purpose for which we hope to see it accomplished, for the restoration of the bonds of affection, and concord, and amity, and friendship between the two islands; and, therefore, let us do what we can to avert the ill, let us do what in us lies to procure the good.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker: It affords me great pleasure to rise on this occasion and to say a few words to endorse the motion placed in your hands by my hon. friend for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). It affords me also very sincere pleasure, as it must afford pleasure to every friend of Home Rule, to be able to congratulate the House and the speakers who have preceded me upon the tone of the discussion up to the present time. With the exception of a few remarks the discussion has been of a character to strengthen the resolutions placed in your hands, without giving offence to persons in this House or out of it. To these resolutions the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has proposed an amendment, and that amendment which I cannot support, is, however, in one sense gratifying to me, because, while it halts at that portion of the resolutions which deal with the question of coercion, it reiterates the warm expression of the Parliament of Canada uttered on two former occasions in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. All through the discussion I have noticed that every speaker who opposed the resolutions based his objec-

Mr. BLAKE.

tions to that feature which deals with the question of coercion, but every one has taken advantage of the opportunity to express his warm sympathies with a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to this House as coming fresh from the country, and it is gratifying to all friends of the measure now under discussion to feel that so far as indications go to show, the representatives coming fresh from the people have, so far as they have spoken, expressed their warm approval of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. As I have remarked, the amendment objects to that portion of the original motion which deals with the question of coercion; and for the alleged reason, as stated in the amendment, as well as by the hon. mover of the amendment in his speech, that we have not sufficient acquaintance with the facts upon which the Coercion Bill is based, that consequently we ought not to pronounce an opinion upon it, and that we are not in a position to deal intelligently with the question. Now I think that objection can be fairly met in this way: We have within our reach in the reading room and in the library, sufficient particulars of the Bill to enable us to form an idea of its probable effects. But even in the absence of such information, I hold that the motion now in your hands is a proper one, and is entitled to the support of every hon. member in this House. It is not upon the details of the measure that the House is called upon to pronounce an opinion. If I understand it we are called upon here to pronounce an opinion as to the principle of coercion itself, and for that purpose we need not go to the reading room nor the library, nor need we refer to papers to form an opinion upon that subject. All that is necessary to establish our right to pronounce against that measure, is to quote leading statesmen on both sides of the House in the British Parliament, who have over and over again declared that every system of coercion which has been tried for nearly a century in Ireland, has proved an utter and miserable failure. They have gone further, and have said that not only had they failed in the past, but they must miserably fail in the future, and that some other means must be found to pacify Ireland and to restore peace and harmony in that country. Now, we all regret that Mr. Gladstone failed in his efforts to carry the measure of Home Rule which he introduced into Parliament. I think very few people in this country, who have made themselves acquainted with the terms of that Bill, as introduced in the Imperial Parliament, could approve of it for many reasons. The most objectionable feature of the Bill was that part of it which provided that the Imperial Parliament should have the power of imposing taxation in Ireland without the Irish people having a voice or representative in the Parliament imposing that taxation. That was not the only objection to the exclusion of Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament. Besides, we know a portion of the English people look with suspicion upon any measure of Home Rule, because they say it is the entering wedge, that the ultimate desire of the Irish people is separation from the British Crown. This is an unfair argument to use against the advocates of Home Rule in this country, who are as loyal as those who differ from us on this subject. It is unfair to the people of this country who advocate Home Rule and who are loyal to the Mother Country and desire to maintain the integrity of the Empire with as much sincerity as do those who speak loudly against the principle of Home Rule. The exclusion of Irish representatives from the British Parliament was objectionable, because I consider that if the Bill had been carried in that shape one of the most important links calculated to bind Ireland to the Mother Country would have been severed. We, of course, understand that Mr. Gladstone did not directly commit himself to the clauses of the Bill as they then stood, and that his expectation was that the vote on the second reading was to affirm the principle of the Bill.

while the details were to be modified at a later period. In this country we are told by public speakers and by the press that Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Liberal party, did all he could to carry a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. Although I hold that the Liberal party, and the Conservative party, until a very recent date, were equally responsible for the misgovernment of Ireland, I am pleased to confess that Mr. Gladstone, in taking the stand he did and becoming the advocate of Home Rule, endeared himself to every man in Ireland, and he received from the Irish people all the credit he could reasonably expect, not only for his great efforts in placing that measure before the British Parliament, but for the great ability and energy he has displayed in seeking to effect the amelioration of the condition of Ireland. But while he is entitled, as leader of that great party, to the thanks of the Irish people for his honest, able and sincere efforts in that direction, I must say at the same time that a portion of the Liberal party, that portion which severed connection with Mr. Gladstone, and refused any longer to follow him as leader—that that is the political party and the political element in the Imperial Parliament which is responsible for the failure of Mr. Gladstone's measure, and are responsible to-day, owing to the support they gave to the present Government, for the absence of a Home Rule measure in the present Parliament. So, in speaking on this question, I think it only fair to put it in that way. I speak no more as a Conservative than as a Liberal, and without reference to any political position I hold in this country, but thinking only as to what will best promote the cause we are advocating, and I am bound to say that up to a recent period both political parties in England were equally responsible for the misgovernment of Ireland. To Mr. Gladstone is due the credit of having broken the ice, and introduced a measure of Home Rule for which he is entitled to the gratitude of Irishmen; but the portion of the Liberal party which deserted his ranks must be held responsible for the failure of that measure at that time. I say further that they are still responsible, while occupying their present position, for the absence of a Home Rule measure, and perhaps for the presence of this coercion measure now before the English Parliament. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in stating his views upon that question, gave expression to them, as he generally does, with vigor and with warmth, and he perhaps used expressions that had better not have been used. If the hon. gentleman failed to establish his argument in favor of coercion, if he failed to convince this House that they ought to vote against the motion now before it, he certainly did not fail to convince me that he is a believer in coercion, because in alluding to Mr. Parnell, the leader of the Irish party in the English Parliament, and the Irishmen who form the Land League, he said they were convicted of complicity in the Phoenix Park murders, because the *London Times* said so, and he condemned that body, notwithstanding that the League, under the leadership of Mr. Parnell, has rendered as much service, and more service, in maintaining order and keeping the peace than all the police force sent to Ireland. The course urged by Mr. Parnell and his followers has been to advise the people to patiently endure their wrongs and to keep within constitutional bounds, and if they did so they were bound to ultimately succeed. And that idea has been acted on very generally by the Irish people. But the mover of the amendment, in order to show the necessity of coercion in Ireland, in order to prove what a deplorable condition the country was in and that the Government of England was justified in bringing that coercive measure before Parliament, quoted reports of certain judges in Ireland to show that the measure was absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, by accident hit upon the reports of certain judges which were very strong in that direction and were not at all favorable to the Irish people. I have

a few extracts here; I have the report of other Irish judges of equal eminence to those quoted by the mover of the amendment, and they show a very different state of things from that presented by the hon. member. Their reports establish different facts entirely. I will read a few of them. Lord Justice Fitzgerald, at Meath, in addressing the jury at the Assizes, said:

"Gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the county of Meath:—The Crown solicitor's list for the present Assizes contains only four cases, one of which has laid over from the previous Assizes, and of the remaining three one was for larceny and receiving, and two for violent assault. In fact your county, as I am led to believe, is in its usual condition, that is to say, there is an absence of anything of the character of serious crime throughout the county, and that is the only subject with which we are at the present time dealing."

The report of that large county does not show a very bad state of affairs there. I have also the report respecting King's county from Judge Lawson, who was one of the judges quoted by the hon. gentleman, and who gave the very strongest report as to the existence of crime in different parts of Ireland. But this said Judge Lawson at the Assizes of King's county, though the reporter does not seem to have been able to follow his words clearly, gives the following:—

"Judge Lawson was heard with difficulty in his brief address to the grand jury. He was understood to say the business to go before them was extremely light. There were but five bills from the entire county, and none of them were of an important character. The county inspector had also reported that the county was in a satisfactory condition; so he had nothing more to do than congratulate them on the lightness of their work."

Sir Michael Morris, Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, opened the Assizes for Westmeath. Here is the verbatim report of the proceedings:

"The Lord Chief Justice, in addressing the Grand Jury, said: Mr. Hancock and gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the county of Westmeath, I am informed that there is but one bill to go before you, which will, I am sure, detain you for a very short time indeed. As there is one absent from your number, the majority of you will have to sign the bill. The grand jury then retired, and returned into court, finding 'no bill' in the only case submitted, which was a case of rape against a private soldier in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers, and the prisoner was accordingly discharged."

Then, in the county of Roscommon:

"The assizes for the county of Roscommon were opened by Judge Murphy. The grand jury having been called and re-sworn, his lordship congratulated them on the condition of their county, and said the bills to go before them were very few in number, and none of them calling for any comment from him."

In Sligo, where he was presented with a pair of white gloves, Judge Lawson addressed the grand jury as follows:—

"The business they had to discharge was exceedingly light. There were only three bills in all to go before them. The only case of any importance was a charge of stabbing, but in investigating that charge they would not require any assistance from him."

These are a few reports taken from the public press, and I dare say others might be added to their number, showing what the opinions of the judges were as to the state of the country, and they convey a very different impression from the reports which were quoted by the mover of the amendment. The arguments of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), who on this occasion, as on former occasions, has expressed his deep and warm sympathy with the Irish people, with the Home Rule movement, and with the motion which is now in your hands, would have been quite as strong if he could have refrained from throwing an insult across the floor of the House to myself, which can affect the question in no way, which can add no strength to his arguments or do any good in promoting the question which is now under discussion. If it pleases the hon. gentleman to take that line towards me, I consider it has done me no harm, and, as far as it personally affects myself, I am not going to intrude my own case before the consideration of this House when a question of such importance is under discussion. But I must refer to his remarks when dealing with the action of this House during last Session upon this same question, because that it is not a personal question at all, and because I do not wish that he should place the

action of this House in any other than its true light. For that reason I would just say a few words with regard to the amendment which was moved by myself and which he criticised so severely and condemned so unreservedly. I prefer using the evidence of those who are known to sympathise as strongly as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) with the question of Home Rule, to anything that I could myself say on the subject. The hon. gentleman stated that, because the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition had been voted down by the passage of the amendment moved by myself, it was hailed in the Old Country as a victory by the enemies of Home Rule, and used, for that purpose, to the detriment of the cause of Home Rule. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, I think, did not read the press, and the Irish press especially, upon that question. I am not now going to discuss the merits of the resolution introduced by the leader of the Opposition as compared with the amendment which I moved myself, but I am going to give the opinion of that portion of the Irish press most devoted to the Irish cause, showing their appreciation of the relative value of the two motions submitted to this House. *United Ireland* of the 15th May, 1886, had the following article:—

“Great capital is sought to be made by a couple of English Tory papers out of the fact that the Dominion House of Parliament has by a large majority rejected the resolution of Mr. Blake, leader of the Opposition, in favour of self-government.”

I could easily understand that if that were the whole story telegraphed across the Atlantic, the enemies of the Home Rule in the British Parliament would have used that fact against the movement in Ireland and in the Imperial House of Commons. They would have declared that public opinion in Canada in 1886 was not the same as it had been in 1882, when my resolutions were carried by the unanimous vote of this House and the almost unanimous vote of the Senate. But *United Ireland* goes on to say:

“On looking at the telegraphed report of the debate on the question we are opaque enough to fail to discern any particular ground for Tory delight. The debate, we perceive, lasted until five o'clock in the morning, and in the result an amendment of Mr. Costigan, a member of the Ministry, was adopted. The amendment differed very little in substance, though it did in construction, from the proposed resolution. It expressed a cordial interest in the welfare and prosperity of the Irish people, and adhered to the sentiments expressed in the former address to the Crown on the subject of granting a measure of self-government to Ireland. While declining to forward any fresh address, having regard to the snub then administered by the Tory Government—”

But we know that it was under Mr. Gladstone's Government that the Colonial Secretary sent the despatch he did. This article proceeds:

—“the Canadian Parliament reiterates its good wishes for Ireland, and earnestly hopes that some measure satisfactory to its people may be passed. Now, where is the cause of our contemporaries' unholy joy? Between amendment and resolution it is all but a case of tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. The advantage, if any, is on the side of Irish liberty; for it is from the responsible Ministry these good wishes emanate, not from the irresponsible Opposition.”

There is the appreciation of the two resolutions by the leading Irish organ in Ireland on that question; and I am satisfied to leave the matter there and let that decide as to the merits of the two resolutions. I make no pretension to claim that the amendment I moved was more useful, that it was stronger or went further in favor of Home Rule than the resolution moved by the leader of the Opposition. All that I claim is this—that in reiterating the sentiments expressed by this House on a former occasion, it became more consistent with the action of that House, more acceptable to the House, and more likely to secure the votes of hon. members. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) alluded to one fact to which I desire also to allude. He alluded to the great number of Irishmen living in the Republic to the south of us, and to the warm sympathy which they felt towards Ireland, and he expressed the fear that a continuance of the present unhappy state of affairs in Ireland might produce a discontent among our countrymen in

Mr. COSTIGAN:

the United States which might in time produce serious consequences to us in Canada. Now, I hold that there is no difference of opinion between the Irishmen in the United States and those in Canada on the broad question of Home Rule and justice to Ireland. I believe the Irishmen in both countries are looking forward with an equally earnest hope to the time when some measure of self-government shall be given to Ireland. There is just this difference, however, between them: The Irishmen who have gone to the United States to make it their home, and to contribute to the prosperity and progress of that country, in leaving their native land, severed all connection with the British Government and British institutions. On that account they entertain feelings of resentment, and having severed that connection, there was nothing to prevent that feeling from growing in intensity and becoming evident whenever occasion presented itself for giving expression to it. On the other hand, Irishmen who left the motherland and came to Canada to cast in their lot with us here, assumed a different attitude, and for good reasons. They have not severed their connection with the British flag or British institutions; but in this country, although a portion of the British Empire, they found that freedom and protection which they did not possess in the land from which they came. There was no reason, therefore, why they should entertain any feeling of hostility towards the British Empire such as was felt by those who went to the United States. Having taken up their residence in Canada, and become Canadian citizens, they felt it a duty, which they have always discharged, to be as true to the country of their adoption as the Irishmen of the United States are to the Stars and Stripes. I say this because I do not apprehend the same degree of danger of aggression from Irishmen in the United States that some men believe to exist. Those who have watched the course of things among the Irishmen in the United States know that they have nothing but feelings of warm gratitude to the people and Parliament of Canada for the action they have taken in dealing with this question. When American Irishmen consider that this Parliament, at a trying time, when famine visited the land of their forefathers, gave out of the public treasury of this country, with a willing hand and with the approval of the Canadian people, a very liberal sum for the relief of distress at that time; when they remember that the Irish minority came to this Parliament and asked it to express sympathy with the Irish people in their demand for Home Rule, and the Canadian Parliament voted that sympathy with the unanimous vote of this Chamber, as well as with the vote of the other Chamber, they must accept those acts as proofs of our sympathy and as strong claims on their gratitude. The question came up again in 1886, when this Parliament was ready again to reiterate its expression of sympathy. All these things must establish a kindly feeling in the breasts of the Irishmen of America towards the people of this country. I believe, Sir, that the motion which has been placed in your hands by my hon. friend, the member for Montreal, will carry, and will receive a large and generous support from the members of this House. Like the hon. leader of the Opposition, I have noticed in the papers criticisms of the motion, and also of the mover. Now, I hold that the resolutions come very appropriately from my hon. friend representing Montreal Centre, the largest Irish constituency in the Dominion. That constituency took the first move in entering a protest against the measure of coercion now before the Imperial Parliament, and my hon. friend is following up its action in making this motion. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who has, with his usual ability, spoken on this question, has called the attention of my hon. friend to what seemed to him certain defects in the resolutions now before you. Instead of moving an amendment, he said he threw out suggestions to my hon. friend of certain changes in the

wording of the resolution. I quite agree with the remarks of that hon. gentleman, so far as they apply to that clause of the resolution which defines the system of government proposed to be given to Ireland. I think it is rather a departure from the former action of this Parliament, and being rather definite in its character it might subject us to unfavorable criticisms. I trust the suggestion made, therefore, will be accepted, and that the clause will be modified so as to reiterate the opinion expressed by previous Parliaments. The hon. gentleman took exception to another feature—not strong exception, if I understood him, for I think he expressed a willingness to support the resolution, even if the changes which he suggested were not made. The other change is as the term used in connection with the Coercion Act, now before the British Parliament, and the question is whether the word "protest" should be in it or not. Well, we all have, I trust, the same desire in dealing with this question, so far as the question of principle is concerned, if we can maintain that, it is not of very great importance what words may be used and if by the re-wording of the resolution, my hon. friend, the mover of the resolution, may secure a larger measure of support, I would advise him to make that change, especially as the hon. the leader of the Opposition having advised it. The motives of the hon. member for Montreal Centre could not be questioned if he yielded to the suggestion. I would, however, advise the mover, before making this second change with regard to the wording of the protest, to assure himself that in making that change, he is going to promote the principle at stake, by adding materially to the support he would otherwise get. Otherwise, I would be against the change suggested. I am not in the habit of detaining the House at any great length. I feel that I have discharged a duty incumbent upon myself in saying a few words on this question, not, as is frequently said by hon. members, that I require to say anything in explanation of the vote I intend to give, because the vote requires no explanation. It explains itself. The remarks I have made were intended to express my continued deep and heartfelt sympathy with any movement calculated to assist in the amelioration of the unhappy condition of Ireland, and if by making any appeal to this House, I can contribute to add to the support of the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, I consider that in doing so I discharge a duty incumbent upon me and accomplish some good. Therefore, I would earnestly ask our friends on both sides to give this motion the favorable, patient consideration they have given previous motions in the same sense, and to give it, what is more important still, the support of their vote. I thank you, Sir, and this honorable House, for the attention with which you have listened to my remarks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of detaining the House in the discussion of this important question, had it not been for some remark of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Referring to the discussion in this House, in 1886, over the resolution then passed, he arrogated to himself all the credit for those resolutions. Now, it will be no harm to refer shortly to the events connected with the introduction of those resolutions. It is well known that people in Ottawa, and possibly throughout the Dominion, who were anxious to get resolutions of sympathy with Home Rule adopted by this House, appealed strongly to the hon. gentleman himself and other hon. gentlemen on that side to introduce resolutions for the purpose of taking the sense of this House in regard to the question of Home Rule. In the first place, these hon. gentlemen said, in answer to these appeals, that they had felt the pulse of the House with regard to the probability of carrying such resolutions, and declared it would be imprudent to introduce any at all. But on their own responsibility, claiming to speak in the name of the Irish people of the Dom-

inion, they sent instead a cable despatch to the Old Country stating that the Irish population of Canada were in perfect sympathy with Home Rule. That was all that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and those associated with him were disposed to do. After the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen on this side had waited six or eight weeks after the House had met for the purpose of giving hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of moving in the matter, the hon. the leader of the Opposition moved in the question himself. Then those hon. gentlemen opposite appeared to be extremely anxious to do a great deal in the same direction, but until then they were very unwilling to move at all, and the course they took was to thwart if possible, or at any rate interfere, with the action taken by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) tried to show that the resolution which the leader of the Opposition had prepared was, in his opinion, not just the thing suited to the occasion. There are times, we know, in the history of every cause when it is well to act, and there are times when action will be of very little avail. So I say, if the hon. gentleman had seen his way last Session to take the action he proposes to take to-day, if he had seen his way then to give the leader of the Opposition the assistance he justly deserved, the weight of his little finger would then have been worth more than the weight of his whole body at present. Changes have since taken place in England. A Government that sympathised with the wrongs of Ireland, led by Mr. Gladstone, was then in power, and anxious to do everything possible; whereas now another Government is in power, which is not inclined at all to sympathise with the demand for Home Rule. The hon. gentleman, who then was very backward in acting, is now prepared to act, and I am glad to say hon. gentlemen on this side are willing to act under any circumstances. They were willing to act last year and supported resolutions which did not meet with the entire approbation of this side, rather than prevent a unanimous expression of opinion, and they are equally prepared to vote on this occasion in support of the principle of Home Rule. Had the hon. gentleman to-day persisted in the course he laid out himself, had he persisted in holding to the wording of the resolution, no doubt he would receive the active co-operation of hon. members on this side. I give the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) credit for the course he has taken in acceding to the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, by adopting the words suggested as better than those embodied in the resolution itself. In accepting largely the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, he has shown a desire to co-operate with my hon. friend. For my part I have always sympathised with Home Rule. I believe that Ireland is entitled to a measure of Home Rule. I believe that the question of Home Rule also embodies the question of protection to the minority, and I am satisfied that the English House of Commons will never pass a measure that will allow of any injustice to the minority. I think that this question of the risks which the minority will have to run, if a measure of this kind be granted, is simply a bugbear got up for the purpose of frightening people into the idea that injustice will be done. I do not think there is any possibility of injustice being done, but still to remove suspicion from the minds of the people I believe the measure will be so framed that the rights of the minority will be strictly protected. We are aware that landlordism in Ireland has been the great trouble ever since that country became part of the Empire of Great Britain. There are in Ireland about 650,000 tenant farmers. There are 538,000 of these who pay an annual rent ranging from £1 up to £20. There are 121,000 who pay an average rent of £56 a year or about \$280. The entire rent collected from the tenant farmers of Ireland is in the neighborhood of £10,417,000 sterling, or about

\$52,000,000 annually. This is a very large sum of money, and, when we consider that the average sum has been collected from those people in the shape of rents for the last eighty years, we may well wonder how the resources, the frugality and the struggling efforts of those people have been equal to the task of producing such an amount annually. Is it to be wondered at that there is poverty and wretchedness in that country to a degree not found in many others? It is evident that the very large amount collected in the way of exorbitant rents is what is crushing those people down, keeping them in a condition of poverty and wretchedness, and causing a great deal of the trouble, the uneasiness and the disloyalty which have been exhibited from year to year. In the introductory remarks made by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), he said he was glad to notice that none of the press of Canada was opposed to Home Rule, that the united press of the country was in favor of that principle. The hon. gentleman surely had not read the *Ottawa Citizen* of the day on which he made his speech, or he would have found a very pointed article in that paper in opposition to Home Rule. I do not think there is in the Dominion a Reform journal in opposition to Home Rule. I do not know of one, but the hon. gentleman will find a very pointed article in opposition to Home Rule in the columns of the *Ottawa Citizen*. We have a system of Home Rule in Canada, and I believe that, if Ireland had such a system as we have, a Government to control her own local affairs, but amenable to the powers held in London by the Queen, it would be a system under which they would conduct their affairs quietly and peaceably. We conduct our own affairs in the several Provinces, and, of course, we are responsible to the Federal Head for the laws we pass, which can be disallowed by the Federal Head. We have got along pretty fairly under that system. We have had some jarring, but we have got along pretty fairly after all, and I think that if Ireland had such a system it would be, at all events, more suitable for her than to continue in the position she is in at present. We know that when we got Home Rule in Canada some members of the English Parliament were pointedly opposed to any such system as we have now. Lord Derby declared that if Canada was granted the measure of self-government she asked, it would lead to one of two things, either total separation of the colony from the Mother Country, or the establishment of another Republic on the Continent of America. We have had Home Rule here, and have carried it on very successfully, and I do not think the people of this Dominion are getting more disloyal because they enjoy that Home Rule. I believe we are just as loyal as any colony belonging to the British Empire, so that the prognostications of Lord Derby were no more fulfilled than would be the ideas expressed with regard to the separation of Ireland from Great Britain if she obtained Home Rule. It has been said during this discussion that Mr. Gladstone's Bill was very objectionable, that it did not contain the necessary provision to protect the rights of the minority, that there were some things in that Bill that could not be accepted. Well, Mr. Gladstone, when he introduced that Bill, and during the discussion of the measure, stated that only the principle of the measure was at issue and invited suggestions from both sides of the House in regard to details. When he went before the country he said he was prepared, in the spirit of fair play, to accept from anyone that wished to make suggestions anything that might be thought of advantage to complete that Bill. That was his position and it was a very creditable position. So, when any person attempts to show that that Bill was decidedly objectionable and should be rejected on that account, it is hardly fair, in view of what Mr. Gladstone stated, to say that he brought forward a cast-iron measure which must be accepted in the shape in which he presented it, for it was rather a measure in regard to the

Mr. McMULLEN.

details of which he was prepared to consider the views of those who were disposed to differ with him on that question. I cannot close my remarks without saying something in regard to the course the hon. the leader of the Opposition has taken on this occasion. If he had followed out the course that hon. gentlemen opposite who have been taking an active part in this matter took in 1886, he might have moved an amendment which might have seriously interfered with the unanimous decision of this House in regard to this question. He has not done that, but has shown his earnest and honest desire to meet the case fairly and honorably, and to do what he can in the cause of Home Rule for Ireland. If the hon. gentleman opposite had taken the same course in 1886, I have not the slightest doubt that possibly we might have been able to send home a unanimous resolution, and under the very advantageous circumstances in which the country was then placed in being governed by Mr. Gladstone, placed it in his hands, and asked that Home Rule should be granted to Ireland; but, simply because they thought it might be a means of his securing part of the laurels they were anxious to secure, they interfered and tried to cripple and destroy the effect of that resolution by amendments. I remember that on that occasion the leader of the Opposition invited the Minister of Inland Revenue to interview him and to give him an opportunity of meeting him fairly and agreeing upon the wording and the shape of the resolution. It was understood, when the leader of the Government appointed a day for the discussion, that Mr. Blake invited anyone who took an interest in the question to suggest any change that might be made in order as far as possible to have unanimous action upon it, but in the time that elapsed from the introduction of the question until it was finally disposed of, instead of meeting the honorable and candid invitation extended by the leader of the Opposition, they took advantage of the time to move an amendment and, if possible, to interfere with the united action he was anxious should be secured. I think, had they taken the course which they should have taken upon that occasion, we might have been able very materially to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone, who was then struggling to carry this measure through Parliament. Now, on this occasion the hon. leader of the Opposition has shown that he is not disposed to interfere with the hon. mover in his course, but he has suggested certain things which, I believe, the House as a whole will endorse, and these suggestions, I am glad to know, have been largely accepted, and I hope that this House will come to a unanimous decision in favor of the resolutions. Any person who has travelled through Ireland and has seen the circumstances of the people, the poverty and wretchedness that he meets on every hand, must feel that there is something wrong in the condition of that country. He sees that although the soil is so rich, the climate so salubrious, and the population so evidently healthy, there must be something wrong in the government of that country, or the condition of the people would be better than it is. He sees on all hands evidences of ancient greatness that are being obliterated from year to year, and the country is becoming more pauperised every year. Now, I think when we come to consider all these facts, it is our duty, while we enjoy all the advantages of self government, humbly to express, in a courteous manner, our sincere desire that those across the waters with whom we sympathise should be granted the same measure of self-government which we enjoy. When I was home in Ireland a few years ago, I was quite surprised to find the amount of ignorance that prevails in that country with regard to England and English affairs. I believe that in this country there are more men, in proportion to the population, who have been to London and travelled through England, than there are in Ireland who have crossed the channel. You

will meet men fifty, sixty and seventy years of age, who have never been outside of Ireland, and who know very little about what transpires beyond their own neighborhood. Very few of them know anything about England. They are just as ignorant about English life and affairs as they are of the people of the United States, and perhaps far more so. Now, Sir, I would not have said anything at all on the subject, had it not been for the remarks dropped by the last speaker, who seemed anxious to remove blame that rested upon him for the course he took in 1886. However, I am not going into this now. I suppose, seeing that we have not the prospect of going before the country in a few months, the hon. gentleman is willing that the suggestions made as to the wording of the resolution by the leader of the Opposition should be accepted, and that his advice should be taken in what we do now in order that we may send home a unanimous resolution in favor of Home Rule. Now, there is one thing which I believe tends largely to produce an unfortunate condition of things in Ireland, that I have not referred to, and that is fixing the rents for fifteen years. I think that is generally admitted to have been a mistake. No doubt at the time it was done it was thought to be for the advantage of the tenants, but I think it is admitted today that the period was altogether too long to fix the rent at a certain sum. We know that the facilities for the shipment of produce from this continent to Great Britain are becoming greater every year, and I believe that the enormous shipment of produce from this country has tended greatly to reduce the value of the products of Ireland, and, as a result, tends to prevent these tenants from paying rents, simply because they cannot reap the same prices they did some years ago; and just in proportion as the value of what they raise is reduced, in that proportion the landlords should be willing to reduce the rents. If they adopted a system similar to that which prevails here, of renting on shares, or taking a certain percentage of the crops in place of certain fixed rents, they would have no trouble; but having fixed the rents for fifteen years, whether the crops are good or bad, whether the prices are high or low, the landlords expect to receive their rents just the same. I think that is a wrong system, and they should be willing to share with these poor, unfortunate, struggling creatures a fair share of the loss they have to sustain when prices are low.

Mr. COURSOL. At this late hour of the debate I shall say but very few words. I could not give a silent vote on this question, and I feel it my duty to say a few words inasmuch as I represent, with my colleagues from Montreal, a population containing a very large, influential and wealthy Irish element. As an old Home Ruler myself, I feel at home when I am with them. When I have to speak of the wrongs of Ireland and the way Ireland has been treated, they are accustomed to my voice. The views and opinions of the Irish people in this country have found expressions on many occasions in a very forcible manner, and at last they have been brought before the Parliament of Canada in the shape of resolutions from the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). They are the real echo of the sentiments of that large population I represent, and, therefore it is my duty, on the present occasion, to give them an unqualified support. When, years ago, Mr. Speaker, we were struggling for popular government in this Dominion of ours, now so prosperous, now so attractive to immigrants from other nations, I remember how comforted and encouraged we were by the expressions of sympathy that we received from all parts of the world, and of hope for success in the cause we had undertaken. I think I have a peculiar right to say we, as I was a very young man then and supported with all my energy the men who risked their lives on the battlefields, and their heads on the gallows, for the success of the great cause of constitutional government. Therefore, I feel that it is a peculiar duty and a privilege for me to express

my sympathies on this occasion with the Irish people in their effort to obtain Home Rule. It is one of the privileges of a country occupying a position like that of Ireland to elicit sympathy and feelings of fraternity. It is natural that the world should sympathise with an oppressed nation; it is natural that other nations should tender sympathy with a nation which has been so oppressed as Ireland. It cannot be matter for surprise, therefore, that we should seek to interfere? And why should we not interfere? It is said that these resolutions might offend the Parliament of England. And why should they offend? Surely they do not offend England. England herself has shown the example of interfering in favor of oppressed people. She has glorified herself upon being the friend of the oppressed. History has recorded her appeals in behalf of Poland, Hungary and Italy. We have, therefore, the example of the English people before us, and we should not hesitate for a moment to extend to the Irish people our sympathy, for the conduct of England on various occasions is a guarantee that we may properly do so. The introduction of this Coercion Bill, which is an un-British measure, would have the effect of destroying a great British institution, trial by jury. The foundation of the trial by jury is, that every man in England, or under the British Crown, shall have the right to be tried by his peers. But when an offence or a supposed offence is committed under this Bill, what will be the course pursued towards the alleged offender? He will be taken from the city of Dublin, or from any part of Ireland across the channel, and will be sent before an English jury to be tried. And by whom will he be tried? By men who must necessarily, in the present struggle, be prejudiced by religion and blinded by partisanship against the prisoner. We would not call that British justice and trial by peers, and such a system must bring into contempt the whole system of trial by jury. The trial should take place in the country where the offence is committed. If there is not sufficient force at the present time to protect the courts and satisfactorily conduct the trials it should be provided, but the trial should take place where the crime was committed. The venue might be changed to some other place in the country, but prisoners should not be sent across the channel and tried among a population who must be more or less prejudiced against them. The time has arrived when the people of England should decide that something must be done to remedy the grievances of Ireland. If the English people would only decide that something must be done they would speedily find a way of doing it. It is impossible to say that in England statesmen cannot be found to settle the Irish question satisfactorily to the Irish people and to the landlords. There must be something behind the scenes which prevents such a settlement being effected. I dare say in this country we could find statesmen who could settle the Irish question, if it was left to them to settle, in a fair way. I heard yesterday, to my great surprise, a member of this House state that the resolution should not be adopted by the House because Mr. Parnell had signed a certain letter, which was read. But I ask what proof was there that Mr. Parnell ever signed that letter? The hon. gentleman ought to have read from another portion of the same paper the denial of Mr. Parnell and his friends. That is not the proper way to administer justice impartially and seek to secure support. Surely a little more respect is due to the words of a public man like Mr. Parnell, one of the ablest members of the British Parliament, and a Protestant. It was absurd to say that Ireland should not obtain Home Rule because her people could not conduct her own affairs in a constitutional manner. Why, there are men like Mr. Parnell, Justin McCarthy, Sexton, and hundreds of others I could name, who were fully competent to administer the affairs of any country. The idea is puerile, and I am sure very shortly other ideas will prevail. When England, through her rulers, gives Ireland fair play and a government like ours,

and secures a settlement of the difficulties between tenants and landlords, it will be a bright day for the British Crown. I am sure the granting of Home Rule in this year of Her Majesty's Jubilee would be a monument remembered by the world more than all the public and charitable institutions that would be founded. It would be the greatest event of the reign of our glorious Queen, and I hope it will be accomplished in order that Queen Victoria may be able to say she has freed a people who have been oppressed for so many years.

Mr. McCARTHY. The discussion has taken so wide a range, it may be well, perhaps, to recall the attention of the House to the matter upon which we shall by-and-bye, and before very long I trust, have to vote. I desire, in the statement I am about to make, to be as free as possible from making any imputation upon the motives of any hon. gentleman who has addressed the House. I desire to treat this matter in as calm and judicial a spirit as under the circumstances it can be dealt with, and I ask that the House shall be recalled to the position in which we stand here, and the powers with which we are invested and the rights we possess here as representatives of the Canadian people. We have been on other occasions invited to vote, and on one occasion we almost unanimously did vote, in favor of the general principle of the establishment of Home Rule for Ireland, and on a more recent occasion, though perhaps not with such unanimity, we also recorded and reaffirmed our former opinion in favor of that general principle. But it has always been to me a matter of some doubt, and that doubt was not lessened by the rebuke with which our first resolutions were received, whether we had not stepped beyond our sphere, whether we had not gone beyond our right and function as a Parliament or as an Assembly to advise Her Majesty as to how this question between Great Britain and Ireland should be dealt with. Now, we sit here as a Parliament it is true—as I believe, the greatest Parliament under the British Empire, except the Imperial Parliament itself, and with larger and wider powers, with that exception, than any other legislative body under the Crown of England. But after all we hold here but a delegated power. We have but the right which is conferred upon us under the charter enabling us as a Canadian people to govern ourselves, in the distribution of that power between the local legislative assemblies and this Parliament of Canada; and it is merely within that power and as far as that power goes, that, as it appears to me, we are sent here by the people of Canada to express their opinions. For my own part, I do not know and I do not feel that I have any right here to express the opinions of my constituents on this question of Home Rule—upon the question of how any particular measure should be decided or disposed of in the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. I do not know that my constituents, in honoring me with the position which I hold in this House, gave me any mandate to express their opinions, to represent them or to bind their views with my own upon this question. I do not deny that we have all got the right of petition to the throne; that is a right belonging to every British subject. But it is one thing to meet in our public halls and exercise the right of petition, and it is quite another and a different thing to pretend, as representatives of the people, to express opinions which are not merely the opinions of the individual members who record their votes, but purport to be—and to have any value should be—a representation of the opinions of those who sent us here. Now I may be met, and properly met, by the answer that this opinion of mine is not in accordance with the votes which I have given on two occasions, in support of the general principle of Home Rule. But we see where we are now being led. In 1882, I do not suppose there was any member of this House—I do not suppose

MR. COURSOL.

that to-day there is any member of this House, no matter upon what side of the Chair he may sit—who does not feel a desire that the difficulties which have occurred, and which are still unfortunately existing in Ireland, should be done away with by means of some measure of legislation or other, whatever means may be found of accomplishing that object. I do not suppose, therefore, that, in according to the general principle of Home Rule our hearty concurrence, as a means to that end, we went very far astray. But where are we now being led? One thing it was to express that general opinion; one thing it was to say that we believe, judging by the way in which we have found the measure of self-government which had been accorded to us had resulted in this country, and that it would probably produce a like result in Ireland—that, I say, was one thing, but we are now proposing to deal with a specific and particular measure submitted to the British Parliament and upon which that Parliament has the responsibility of deciding. That, I take it, is the point of the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). It is not merely to reiterate our former opinion on Home Rule that this resolution is moved. The hon. gentleman has told us candidly—or rather, so I infer from his address—that the reason this matter was brought before this assembly was that the Coercion Bill, as it is called, had been introduced by the Government of England, and that large and important meetings had been held throughout this country petitioning—as their right was and is to petition against that or any other matter which they thought affected their individual interest—petitioning against this measure. In that view the hon. gentleman thought proper to bring the matter up in this House, and ask us as a legislative body to express by this constitutional means our opinion upon this important question. If you eliminate from these resolutions the important paragraph relating to the question of the Coercion Bill, I do not suppose that the other part of them would have occupied, to any great extent, the attention of this House as this matter has occupied it. To that, therefore, I desire to take exception—not from any feeling of hostility to the Irish race, of which I am proud to be a member; not from any desire to prevent that race getting such a measure of freedom or self-government, such constitutional redress as they may be able to get in a proper way; I take this position from no such feeling, and I trust that no word of mine can possibly be used in support of the supposition that I entertain any such feeling. It is not for any such reason as that, that I take this view, but because I believe that we had better leave with the proper constituted Imperial authorities the questions which belong to them, and we will find we have quite enough to do here in Canada with the management of our own affairs. We are proud, Sir, to know that since 1840 we have had what is called responsible government in this country. We have won the right from the British Crown to govern ourselves, according to the well understood rules of constitutional government, and we have found, as a whole, that we have prospered in that way. But while that is so, are we not pretending to go a little too far? Are we not pretending to do too much when, not content with the liberty which we enjoy ourselves, we propose to dictate to the Imperial Parliament which has delegated to us these powers, what they should do under circumstances where they have great responsibility and full knowledge, whereas we have neither the knowledge nor the responsibility which belongs to that great body? What is this Coercion Bill, so called, and why has it been introduced? I am not going to argue to-night in favor of that measure, nor am I going to argue against it. I humbly admit differing altogether from hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, for whom their leader spoke, that my acquaintance with the subject is not sufficient to enable me to discuss it in that way on my own account and form a competent opinion upon it, much less to bind those whom

I represent in this House. The hon. gentleman opposite sneered at my two hon. friends who expressed an opinion to that effect, and said their speeches demonstrated their ignorance. Perhaps if he were candid he would have said,—and I think I will point out before I am done—that his knowledge on the subject is not quite so accurate as to enable him to cast a slur on hon. members on this side. I think hon. members on both sides of the House, if they are honest, will say that the percentage of members of this House who are prepared to assert that they know enough of this question to speak intelligently upon it, and to speak with the responsibility of members of Parliament, is very small indeed, though I do not suppose we are to be blamed for that. We have enough, as I have said before, to do in governing our own land, and we cannot pretend to grasp the whole world of politics and understand the minutiae of the different questions which, at one time or other, may arise in the Parliament of Great Britain. Now, if the Coercion Bill, so-called, is for the purpose of enabling the home authorities, the government of the Queen, to enforce the laws of the land, it is not, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said, effecting any change in the criminal law. It does, it is true, effect important changes in the procedure of that law. But there is nothing in the Act of Parliament, of which I have a copy—and I think the hon. gentleman spoke as if he had only read the statement of the Chief Secretary on the subject—there is nothing which, so far as I understand the criminal law, in the slightest degree creates offences, though, undoubtedly it creates changes in the procedure for the suppression of the crimes which, by the common law of England, and by various statutes passed from time to time have been created offences against which they are perhaps necessary if the bonds of civilised society are not to be altogether unloosened. We know that there was a Coercion Bill in 1880 for a limited period of time, and another in 1881, again for a limited period of time. We know that the latter was caused by a terrible tragedy which occurred in Phoenix Park, which the hon. leader of the Opposition has characterised as a massacre; and certainly we can all speak of it as the most diabolical murder of modern days. We are told that these Coercion Bills have only added to the difficulties instead of removing them; and we were told this afternoon by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) that that will always be so—that the attempt to have the laws of the land enforced must always be followed by meetings, by secret associations, by fresh and greater breaches of the criminal code. Well, Sir, that has not been found to be the result of these enforcements of the criminal law. I hold in my hand a small history of the English Parliament during the last five years, in which, speaking about coercion, the author tells us this fact, which I commend to the attention of this House:

“The improvement was very limited, it must be allowed; too slowly it developed; but eventually brightened considerably, and really another era had dawned for Ireland; if we consider the decrease in the number of agrarian outrages alone. In 1881 there were 4,431. The year following the passage of the Crimes Act saw 762 only, and murders having decreased from twenty-six in 1881 to none in 1884.”

That was the effect of the passage of the Crimes Bill in 1881. And when the period came for that Crimes Bill to be renewed we know the difficulties that were supposed to have occurred in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet; and it was said by some that it was owing to dissensions with regard to the renewal of that Bill that that Cabinet shortly afterwards fell. We know, too, as a matter of history, that Lord Salisbury's first Administration refused to renew the Crimes Bill, and from that time to this the Government of England has endeavored to govern Ireland by the ordinary law of the land. What has been the result? The result cannot be known to all; but when the Minister comes before the House of Commons and makes the statement to

that House which I am about to read, and asks for powers in order to secure respect for the law of the land, I do not know very well how we, sitting 4,000 miles away, have a right to criticise, much less to censure, that Government. Mr. W. H. Smith, in bringing this matter to the notice of the House of Commons used this language, after quoting Mr. Gladstone's own words used in 1881:

“Is that the state of Ireland—Is one in which the administration of justice has failed, and in which to a very considerable extent the influence of terror places in abeyance the discharge of civil duties and the exercise of civil rights. The powers we ask for are necessary to maintain social order. They are necessary to maintain the very existence of society upon the conditions in force and recognised by every civilised community.”

When the responsible Minister of the Crown, who has information not open to us here, comes down to the House of Commons and uses language like that, I do not know very well how even in the House of Commons the powers they ask are to be denied to them. They went further and said:

“So serious do we find the condition of affairs in Ireland to-day that we tell the House of Commons that if they refuse to give us the powers which we as a Government desire, after having for two years tried to govern the country by the ordinary laws of the land, we will surrender to others the responsibility of advising Her Majesty in the government of the country.”

The Government made that statement, and fortified it by facts in their information, some of which I have here and might mention, although I am not going to make anything like an exhaustive argument on this question. When I find the statement made by the Chief Secretary that out of over one thousand cases of crimes committed during the preceding year there had been only in the neighborhood of sixty convictions—and the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition establishes it; when we know that the people in the different parts of the country have joined associations for the purpose of compelling the landlords to come down to their terms; when we know that sometimes, growing out of those associations, crimes are committed, and sometimes crimes are committed not growing out of them, because the bonds of civilised society are relaxed; and when we know that the jurors who are to try those people belong to those various associations, I want to know how it is possible to expect the criminal law to be enforced without special powers. Now, these are facts which induced the authorities charged with the responsibility of governing that country to say that they must have additional powers; and in the face of these facts we are asked here, in our ignorance of the position of affairs there, to practically vote against the principle of the Bill which has received its second reading recently by a majority of over 100 in the House of Commons of England. Are we the people to take such a position? Are we so negligent of law and order in this country? Are we so careful of liberty, as it is called, as to entitle us to tell the people and Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland that the laws which the responsible advisers of the Crown say are requisite for the maintenance of society should not be passed? Do you remember the strike on the Grand Trunk Railway service which occurred, I think, in the year 1877. Do you remember, Sir, the difficulty that occurred when the Grand Trunk servants refused to do the bidding of their master and struck, having combined, as it was their right to combine, for the purpose of advancing their own interests and getting better terms from their employers. But the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) who thinks it so wrong to make the Irish people obey the laws of the land, not merely created a new crime and altered the procedure, but brought down an Act of Parliament and backed by the whole strength of the party then in power, including the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier), said that a breach of civil contract under the circumstances detailed in this Act, should be a crime. A new difficulty had arisen, the

people of Canada found themselves strong enough to cope with it, and the Government of the day came down—I do not think it was the Government, if my recollection serves me a right, so much as the hon. member for West Durham—and proposed, not being competent enough for the emergency, not being Irish enough to understand how to frame the Bill, that it should be given to a commission to frame; and the hon. member for West Durham brought down the Bill and carried it through. I find in that measure that breaches of contract with railway companies, under certain circumstances which caused public inconvenience, were to be made criminal. But that is not the worst feature. Why, they were to be tried summarily—not by a court and jury. The great right of trial by jury was ignored by the hon. gentleman, and the trial was to take place before two magistrates who had power to send the accused to prison. That was the way we acted in circumstances of that kind. I voted against that measure, and I believe those associated on the Opposition side of the House with me almost unanimously voted against it. We did not so vote on the ground that we had not the power to pass legislation of that kind, but we denied that there was any occasion for so stringent an amendment to the law. That was the Coercion Bill of that day, which remains from that day to this on our Statutes. We may call it the Coercion Bill of the hon. member for West Durham, for he is certainly entitled to the credit of it more than any other hon. member.

Mr. MILLS. Why do you not repeal it?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is another matter. Let me investigate the Bill which has been brought before the British Parliament, whether necessary or unnecessary, it is not for me to offer an opinion. I am merely endeavoring to point out to this House that we will be assuming very dangerous responsibility, if these resolutions are intended to affect any purpose except the purpose which I do not propose to mention, if they are intended in the slightest degree to affect the passage of the Bill in the English Parliament,—in asking this Parliament to send home resolutions of that kind. What is the measure about which so much has been said here? Listening to what has been uttered on the floor of this House one would suppose the Irish people have no liberties;—

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY—one would suppose they were a down-trodden race;—

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY—one would suppose they were in the position in which we were before responsible government was granted to us.—

Mr. MILLS. Worse.

Mr. McCARTHY. Worse. They have a larger representation proportionately than have the people of England and Scotland in the United Parliament of Great Britain. They have to-day 87 members; and in the last Parliament they held the balance of power between the two great political parties in the Imperial Parliament. They boasted they could make or unmake governments, as we know they did. They have to-day a band of able representatives in that Parliament; prepared and willing to support their views, and it may be said that by-and-bye they will successfully, perhaps, have their views carried by means of the perseverance and power of that compact body directed by Mr. Parnell. It is not correct to compare the situation of the people in this country before responsible government was granted to us, with that of the Irish people to-day. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) told us this afternoon that since we had been granted responsible government sullenness had disappeared from our midst,

Mr. McCARTHY.

and peace, happiness and loyalty to the Crown prevailed throughout the land; but does not the hon. member forget that the Bill which gave him that right was forced upon the people of Lower Canada against their wishes?

Mr. LAURIER. It was the Act of Union they opposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and it is by the Act of Union that the hon. member got responsible government and the liberty to govern himself of which he has boasted, and which he says, has enabled his people to live happily and prosperously under the British flag. That Act was passed in the British Parliament, against the will of the people of Lower Canada, and yet that union with the people of Upper Canada, which lasted until the time of Confederation, was found, as my hon. friend has had to admit, to confer happiness and peace and prosperity upon us all. Now, the first thing I find in this Act is what, perhaps, may appear to be a terrible wrong, and that is the right to make preliminary investigation—the right, although no particular man may be charged with crime, to hold, as it were, an inquisition for the purpose of discovering who the criminal may be when a crime is committed. We have for some time past adopted that principle with much effect. If a fire takes place, we have the right to hold an enquiry and take evidence for the purpose of discovering who it was that committed the arson. Does any hon. member say that, so far as that is concerned, there is anything so far astray or wrong? We will pass to the next provision of the Bill, the one concerning summary jurisdiction. It does, as has been correctly stated, in certain misdemeanors, not in matters of felony, but in the minor descriptions of crime, enable people who are charged with the offences to be tried before two magistrates, who may commit to gaol for a period not exceeding six months. We are a down-trodden race, for have we not been living under the Canada Temperance Act for some years, and that is the power we find within the four corners of that Act. There are many offences which can be tried under our criminal law before magistrates, most of them, I admit, by the consent of the accused; and if my hon. friends will look at our criminal statistics, they will find that, in the greater number of cases, that tribunal is chosen in preference to going before a jury; but in some cases, not all, the accused are compelled to be tried before a stipendiary magistrate, or a police magistrate, whether they will or not. What is to be done, will hon. members say? If juries will not convict, if out of a thousand crimes the convictions are only sixty-two, if judges in assize town after assize town have to adjourn the courts or to adjourn the trials of the criminal cases, because in the face of the plainest evidence, juries will not convict, I ask hon. gentlemen, who say that this measure should not have been passed, to tell us what should be done. I point to the Act of 1877 to show what we would have done under similar circumstances. I point to the range of our criminal laws to show what we have done from time to time, and I think it hardly lies with the representatives of the people of Canada in this Chamber, which enacts the criminal law, to find fault with the Government of Great Britain and Ireland who have thought proper, under these circumstances, to ask for these powers. Then there is the power to move for a change of venue, but every hon. member at all familiar with our criminal law knows that that power—I am not now speaking of the trial in England; I will come to that later; I am speaking of the other power to move for a change of venue from one part of Ireland to the other—that that is a power to be found on our criminal law. I do not know when it was passed, but it has been there certainly ever since I have been practising law. And it is there now. It is really more fenced. It is more difficult under this Bill to have a change of venue than it is under the Canadian criminal code to-day, because it is only on the representation of the Attor-

ney General himself—not a mere Crown prosecutor—that the motion can be entertained by the court, and the defendant has power to appeal against the decision of any court of first instance that so decides.

Mr. MILLS. From one Province to another?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of Ireland. I will deal with the other matter in a moment. The hon. member will allow me to get at it step by step. I am not going to attempt to speak of it all at once. So far, at all events, is there anything so very serious in what is called a Coercion Bill? Is it proper and right, in regard to men who live in the Emerald Isle, under laws which their representatives have had an act and part in making, which are not tyrannical laws, which are fair laws, which are the same laws practically that we have here in this country, some means should be found of enforcing them? Would it be said, would it be admitted, that the English people were fit to govern themselves, or that the Irish people were fit to govern themselves, if they were not equal to emergencies such as these. A free people, freely governed, governed by its own representatives, must in some way endeavor to enforce its laws, and we know that at times the Habeas Corpus Act has been suspended. The thought occurs to me that the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended in this country, if I remember aright. Surely it is one of the attributes of free men, dealing through the representatives of the people, to so adjust their laws that law itself shall not be brought into absolute contempt. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in reading from the statement of the Chief Secretary on the introduction of the Bill—not that I at all impute the blame to the hon. member himself, as it is much more likely to have been the inaccurate statement of the Chief Secretary—spoke of the power of proclamation, the power to proclaim. There is the power to proclaim, and why? Because over the great portion of Ireland the law is obeyed. It is only in parts, in the south and southwest, that the law is set at defiance, and it is only in these portions of Ireland that the magisterial powers which have been so objected to are to be enforced. It is not a law for the whole of Ireland. It is not a law for more than the districts where the ordinary law, according to the machinery and with the ordinary means, cannot be enforced. There and there alone, upon the proclamation of the advisers of the Crown, can this special procedure obtain. Now, I come to another power which this Crimes Bill gives, and that power is this: If, in any of the following cases—and to be accurate, if the House will bear with me, I will read the particular cases—if in these cases the Lord Lieutenant is satisfied that any association is formed for the commission of crime—that is one; or, carrying on operations for or by the commission of crimes—that is two; or, encouraging or aiding persons to commit crimes—that is three; or, promoting or inciting to acts of violence or intimidation—that is four; or, interfering with the administration of the law, or disturbing the maintenance of law and of order. Now, if a society is either formed or carried on for any of these purposes, and if there be such a society, would any hon. member in this House; would my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, or my hon. friend who last addressed the House, pretend to say that such a society as that should not be put down? If there be such societies in Ireland, formed for the express purpose of committing crime, then by proclamation those societies may be inhibited. It does not create a new offence. The offence of joining together to commit a crime, is an offence of common law. All it does is—if the Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, upon the advice of those who are responsible to Parliament, says that the circumstances exist, there is a presumption that these societies do exist for that purpose—they may be suppressed; but even that power is limited and guarded,

because that proclamation has to be submitted to Parliament within seven days after it is passed, if Parliament is then in Session, or within seven days after the House meets, if it is not then sitting, and if it is disapproved of by the House the proclamation ceases. There is but to my mind—granting there is sufficient cause, as to which I have already said I am not to be the judge—and I do not pretend to state any opinion—there is to my mind only the objectionable feature to which the hon. member who last addressed the House referred. But this Bill is not yet law. The principle of this Bill, it is true, has been assented to upon the second reading; but the details of the measure have yet to undergo the scrutiny which no doubt they will receive in the Committee of the Whole; and how it may emerge from that committee, and finally pass the House of Commons, we do not know. That provision is that, if there cannot be, upon the opinion of both the Attorneys Generals of Ireland and England, a fair trial by a jury in Ireland—and, remember, that does not apply to political offences, but to murder, and offences of that class—if there be offences of that kind, if political feeling runs so high, if, in point of fact, the whole neighborhood are mixed up, as it were, with the men who are accused of the crime, if it be agrarian in character, where it is believed to be a virtue and not a crime by those who have committed it and those who abet it, then in such a case there is power to do what? In the case of murder, arson and breaking and firing into dwelling-houses, to have the trial take place in England. That is the proposition of Lord Salisbury's Government, and what was the proposition of Mr. Gladstone's Government? Mr. Gladstone's proposition was that these men should be tried, not by a jury in England, but by a bench of Irish judges. Which is the better of the two? And I noticed the other day that the Home Secretary for England, Mr. Matthews, thought it might be a good amendment to say that the prisoner should have his choice, either take a bench of Irish judges, or take his trial in England, just as he pleased. But is it so certain that fair play cannot be had before a jury at the Old Bailey? Are the people of England so united anywhere against Irishmen, when we are told that 150,000 of them went out the other day to Hyde Park to protest against this Bill—are they all so unanimously of the opinion that Irishmen ought to be hanged at all events, that there is no hope of fair play to be found before an English jury? I ask again, not venturing an opinion myself, what are the responsible advisers of the Crown to do? What happened the other day in Dublin? What happened at the Assizes referred to by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)? Simply, no contradiction of facts, no dispute as to the law. I have an extract here of the charge that was given by Mr. Justice Murphy, and perhaps it may be taken as a sample of the whole. The judge stated to the jury: The case is clear, you are privileged, you can do as you please, the evidence is perfectly uncontradicted, but the privilege is yours of disregarding the evidence. After half-an-hour's deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. "Gentlemen," said the judge, "your verdict is contrary to the evidence, but it is your privilege to disregard your evidence and your oaths." Now, if that is anything like what is happening in various parts of Ireland, owing to these political agitations and this agrarian feeling, then the law is paralysed, the ordinary means of convicting those who have been guilty of crime are found not to be effectual, and some other means must be discovered, that means is to offer them a trial in England, or before a commission or bench of Irish judges. There is the Bill which is called a Coercion Bill. But what is it a Coercion Bill for? It is a Bill altering, speaking generally, the procedure in criminal cases for the purpose of enforcing the criminal law of the land. That is undoubtedly one means of doing it. Another means is, give them what they

want, give them all they desire, give them, it is said, Home Rule, and then you will not require the Coercion Bill, the ordinary criminal law would be sufficient for the suppression of crime. I have only to point out—I am not standing here as the justifier of Lord Salisbury's Government, but it is only fair that it should be mentioned—that at the same time that a Bill for the enforcement of criminal law is passing through the House of Commons, in the House of Lords there is a Bill to relieve the over-burdened, as some would call them, the rack-rented tenants. But here again, when we look at statistics what do we find? We are astonished to find how much is made of the rack-rented tenants. Sir, there are over half a million tenants in Ireland, and I am speaking by authority when I say that in the last quarter of last year the number of evictions were 522. What percentage is 522 evictions out of half a million tenants? Out of those we have the heartrending picture of the Glenbigh evictions, we have those about which we are to hear more from the emissary who is now on his way here to enlighten the people of Canada. But if we will only look at home have we no sympathy for our overburdened farmers, those men, who, sometimes, have been paying to building societies out of which some hon. members have grown wealthy, 15, 16 and 17 per cent. for money, borrowing at 10 per cent, with fines added on, until it has grown, as we have known in some cases, to 15, 16 and 17 per cent.? We know that would have been impossible in Ireland, and we know that it was only the increase in the value of property in Canada that enabled the farmers to pay these exorbitant rates. Well, is it to be said that we would countenance them in banding together, the honest yeomanry of this country, to resist such payment? It is true, it may be said, that they had promised to pay this interest. That was their contract, and although the rise in the value of the property has enabled them to pay it, would we justify them in banding together and refusing to pay? I think we ought, under these circumstances, to be careful what we are about to do. Now, the position I ask this House to adopt, and the proposition I propose, before I sit down, to place formally in the Speaker's hand, is on the lines of the observations I have endeavored to make. But, I desire it to be perfectly well understood that I am not taking a position for or against this Coercion Bill. I have stated one side, because there have been a number of the members of this House who have told us the other. I have pointed out what this law is. If we are told to deal with the law, if we are to offer an opinion about it, certainly it is only right that we should consider it well, and clearly understand what we are doing. Now, we have obtained our own freedom and our right to govern ourselves, and it behooves us not to invite, by meddling with the affairs of other people, interference in our own concerns. I want to know how any hon. member in this House can undertake to pass such a resolution as this, saying that a particular measure submitted to the British Parliament ought not to be passed—I would like to know what that hon. member will by-and-by say if the British Parliament, with greater power and authority, pass a resolution which will affect our dearest interests and interfere with our local concerns. Surely, if we have a right, with our delegated power under the British North America Act, to say to them: You are wrong in passing that Bill, can we with any consistency deny to the British Parliament the right to deal with our affairs when they think proper? Surely what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; surely it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; surely we will find ourselves in a difficult position. But this is to be said: While our resolution is practically ineffective, while our resolution sent home to Lord Salisbury, if you are going to send it, and to Mr. Parnell and to Mr. Gladstone, will get into the papers and be read and possibly thrown into the

Mr. McCARTHY.

paper basket, their resolutions will have practically the effect of law.

Mr. CURRAN. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is wrong, if he will allow me to say so, when he says "no, no," to that statement. What the Parliament of Great Britain enacts overrides the laws passed by this Parliament. They could determine by statute what our Customs law should be.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to see them try it,

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think they will.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree that they will not try it, but if they were to try it, I do not know very much what we could say—

Mr. MITCHELL. We are remonstrating.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are doing a little more. We are asked to say by this resolution:

"That this House has learned, with profound regret, of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland."

That is what we are asked here to vote upon.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will alter that.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been no suggestion of alteration.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, there has.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the way the matter stands before us now. No matter how we alter it, we shall all find ourselves in this difficulty: You have the right to govern yourselves, nobody is interfering with it; but you are not satisfied with that, you want to govern somebody else to whom you are not responsible.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then this means nothing. It is no good, and it is not intended to effect any result. Is it for the people out of doors? Are we passing these resolutions, are we making these speeches about liberty and right and freedom for Ireland and all the rest of it, for the people out of doors here, and not with any intention of doing the people of Ireland any good? It must be one way or the other, and the hon. member can accept either horn of the dilemma he pleases.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How about yourself?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say we should not interfere. I am making what the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) perfectly well knows is not a popular speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. What the hon. gentleman with his knowledge of the constituencies of Ontario from which we both come, would not make, though, perhaps, I am speaking his sentiments. But I say this, that I will not stand here as the representative of my constituency under any false colors or false representations. While I have a large Irish population in my constituency, the confidence of many of whom I have the honor to enjoy, I am not afraid to speak to those men and argue this question fairly and squarely before them, and I think they will agree that the course I propose to ask the House to adopt is after all the best one in the interest of this Dominion. A word has been said against the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), a rebuke has been administered to him for the language used by him with respect to Mr. William O'Brien who is about to come to talk to us and tell us of the iniquities of His Excellency the Governor General. Sir, if the hon. member for Muskoka used strong

language, I think perhaps it did credit, if not to his head, certainly to his heart. His Excellency the Governor General is to a certain extent, if not altogether, in the position of a man who cannot defend himself in this country. He is in the position of a man who cannot take the platform and answer William O'Brien, or state his side of the case, and it is on a subject with which we are unfamiliar, and about which the people of this country are not perhaps very well capable of forming a correct judgment. And what will William O'Brien say when he gets here? When we have heard what has to be said, perhaps he will find that the atmosphere of free Canada recognises the rights of both sides, and does not wholly disregard the rights of a man because he happens to occupy a position of authority. Speaking of Lord Lansdowne these were his words:

"Lord Lansdowne thinks he can safely snap his fingers at you because he is 4000 miles away Governor General of Canada. I tell you here to-day that the voice of the Irish nation is loud enough and strong enough to reach him in his palace gates in Ottawa, aye, or if he were to go into the deepest backwoods of an English settlement to hide himself. I warn them here to-day that if French dare to lay a robber hand upon any house of the honest man in the Queen's county, we will carry the war into Canada, we will meet him at his palace gate, and we will make the air ring with his fame as an evictor and an exterminator. We will teach him night and day the wide world over, and from one end of that Dominion of Canada to the other I promise him on the part of the Irish in Canada that wherever he goes he will find Irish hearts and Irish throats that will hoot him and boycott him and hunt him with execrations out of that great and free land."

Is there an hon. member in this House who has read that speech and can say, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said to-night, that he hopes he will have a patient hearing, and will not be disturbed. I confess I am not able to understand from whence that hope springs. I think that such a statement as that was calculated to arouse the blood of every honest member of this House and of every man who reads it in this country. But, perhaps it is only a specimen of the manner in which the war is being conducted on the other side of the Atlantic; and if that be so, we may not wonder so much at the way in which the law requires amendment. I have endeavored to give the grounds for the conclusion to which I invite this House to arrive. I have only to say now that I have not made an attempt to emulate my hon. friend the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) in his able address; I have not made any attempt to follow the hon. member for North Bruce, (Mr. McNeill), whose speech was an ornament to this House, and a credit to the hon. member himself; I have endeavored to lay down what I believe to be safe principles for our guidance and governance, and I think this House will find that if we depart from the principle of self-government we enjoy, if we invade the rights of other representations, if we undertake to do more than govern ourselves, we shall be bringing trouble on ourselves which, by-and-bye we may have cause to regret. Do we remember—and it is the last observation I propose to make on this subject—that those rents which are so much complained about were fixed by and under the Gladstone Bill in 1881, or could have been fixed. Do we not remember that the judicial settlement, as it were, of the rents is what is now complained of? Do we not know that these tenants enjoy more and better rights and greater privileges than any other tenantry in the world? Do we not know that their tenant right is made as fixed and certain and definite as the landlord's right is, and in many cases is more valuable? Do we not know that, while I admit that that rent, owing to the fall of prices, is higher now than possibly in some cases can be paid, in most instances the landlords are willing, and are bound of necessity, to meet the tenants half way? Then where are the great grievances of which we hear? The contracts were made and I acknowledge that these poor peasants were not in a position to make free contracts with their landlords. I acknowledge that, from their land hunger, as it may be called, their bidding against one an-

other to such an extent in the desire to acquire land, they were agreeing to pay rents which had become impossible to pay. But do we not know that that was the reform effected by Mr. Gladstone's Bill? Do we not know that Mr. Gladstone said, since this is so the courts will settle a fair rent, and they were settled on what was supposed to be a fair basis? To-day it is said that the rents are too high, but so are the rents of every man in this country who made his bargain five or six years ago, because if prices fell there prices have fallen here, and perhaps to a still greater extent. But does that form an excuse for crime? because that and that only is the pertinent point, so far as the present position of affairs is concerned. Now we are asked to send these resolutions, not to our Gracious Sovereign, because we have been told by Mr. Gladstone himself in very plain and unmistakable language, that he wants none of our advice. I saw a statement in a newspaper the other day that Mr. Gladstone invited the opinion of Americans upon this question of Home Rule. But we know that Mr. Gladstone sometimes speaks with greater freedom and with less responsibility than at others. We know he has had to excuse his statements and utterances in that way, but we have a formal statement, not as the hon. member for West Durham said, of a Colonial Secretary merely, but the formal statement of the Government of Mr. Gladstone, telling us in answer to the most respectful resolutions which it was possible for a Parliament to frame or pass on the question of Home Rule, or any other matter, that:

"Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

We have taken that hint. We do not address Her Majesty any longer, but like respectful subjects, we get around it and address the Prime Minister. But we propose not only to address the Prime Minister, but to address also the leader of the Opposition and, as there is another minor opposition, Mr. Parnell is to have our opinions as well. I do not know why it is that Lord Hartington, whose following is quite as large as that of Mr. Parnell, is not to be favored with our views on this question; perhaps he is to be put in too. I think we hardly have regard to our own position. I think the great Parliament of this free country, if not at liberty to address the Crown, ought not to be called on to pass an address to any particular individual. I think it better behooves our dignity to omit that last passage. If we must pass an address, if we know so much about this question, if we are so full of burning zeal and knowledge as to press our views on the Parliament of Great Britain, I think we had better allow them to reach the persons for whom they are intended in some other way than this. But for my part, to whomsoever else it may be sent, I shall most certainly vote against sending it to Mr. Parnell. I am not going to say that Mr. Parnell is the associate of murderers, as we are told he is. I am not going to accuse him of having written that letter which, if he did write it, must always make him the most contemptible of all mankind; because we are told that he came down to the House of Commons arrayed in mourning to express his regret for the assassinations in Phoenix Park. And if at that moment he was in communication with the society which had done these men to death, no language I can use, or that any member of this House can use, would be too strong to condemn Mr. Parnell from whatever point of view he may be looked at. But I do say that it hardly agrees with the position we hold to send an address of this kind to Mr. Parnell, who has not taken, up to the last intelligence we have received, the means of freeing himself from the stain which has been cast upon him. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for West Dur-

ham (Mr. Blake) have already decided in Mr. Parnell's favor. They have already pronounced that he is not the author of that letter, and various reasons are given for coming to that conclusion. I never understood that that letter implied or meant that Mr. Parnell had actually directed the assassination of these men. I apprehend that all that letter means is that Mr. Parnell was in communication with those who had done Lord Cavendish and Mr. Burke to death in Phoenix Park. I would like to know what Mr. Parnell's course is. The *London Times* has, with care and deliberation, published reasons for coming to the conclusion that Mr. Parnell and his associates—but I will read the deliberate words of the *Times* published in the early part of March:

"Be the ultimate goal of these men what it will, they are content to march towards it in the company of murderers; murderers provide their funds; murderers share their inmost councils; murderers have gone forth from the league offices to set their bloody work afoot and have presently returned to consult the constitutional leaders on the advancement of the cause."

This statement was made with deliberation; the conclusion was argued out for every man to read for himself—proved, so to speak, from the writings and speeches of these men themselves; the day and date and place of publication given to those who choose to study it. Mr. Parnell has been challenged, and there is no other way open to a man thus assailed than to bring the so-called libeller to justice; and finally these words—emphatic enough in all conscience, deliberate enough, clear enough, unmistakable in their meaning—have been followed up by the publication of the letter. And when Mr. Parnell gets up in the House of Commons and denies being the author of it, he is told by the great Thunderer: Mr. Parnell, your big words do not frighten us; we have not published this statement without care and without examination, and we challenge you to come into a place and give us your oath on the subject and undergo a cross-examination which will enable the people of England and the people of the world, no matter what the jury may do, to decide as to your guilt or innocence. And it has been pointed out to Mr. Parnell that he can bring that matter before an Irish jury, as we know that he can, before a Scotch jury or before an English jury, but Mr. Parnell refuses the ordeal. Then, Sir, if Mr. Parnell continues to refuse that, what will be the verdict of mankind? The hon. gentleman pronounced in advance in favor of his innocence; and certainly if Mr. Parnell took the course which I venture to say an honorable man ought to take, we ought to esteem him innocent until he is proved to be guilty; but if Mr. Parnell denies to his character the only means of its justification, the verdict of mankind and the verdict of posterity will be in favor of the charge being true. Under these circumstances ought we to send this document to Mr. Parnell? Ought we to show that we accept the *ipse dixit* of one or two gentlemen who seem to think they know all about this matter? Ought we not, at any rate, to obliterate his name from the resolution, even if we think proper to send it to the Prime Minister and to Mr. Gladstone? I think, perhaps, we would be doing more justice to ourselves if, in the event of the resolution receiving the assent of the House, that course should be adopted. I will therefore move, in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" in the main motion be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—"this House, while justly jealous of any interference in the local affairs of Canada within the jurisdiction of this Parliament or of the Legislative Assemblies of the several Provinces of the Dominion, either by the Imperial Parliament or other Legislative body of the British Empire, cannot without inviting such interference fail to recognise it as within the exclusive right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate respecting matters solely appertaining to the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom; than which none can be more absolutely of local concern than the due and proper administration of the law within the bounds of Great Britain and Ireland.

"That, therefore, it is inexpedient and unwise for this House to express any opinion or in anywise to interfere with the Imperial Parlia-

Mr. McCARTHY.

ment as to the course to be adopted by it respecting the Bill now before the House of Commons for the amendment of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland)"

Mr. CLAYES. Just one word I desire to say in reply to the hon. member for North Simcoe. He opened his remarks by speaking of our duty and our relations to the Empire and the Home Government. Now, the hon. gentleman represents a political party which owes its strength and power largely to sentiments which have their origin in Imperial memories—sentiments which have to do with the honor of the Empire. I am not one of those who believe that that party dominates in this country because alone of the superior skill of its leader or because of the questionable influences which are said to be used and which I believe are used to move and determine the action of individuals; but I believe it dominates because the country as a whole believes that that party, being the Tory party and devoted to the past, is opposed to movement and to change, and distrust the Liberals because it is the party of progress, and progress involves change. It is because of that that the party is strong, and that the right hon. gentleman stands here representing, as he does with great ability, the Tory party. If that be true, and if a question comes up which involves the honor and integrity of the Empire, its peace and security, then I ask you, being a part of the Empire and being a people moved by sentiment, when sentiment has so much to do with our political action and opinions, whether it is not proper for us to approach the Home Government and ask them to consider what our experience has been in the way of Home Rule, and whether the history of the past is not such as to induce them to pause and question the propriety of passing another measure of coercion. I would ask them to pause before taking such action, in view of the fact that for 700 or 800 years Ireland has been treated to repeated policies of coercion, and time has repeatedly told the story of her people trodden down, outraged, their loyalty destroyed by virtue of that very policy which the present British Government proposes again to adopt. Is it not proper that we should approach the Government at home and say that we, like themselves, as citizens of the Empire, men capable of comprehending a question like this, appeal to them, from our own experience of the blessings of Home Rule, to adopt that policy which, in our opinion, would result in making a disloyal people loyal as it has done to the same people here. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Mc Carthy) said he did not believe we had the right to express our views upon this question. He said we had enough to do to mind our own affairs. He did not know enough about the question. Well, there is a certain knowledge of this question in which I think the hon. gentleman is wanting. He shows a knowledge of the technicalities of this question; he has stated them with great ability as a lawyer; but there is another knowledge which he does not possess, there is an ignorance for which there is no cure. It is the ignorance of heart. Now, Mr. Speaker, coercion has had its influence upon the character of Irishmen, and the hon. gentleman has given us an exhibition of that influence. He spoke as a representative of the oppressors of Ireland. He is a representative of the little minority of Irishmen who have been sustained in their oppression by the power of England, and who in a great measure have inspired the action of England in all its coercive measures. The hon. gentleman has expressed honestly and ably opinions thoroughly opposed to the welfare of the country as a whole. The hon. gentleman is one of those who perpetuate in this country the quarrels of the old? Why is it that these quarrels should be imported here? Why is it that we should have established here a powerful organisation, the organisation which I presume he represents, the Orange lodge? What ground is there here for such an institution—an institution that simply exists by virtue of ages of experience in Ireland,

ages of opposition and ages of oppression to a great and powerful Church, which, in Ireland, has been subjected to the greatest suffering. These men come here and keep up their organisation, because they must have something to remind them of the state of things that existed at home. The question before us is whether we ought not to send our voices over to England, asking the people of that country to adopt a policy for Ireland, which in this country has operated so admirably in making Irishmen the most loyal people in the Empire. Some of them, in fact, have not only become loyal to the Empire, but have completely forgotten the authors of the wrongs their country has suffered. They have forgotten the fact that the Tory party in England—of which the Tory party in this country has inherited all the traditions—has been the instrument of all the wrongs from which Ireland has suffered. They not only become loyal and bow the head, but they forget the old story and become of Tories the best in the land. Three or four of them have spoken here to-day. We have had the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and an hon. gentleman from away over on the Pacific, and an hon. gentleman from half way there—all of whom have joined the Tory party and all of whom are Irishmen, and Celts and Catholics. Why, their memory of the wrongs their country has suffered has completely faded away. Not only have they become loyal to the Empire, but they have become loyal to the party of oppression. Surely after that experience, we ought more than ever to feel it to be our duty to go to England and tell the people of that country what a wonderful transformation Home Rule in Canada has effected.

Mr. DAVIN. I had hoped not to have addressed the House on this question. I had hoped that we should have reached a division half-an-hour ago; but, after the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I find myself compelled to make a remark or two; and, as I have risen to my feet, I may possibly venture to ask the indulgence of the House while I enter into the question which has been already discussed at some length. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is laboring under a complete delusion. He begins by identifying in many respects the Liberal-Conservative party here with the Tory party in England, and he is also under a historical mistake in supposing that all the oppression he deplors as having been dealt out to Ireland was dealt out to it by the Tory party, because the Whig party, which I suppose he would identify himself with, was in power in England at the time most of the Coercion Acts were passed. I rather think that the speech of the hon. gentleman, and indeed, if I may be bold enough to say so, many of the speeches which have been made on this question, seem to me to show a complete misapprehension of what is the disease from which Ireland suffers. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that if a Home Rule Bill were passed, if Home Rule were given to Ireland, you would then minister to her diseased mind and pluck from her memory its rooted sorrow; but if you had Home Rule in Ireland to-morrow, you would have there the same number of tenants as exist to-day, you would have about the same number of landlords. By merely passing a Home Rule Bill, you could not execute a transformation scene, and change the whole political and social condition of Ireland. Does any man suppose that the mere fact of having Home Rule would make the peasant who is now discontented, contented, would make the peasant who now thinks he ought not to pay his rent, pay it?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Bothwell says yes; but I notice that when my hon. friend says yes to anything, it generally turns out that facts do not justify his affirma-

tion. The disease in Ireland is a complicated one. It is inherited from successive confiscations; it is inherited from a state of things by which men, different in religion, different in race and different in social instincts, were placed by an unhappy fate to govern a country, a large portion of the population divided from them by this triple wall, and, if the condition of Ireland is to be dealt with in such a way as to make that country peaceful, as to make it happy, as to make it prosperous, then you must go deeper into the evils than by merely passing a Home Rule measure. I think it is not undesirable to make remarks like these, because it is hardly creditable to this Dominion of Canada, and to a great Parliament such as this, a Parliament which my hon. friend the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) very properly described as the first Parliament after the Imperial Parliament itself, it is not creditable that we should discuss a question like this large Irish question and not go deeper than the surface, and think, like people orating in a debating society, that, by passing a measure like this, all the ills that afflict Ireland would be swept away. I am of opinion that it is desirable that a measure of local self-government should be given to Ireland, but I think, before any local self-government is given to the country, the Imperial Parliament should pass such measures as would help to get rid of the real causes of the discontent, because, if it be left to the local government—supposing you had a constitution there which would leave it to the local government to deal with these evils between landlord and tenant, of which we hear so much—then I am afraid that there would not be that measure of justice dealt out to the one side which would be desirable. Therefore, it would be, in my opinion, very improper to pass a Home Rule measure, unless you also have a measure dealing with the land. A comprehensive measure dealing with the land should accompany any measure of Home Rule, and, of course, I think that any measure which should be passed, dealing with Home Rule, ought carefully to guard the rights and liberties of the minority, so that when we are asked to send a message across the water to have a Home Rule measure passed, we are asking a thing to be done that is complicated, difficult, onerous, and requiring the greatest reflection and care.—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. member will pardon my interrupting him, I believe that a number of members on both sides of the House are anxious to leave to-night on the 11 o'clock train. That being the case, I do not think there is any chance of this debate being finished to night, unless those gentlemen were obliged to remain. I would, therefore, if my hon. friend will pardon the suggestion, ask him to allow the debate to be adjourned, and to stand over till Monday, and be the first Order of the Day, if that meets the view of the House.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned, to stand the first Order for Monday.

PAPERS IN REGARD TO THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the house. He said: I may say that my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries promised the papers relating to the fisheries question to-day, or on Monday at the latest. We have only to-day obtained permission to bring down the last papers which we have. We have obtained that permission to-day, so that all the papers will be laid on the Table on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 25th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGE—QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. SKINNER. On motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) it was ordered, on the 15th inst, that the returning officer for the county of Queen's, N.B., be ordered to transmit forthwith to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the poll books and other papers connected with the late election in that district. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has now the papers, and only awaits the order of the House to produce them. I would, therefore, move :

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be ordered to attend at the Table forthwith, with the poll books, certificate of returns, ballots and all other papers used and connected with the late election for the electoral district of Queen's, New Brunswick, and returned to him by John R. Dunn, the returning officer for said district at said election, pursuant to the Order of this House made on the 15th instant.

Motion agreed to, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery ordered to attend with the papers.

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) respecting procedure in criminal cases. He said : The Bill is intended to regulate the law respecting appeals in criminal cases. The principal feature is that no appeal will be had to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council from the courts of last resort in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC STORES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) respecting public stores. He said : The object is to enable stores which belong to the different Departments to be marked in such a way that they can be identified ; also to establish the principle that the marks to be put on Government stores are *prima facie* evidence that they are the property of the Government, and to provide penalties for counterfeiting or obliterating the marks or improperly marking goods. The same provision exists with regard to naval and military stores.

Mr. BLAKE. If this Bill is introduced in consequence of defalcations we should have some account of their character and extent.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not introduced so much with regard to that, as in connection with missing articles belonging to the public departments, more especially the Department of Railways. It is extremely difficult to prove such articles which are scattered over the country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC MORALS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) respecting offences against public morals and public convenience. He said : The object of the Bill is to add to the provisions of chapter 52, 49 Victoria. It consists of adding to the clause of dealing with idiots and imbecile women, the words " insane women." A Bill of that character has recently passed the Ontario Legislature. It is one of an excellent character, and I hope the House will see fit to adopt it. It also provides for restoring the provisions of the previous Bill, as it left this House, in regard to seduc-

Mr. DAVIN.

tion under promise of marriage, making the age of the woman who may have recourse to law in this respect, twenty-one, while the male is liable at the age of eighteen. This was changed in the Senate so as to make the age of the man twenty-one, while no woman could have recourse after the age of eighteen. This is the provision of the Bill, with the addition of the insane woman to those protected by the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have now the honor to inform the House that, in obedience to the order of the House of this day, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is in attendance with the poll-books, certificates, &c., connected with the late election for the electoral district of the county of Queen's, N.B.

Mr. SKINNER moved that the papers produced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery concerning the late election and poll held in and for the electoral district of the county of Queen's, N.B., be now read, saving the poll-books and ballots.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. We desire everything except the poll-books and the ballots. The other things, I presume, will be the returns from the deputy returning officers to the returning officer. It is not necessary actually to read them. We only want to get them on the Votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Take them as read ?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

THE ESTIMATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to enquire of the Minister of Finance whether he is in a position to give the House any information as to when he will bring down the Estimates and deliver his Budget Speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman that information at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose we may assume that the hon. gentleman cannot do it this week.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly not.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that we should dispose of the Private Bills, so as to allow them to go to the several committees. I observe that they are all printed in both languages.

Mr. BLAKE. I noticed that these were marked as printed, but, as I have none of them on my file, I have just sent for them with a view to agree to some arrangement of this kind, but I have not seen them in print.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not seen any of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest that we should go through the unopposed orders on the paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unopposed questions ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not mean the questions, because, of course, you can answer them if you like. I mean the unopposed notices. The hon. gentleman will see that Monday is the only possible day for getting through those notices for a week, because on other private days we stop at six o'clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the unanimous consent of the House and for the purpose of forwarding the business, I shall have no objection to do that. Of course, any one hon. member can object.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see all the private Bills are railway Bills. Perhaps the leader of the Opposition would allow them to be passed, and to go before the Railway Committee. They will require to be posted up for eight days.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty is that, if these Bills are to take the second reading without being printed, it is a pure formality. We have not the slightest opportunity of forming a judgment upon them, and it does not appear that we are at a stage of the Session where there is any great necessity for such a course.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we will take the questions by members, and then the unopposed motions, and then go on with the debate.

SUBWAY TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to construct a subway from Prince Edward Island to the mainland, in order to secure fulfilment of the terms of union between Canada and the Island of Prince Edward?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask the hon. gentleman to let that question stand, as I have not my papers here. I will point out, however, that the hon. gentleman must strike out all after the word "mainland."

WHARF AT KAMOURASKA.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed this year with the works already commenced for the building of a wharf at Kamouraska?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No decision has yet been taken on this question.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT KENTVILLE, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN asked, What steps have been taken toward the construction of a public building at Kentville, Nova Scotia, for which Parliament voted the sum of four thousand dollars last Session? If nothing has yet been done, what is the intention of the Government regarding the matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An officer was sent down there to look at certain sites that were pointed out as likely to be proper ones. The officer came back, and afterwards a representation was made by a number of residents in favor of another lot, but negotiations have not yet been completed on the subject.

HOOP NETS ON THE RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to change the present fishery regulations so as to allow hoop nets to be used in the River St. Lawrence from the foot of Wolf and Howe Islands to Montreal for the capture of sturgeon, catfish, dogfish, bull-heads, eels, &c., between the 1st of September and the 1st of June in each year?

Mr. FOSTER. A numerously-signed petition has been presented asking for the change referred to, and it is at present engaging the attention of the Government?

SUBSTITUTES FOR BUTTER.

Mr. BAIN, in the absence of Mr. FISHER, asked, Whether any oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter

prohibited by the Act 49 Vic., chap. 42, has been seized or confiscated, and whether any person has been prosecuted or punished under that Act?

Mr. BOWELL. No seizures of butterine or oleomargarine having been made by the Department, no one could have been prosecuted or punished under that Act?

STATION-HOUSE BETWEEN ST. CHARLES AND ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether tenders were called for the building of the station-house on the Branch Railway from St. Charles to St. Joseph de Lévis? If so, what were the names of the parties who tendered and the amounts of the several tenders? To whom was the contract for the building of the said station house awarded?

Mr. POPE. Tenders were called for. The names of the tenderers were: E. T. Nesbit, Quebec; D. Roy & Frère, Lévis; and Philibert Ouellette, Lévis. The amount of the tenders were: \$1,473, \$1,375, and \$1,260. The contract was awarded to Philibert Ouellette, Lévis, at \$1,260.

FLOODS AT MONTREAL AND ITS VICINITY.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government have received one of the Reports of the Commission of Engineers appointed to enquire as to the periodical floods at Montreal and its vicinity? Were the Commissioners instructed to extend their enquiries to other localities which suffer in like manner from such floods, such as the town and parish of Berthier, St. Bartholomy, Laprairie, St. Lambert, Longueuil, Boucherville, &c.? If the Government have received the said report, when will the same be laid before this House? If not as yet received, is it the intention of the Government to order a report to be made of operations up to date, and to submit the same to this House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A report dated the 31st of July, 1886, was received from the Commissioners appointed to enquire as to the cause of the floods at Montreal, concerning the building of a pier for the protection of the district lying south of the Lachine canal, the cost to be \$120,000. On the 28th of October the Commissioners suggested to keep the River St. Lawrence free from ice from Sorel to Three Rivers by means of tug-boats specially adapted to such service, but the season being too far advanced it was impossible to attempt the experiment. The Commissioners are not limited in the extent of their powers.

BAGGAGE PASSING THROUGH THE CUSTOMS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, in the absence of Mr. MITCHELL, asked, Whether the Government have rescinded in whole or in part the Customs regulation recently issued in relation to the examination of the baggage of passengers coming into Canada? If so, to what extent?

Mr. BOWELL. The order referred to by the question has been withdrawn.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN MANITOBA.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. WATSON, asked, Is it the intention of the Government to establish and put into active operation an experimental farm, during this season, in the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. The question of establishing an experimental farm in Manitoba is now under the consideration of the Government.

IMPROVEMENTS ON WHITE MUD RIVER, MANITOBA.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. WATSON, asked, Is it the intention of the Government to continue the improvements on White Mud River and Lake Manitoba during the coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The dredge which was purchased by the Department has been placed at Westbourne, on White Mud River, and is available for the work, should such be ordered. The order has not yet been given.

THE JUDGE OF EAST ASSINIBOIA.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) asked, For what reasons the residence of the Judge of East Assiniboia has been removed from the centre of the district at Whitewood, to the western boundary of Manitoba?

Mr. THOMPSON. The residence of the Judge was not removed, but before the Judge had time to take up his residence at Whitewood, in accordance with the Order in Council fixing that as the residence, it was ascertained that by his residing at Moosomin a larger number of people in the judicial district would be served than by his living at Whitewood; for that reason the place of residence was changed.

FRAUDS ON THE CUSTOMS.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government are aware that the Customs officers have found, in a manufactory near Quebec, whiskey put up in casks marked as containing vinegar, and ready for delivery to the trade; that the said whiskey had been passed free of duty, under pretence that it was to be used for the making of vinegar? How long has this fraudulent system been carried on with the knowledge of the officials? What steps do the Government intend to take in the matter?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Government is aware that a quantity of whiskey in barrels, marked as vinegar, was found in a factory near Quebec. The next portion of the question, asking how long this fraudulent system has been carried on with the knowledge of the officials, is an improper question, to which, as it implies guilty knowledge on the part of the officials, I would not be obliged to answer. But, for the information of the hon. gentleman, I may say that two of the present officers in the service have been looking into this matter, and after full enquiry they exonerate the officers there from any knowledge of or participation in this fraud. With regard to the steps the Government have taken in the matter, of course the quantity of liquor found has been seized, and another quantity that was supposed to come from there has been seized in Montreal, and the plant in connection with the manufacture is also under seizure; and the Government will take such further steps for the protection of the revenue as may be indicated by the Act.

FORTIFICATIONS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Has the Government received a copy of the report of Colonel O'Brien, of the Royal Engineers, on the fortifications of British Columbia? If so, will it be laid on the Table of the House at an early date?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Department of Militia and Defence has not yet received a copy of the report of Colonel O'Brien on the defences of British Columbia.

Mr. CARLING.

CAPITAL ACCOUNT OF THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the sum charged to capital account of the Intercolonial Railway up to date of 20th April, 1887?

Mr. POPE. \$44,197,451. Of the above, \$11,171,894 was expended prior to 30th June, 1887.

EXPLORATION OF THE YUKON RIVER REGION.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to despatch an exploring expedition up the Yukon River this season; if so, whether any practical gold miners will be selected to accompany the expedition, with a view of testing the value of the auriferous deposit in the regions to be explored?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Government have despatched an expedition for the exploration of the Yukon River country. The chief of the expedition is Dr. George Dawson, Assistant Director of the Geological Survey, than whom no one in America is more competent to test the value of auriferous deposits.

DEEP SEA FISHERIES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue, this year, the exploration of the deep sea fisheries on the coast of British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention of the Government, this year, to renew the exploration of the deep sea fisheries on the coast of British Columbia.

TELEGRAPH SIGNAL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the telegraph signal service to Johnstone Straits, Alberni, Cape Real and Port San Juan? If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

LIGHTING THE STRAITS OF JUAN DE FUCA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a lighthouse at the entrance to the Straits of Juan de Fuca, either at Bouilla Point or Port San Juan? If so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is at present under the consideration of the Government.

HARBOR OF REFUGE AT PORT SAN JUAN.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether the Government have considered the necessity of constructing a harbor of refuge at Port San Juan, for the safety of sealers, tug boats and other vessels and steamers engaged in the commerce of the Dominion on the Pacific coast?

Mr. FOSTER. This matter is also under the consideration of the Government.

DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS AND MONTREAL COTTON COMPANY.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, Has there been any dispute between the Department of Customs and the manager of the Montreal Cotton Company with regard to duties on goods imported by said company?

Mr. BOWELL. I scarcely understand what the hon. gentleman means by the word "dispute." There has been

no "dispute" between the manager of the Montreal Cotton Company and the Department of Customs. There have been some irregularities, to which I have called the attention, not of the manager, but of the directors, and they have promised to put the matter right. What the decision of the Department will be, I am not at present able to say, as I have not received all the papers.

STATION HOUSE IN THE PARISH OF CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. DESSAINT, in the absence of Mr. CHOQUETTE, moved for :

Copies of tenders received by the Department of Railways for the building of a station house on the Intercolonial Railway, in the Parish of Cap St. Ignace, County of Montmagny.

Mr. POPE. There is no need for this return. There were tenders received, but the specifications were misunderstood, the tenders being from \$4,000 to \$6,000. New specifications are being prepared, and tenders will be invited in a few days. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Curran (p. 46) on the subject of Home Rule for Ireland, the proposed motion of Mr. McNeill (p. 55) in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy (p. 98) in amendment to the said amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker : It is with great unwillingness that I intrude myself on the House on any question not connected with North-West affairs; but there are a number of hon. gentlemen listening to me who will easily understand that when a question like this comes before the House, I having taken a deep interest in the general question to which it belongs, it would be very hard, and would cause some misunderstanding, if I did not express my opinion upon it; and, therefore, I will crave the indulgence of hon. gentlemen while I make a few remarks on the resolution and the amendments thereto now before the House. When I rose, Sir, on Friday night, I was led to speak on a topic raised by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Claves), who, asserting that the Tory party in England had dealt out nothing but cruelty to Ireland, gave the House the idea that all the Coercion Acts passed were passed by the Tory party. I knew that that was not the case, and, on the impulse of the moment, I questioned it. I have since analysed the Coercion Acts passed since the year 1800, and I find that in that period the number passed by the Liberal party nearly double the number passed by the Tory party; and I may say this, that the beneficent legislation of Mr. Gladstone, with regard to the land, was anticipated by Mr. Disraeli in 1852, when he laid plans on the Table of the House embodying the recommendations of the Devon Commission; and one of the most useful measures passed in regard to Ireland was Lord Ashbourne's Act, under which something like \$5,000,000 has been lent to the people of Ireland, as much more is about to be lent, and there are applications for as much again. The House is aware that Lord Ashbourne was Mr. Disraeli's Attorney General. So the hon. member for Missisquoi may feel a little more charitable towards the Conservative or Tory party, either in Canada or in England. In fact, Sir, the most liberal-minded Minister that ever led the House of Commons in England, the man who had the most enlightened views of Ireland, the man who, if he had had his way would, I believe, have settled the Irish question something like eighty-seven years ago, was Mr. Pitt. Now, Sir, during this debate we have had many able speeches, and two remarkable speeches: I allude

to the very able speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the cold, clear, logical utterance of my hon. friend the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But, Sir, I should like to call the attention of the House to what I was about to point out on Friday night, the fact that there are difficulties in Ireland with which, to deal effectively, will require years, and more than one, probably more than two or three Acts of Parliament. At the same time, in the sense in which the word grievances has been used from the time of the first protest against Poyning's Law to the time of O'Connell's agitation for Catholic Emancipation, and from that time to the time of Mr. Gladstone's legislation, there is no such thing at present in Ireland. At the present time in Ireland there is not a vestige of disability; yet how comes it that we have agrarian crimes? How comes it that the people are discontented? From the time of Strongbow and Fitzstephen the Irish Celt has fought in one fashion or another with the powerful intruders for the land, and those who were not and are not Celts, but Celtised, have taken up the struggle in the same spirit. When the Norman went into Ireland he found him there in the agrarian partnership of the clan, and that sense of property of dubious value still lingers in the mind of the Irish peasant. When we read in Irish history of chiefs and leading men having been forced to transplant and move westward, the reader generally thinks, probably, that the leading man only felt the sense of dispossession. The fact is that all his followers felt that they too were dispossessed. I will call the attention of the House for a moment to the language of Mr. Froude, because it is the language of a man who writes very adversely of Ireland, but still the language of a very well-informed historian. Speaking of an opportunity for Wentworth, Charles I's great Minister, to do a little plundering, he says :

"The state of tenures created an opportunity. The Commission was appointed to survey the lands, and to trace and enquire into the titles of their professing owners. In strict construction, four-fifths of Connaught was found to belong to the Crown; and Wentworth meditated taking advantage of the situation to make a new plantation. The intention, scarcely concealed, following so soon on the confiscation of the six counties, flung the Irish of the old blood into a frenzy of rage. Religious indulgence might satisfy the Anglo-Norman Catholics of the old settlements. The passions of the true Irishman were for the land, and he saw the land in large slices passing away from him to the stranger. What to him was King or Parliament, Calvinism, or Anglicanism. The one fact, to which all else was nothing, was coming home to his heart, that the Englishman, by force or fraud, was filching from him the inheritance of his fathers."

And if we turn to page 217 of the first volume of Mr. Froude, we find him writing as follows :—

"When the State sold lands to raise money, or allowed men to sell to one another, it became necessarily more indulgent to neglect. But if, on the one hand, London speculators, or Crown favorites, could not be prevented from acquiring large estates in Ireland, or the other, the entire object of the confiscation was defeated if the population were left unshepherded; or if, for the landlords' convenience, the sons and grandsons of the old owners were left in possession as tenants retaining their local influence, still, to all intents and purposes, the practical rulers; and of the conquest, no result was left but the annual exasperation of the returning rent-day. An ownership, which consisted merely in robbing a poor country of a percentage of the fruits of its industry, was no benefit but a curse; and, although it might have been impossible to revive the laws of Henry VIII, a wise settlement of Ireland would have included a tax so heavy on all rents sent out of the kingdom, as would have compelled proprietors to sell their lands to others who would make their estates their own."

The first quotation refers to the time of Charles I, and the second to the time of the Revolution; but this state of things was going on all the time, and the tradition of it has lingered in the minds of the people, a people of great longevity and tenacious of tradition. Cromwell's war was followed by the war of William. William was an enlightened statesman who desired to carry on that war with as much consideration as possible, and if the ascendancy party in the Irish Parliament had allowed him he would, at a later time, have dealt out a beneficent policy; but although he was strong and victorious, he was unable to carry out the stipulations

of the Treaty of Limerick, and the result of the violation of that treaty was that the Celtic gentry went over to France and Spain and the armies of the continent, and won, and their descendants have won, the very highest places in diplomacy and in the career of arms. The great French general, whose name is so dear to France, Marshal McMahon, is the descendant of one of these men who thus went out of the country after that unhappy transaction; and I remember—and it will probably interest those gentlemen from Lower Canada whom I see around me, to learn—that when, during the Franco-Germanic war, I had the pleasure of seeing Marshal McMahon, his face strongly reminded me of the face of an Irish gentleman. He had all the facial characteristics of an Irishman. The result was that the more Celtic portion of the people were deprived of their natural leaders. The legislation of Mr. Gladstone, as I have said, was beneficent legislation, but it must be confessed that it has not had a chance. When that legislation was passed, as much was given to Ireland as some of her strongest friends who had fought unselfishly for that country had hoped for; and if that legislation had had a chance, if the people had, under it, set about their work with patience, industry, and steadiness, if they had availed themselves of an instrument, which, I believe, they had, under these Acts, to become landed proprietors, there is not the slightest doubt that there would be a very much more prosperous state of things in Ireland than exists at present. But if the statistics are looked at, it will be found a great mistake to suppose that Ireland has receded. On the contrary, she has, and is progressing. Although she has had some bad years, there is no doubt that in the past quarter of a century she has made steady progress; but on the heels of the Gladstone legislation, what happened? There sprang up another agitation, as the result of which the people are being educated into carrying on a kind of war; they are being educated to make struggling and agitating a necessity to their existence; and if you were to give them Home Rule, how do you suppose these people would become at once denuded of their habits, and settle down into ways of peaceful and quiet industry? So that, with regard to the agitation that is going on at present, it is desirable that it should be stopped by rendering it unnecessary. I said I am in favor of local government for Ireland—I mean a system of local government which would leave her connection with the Empire intact, and I believe that a local government which would give an opportunity to her aspiring spirits to have the direction of their country's local affairs—a local government such as our Provinces have here—would, I believe, terminate this agitation. Nor would there be any difficulty in now ceding local government to Ireland. That government would have been granted to her long ago, if some of her leaders, who have brought themselves into prominence on this Home Rule question, had not used language that alarmed, not only Englishmen and Scotchmen, but the best friends of Ireland the world over. Had they shown themselves perfectly loyal to the Empire in word and action, there is not an Englishman, from one end of England to the other, who would not have been ready to do all in his power to secure to Ireland local self-government. Let me say one word about the schemes of independence that I sometimes see sketched. For dark decades Ireland's soil has been wet with blood and tears; she has had a fearful baptism of sorrow for centuries, but no bloody era through which she has passed would be equal to the disastrous results that would follow any attempt to bring about independence in that country. What is meant by this phrase Home Rule?—because my hon. friend who moved the motion did not explain to us either the meaning of Home Rule or his plan. Is it meant that the people are to be governed by their own representatives in the country to which they belong—in the country for which their forefathers fought and toiled, and in which their

Mr. DAVIN.

forefathers distinguished themselves? If so, Ireland has Home Rule at present. I consider that Ireland is governed by a Parliament that is her own Parliament, as much as it is the Parliament of England or Scotland. I consider that the Empire belongs as much to Irishmen as it does to Englishmen or Scotchmen. England is an old country, so is Ireland, so is Scotland, but the British Empire is but of yesterday. Go back a couple of hundred years, and where is the British Empire? The British Empire has been built during the past two centuries by Irishmen, Scotchmen and Englishmen, and if you go to India and the battle-fields of the continent, you will find Irishmen fighting side by side with Englishmen and Scotchmen, and not distinguishing themselves less than their brothers in arms. You will find them in every walk of life, active and fruitful—as statesmen, as literary men, as barristers, as mechanics, as laborers. In every walk of life you find the Irishman doing his part in building up the Empire during these two centuries. There is not a quarry from which a stone has been taken to build up that grandiose structure, where you will not find Irishmen working side by side with Englishmen and Scotchmen; there is not a stone in the majestic edifices of the British Empire in which there is not the mark of an Irish chisel. The man who would try to make an Irishman feel that he is an alien in the British Empire is either an ignoramus or a scoundrel. Therefore, if you want Home Rule you cannot want it in contradistinction to alien rule, because you have Home Rule already, and for that reason I prefer the phrase local government. Now, pursuing the line of thought that I was on a moment ago, let me take the words Celt and Saxon. I saw in a newspaper I was reading awhile ago the phrase "The Saxons must go." Why, if you were to go into Ireland at the present minute, and try to find out the Saxons in order to get rid of them, it would be a very difficult piece of work; it would be a piece of work very much like Shylock had to perform when he was told to take his pound of flesh; it would be a very difficult job indeed, just as difficult a job as it would be if you were to go into England in order to get rid of the Celts in England. England is largely Celtic. Long before the recent infusions, England, as Matthew Arnold points out, was largely Celtic; and in Ireland, as Froude says, the races are so mixed—Saxon, Norman, Dane, and so on—that it is very hard indeed to find a pure Celt. So there is no ethnological base for those hatreds that are sought to be fanned as between Saxon and Celt. So early as the fourteenth century, there was a statute of Kilkenny passed forbidding Englishmen, English settlers, that is, Norman settlers, to assume Irish names. Therefore, names are no guide. A name may show that a man must infallibly have other blood than that of a Celt in him—as for instance, we have the name of the distinguished leader of the Opposition. That is not an Irish name; it is a Norman name. But many Irishmen who have Irish names, really Celtic names, are actually the descendants of men who assumed those names and became, according to a Latin proverb, more Irish than the Irish themselves. Then, religion is no test, although I saw that a late mayor of Dublin put out the banner "Faith and Fatherland." Of course, if that is put out, they ought to expel Mr. Parnell right away, and they will have to get rid of the Floods and the Grattans and the Currans, and a great number of their distinguished men. But I want to emphasise this still more. Tipperary is supposed to be the most characteristically Irish county in Ireland. What are the facts? The fact is that Tipperary was colonised by Cromwell's Ironsides. How are they Catholic to-day? I will tell you. The miserable and abominable way in which the English Church was exploited—men taking orders in it and not doing any duties in connection therewith—left that county as it left other parts of Ireland, to the charge entirely of the more zealous Catholic priest, and the more zealous Catholic priest took an interest in education, and, in the course

of two or three generations, the descendants of those Ironsides had lapsed into the faith against which their forefathers had fought so bitterly and so strenuously. Thus neither name nor religion will prove that a man is a Celt, and there is consequently no historical and no ethnological base for these unchristian, and I will say, unnational hatreds that I have seen advocated and expressed in various quarters. Therefore, on sentimental grounds, although that is the ground I find some people put it on, there is no reason whatever for granting a local Government or Home Rule to Ireland. Is there on practical grounds? Yes, Sir, on practical grounds it would be useful. I will give an instance to the House. There is a railway from Cork to Bandon. It is a little one-horse railway, something like a railway would be from Ottawa to Pembroke. I was assured by one of the promoters of that railway that it cost as much to get that railway Bill through the committees in London as it cost to build the line. That is a thing that ought to be got rid of. Can there be any objection to having an Assembly to deal with a matter like that in Ireland? Besides, I think that, although the Imperial Parliament is taking many measures for the development of the material resources of that country, a local Assembly would have more time to devote to those matters. What a local Assembly could do was shown in the eighteenth century, when they had a Parliament, emasculated indeed, but still a local Parliament. In the middle of the eighteenth century Ireland was a country of all but limitless pasture. At the time of Arthur Young's visit, about a century ago:

"A change had set in. Yet he found one grass farm of ten thousand acres, and not a few sheep walks of five or six thousand acres. It is important to note that it was not natural adaptability which brought about this state of things. One cause was the scarcity of labor, consequent on the incessant wars of the seventeenth century. But there followed on the Treaty of Limerick three-quarters of a century of repose. Population increased, but still cattle farming was continued. The penal laws prohibited Catholics from buying or leasing lands. Competition between tenants was kept down. Thus the breaking up of farms was prevented. The markets of England and the Colonies were closed against the Irish farmer, and he had no motive for increasing production. Besides, the disqualification of Catholics lulled the Protestants into a lethargic confidence. Complaints at last arose that there was not enough food grown for the population which had greatly increased. The Irish Parliament offered a bounty for all corn imported from the inland rural districts into Dublin. The effect was immediate. Arthur Young noticed in 1776 that the richest pasturages of Tipperary and Limerick were being broken up. The outbreak of the American war gave a new impulse to this movement."

So that we have an historical fact to show us what might be done by a local Assembly. Not only that, but there is a certain impulse of life given by contact, close contact, with a Government, and to-day, if you go through Dublin, you will find that it wears a widowed appearance; there is a venerable dinge over everything, and the people are entirely without that sense of being able to deal directly and rapidly with their local affairs that you find, for instance, here. Take Ontario. Suppose you were to take the local Assembly away from Ontario, there would at once be a great diminution of life in that great Province, and so in all our Provinces; and what I desire to see is such a local Assembly as would do for Ireland what the local Assemblies do for our various Provinces; and, if there were a local Assembly to do the same thing for England, and a local Assembly to do the same thing for Scotland, I do not think it would be a bad thing, because the weary Titan of the Imperial Parliament already staggers under the load she has to carry, "the too vast orb of her fate." From 1782 to 1798 the Irish Parliament had been relieved of those shackles which were placed upon her by one Act after another, and by one usurpation after another, from the Poyning's Act down; and what do we find as the truth about the state of things between 1782 and 1798? Lord Clare, who was the leader of the ascendancy party, says, in a pamphlet published in 1798,—and his testimony, remember, was the

testimony of a man opposed to the existence of an Irish Parliament:

"There is no nation on the habitable globe which has advanced in cultivation and commerce, in agriculture and manufactures, with the same rapidity in the same period."

Mr. Plunket, afterwards Lord Plunket, in January, 1800, said:

"Her revenues, her trade, her manufactures, thriving beyond the hope or the example of any other country of her extent; within these few years advancing with a rapidity astonishing even to herself; not complaining of deficiency in any of these respects, but enjoying and acknowledging her prosperity."

In December, 1798, the bankers of Dublin had a meeting at which they resolved:

"That since the renunciation of the power of Great Britain, in 1782, to legislate for Ireland, the commerce and prosperity of the country have eminently increased."

And, Sir, it stands to reason that if there is an Assembly whose sole business would be to deal with the material development of a country, on the very principle of division of labor, the work would be better done. Now, in regard to the union itself, two objects rose before the minds of the men who were engaged in bringing that union about. George III declared, when the union was brought about, that he consented to it because it "finished him with the Catholics." He thought he would never again be bothered with any Catholic claim. Well, that, of course, failed, because in 1829 Catholic Emancipation was passed in order to avoid a civil war. Mr. Pitt said, when the union was brought about, that he looked at it as a great means for tranquillising and pacifying Ireland. Well, that, of course, has failed. We keep there at present an armed police force such as is kept in no other part of the Empire, and that police force is supplemented by an army which, on the authority of an English Cabinet Minister, I can say is as large as the army with which we fought Napoleon. Now, Sir, that is a state of things that must be faced by English statesmen, and it must be faced by those among us who take an interest in Imperial questions—and it is palpable that we take a deep interest in Imperial questions, because we are turning from our legitimate business here to discuss this great question. It is very properly said that there should be some anxiety on the score of the minority. It is said that the minority would suffer. I have heard people talk about arming. Why, Sir, there would be no necessity of arming. Of course, no Imperial Act would be passed that would not make provision for the protection of the minority; and I suppose the Catholics of Ireland would no more be able to act together than the Catholics of Quebec, or the Protestants of Ontario. I suppose the same laws which divide the Catholics of Quebec and the Protestants in Ontario, would divide the Catholics in Ireland. The same ambitions, the differences of view, all those mental and moral causes which divide the Protestants in Ontario and the Catholics in Quebec, would divide the large Catholic population in Ireland; and what should we see then? Why, we should see a Protestant vote in Ireland; and from what we see of the Catholic vote in Ontario, I suppose the Protestant vote in Ireland would be able to make itself felt. So, Sir, I do not think there is a danger of the minority suffering. As I said before, I doubt very much if there would be any danger of separation, although we read certain wild statements from the more ebullient spirits. There are many reasons why there would be no danger, in my opinion, of an agitation for separation. In the first place, the rebellion of 1793 was not caused by the fact that they had a separate Parliament. That rebellion was an echo of the French revolution—the French revolution was in the air everywhere; the Irish mind took fire at the French revolution, and that was the main cause of the rebellion. Any man who reads the history of the rebellion of

1798, will see how close was the correspondence between the Irish leaders of that day and the Directory in France. Then, again, if you give her a local Government her material interests are bound up with those of England. She exports at the present moment to the extent of £20,000,000 sterling, about \$100,000,000 worth. And how much of that goes to England? £19,250,000. So that if she wanted to separate, what would she have to do? She has not got a ship, she cannot become a naval power; and she would have to make a navy to destroy her best customer, and to destroy the navy of the greatest naval power in the world. So, Sir, I think we need not be alarmed on that score. Now, let me say one word in regard to the Coercion Bill. But for the word "exciting," but for the provision in regard to exciting in the Coercion Bill, I do not see there is much to object to. And the two magistrates—that is a thing, I confess, knowing Ireland as I do, to make one pause; because these two magistrates, would, in nine cases out of ten, belong to the landlord class, and we know the state of mind that class is in at present. I am afraid that, under these circumstances, a man accused, to use an expressive though not very elegant phrase, might be "going to law with the devil in the court of hell." But, Sir, there is crime in Ireland. In the telegram that arrived this morning, which tells us that Mr. O'Brien is not coming here—and I think he does very well not to come here—there is a statement that persons will not be allowed to take a certain course. A circular is sent around Ireland telling the rack-renters to beware of sharpshooters. Well, Sir, of course the state of things in which crime, menace and threatening obtain, is not a state of liberty. The moment the law is paralysed the people are under a tyranny. I have here a few words from Lord Littleton on this subject, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. Remember, that at the present time freedom in all parts of the British Empire is no longer in danger from the encroachments of the Crown; it is in danger, if anything, from the people themselves. Lord Littleton says:

"In order to preserve the independence of Parliament against any future violation on the part of the Crown, it will be necessary to preserve the reputation of Parliament in the minds of the people, and the love of it in their hearts. How, my Lords, can this be done if they find it an obstacle to their equal justice, which is their birth-right and their safety? Upon the whole I am confident your Lordships will, on no account, depart from that maxim, which is the corner stone of all Government, that justice should have its course without stop or impediment. *Jus, fas, lex, potentissima sint.* This, my Lords, is the very soul and essence of freedom. Obstruct this, and you immediately open a door to all violence and confusion; to all iniquity and all the cruelties of private revenge; to the destruction of private peace, the dissolution of public order, and in the end, to an unlimited and despotic authority which we must be forced to submit to as a remedy against such intolerable evils. The dominion of law is the dominion of liberty. Privilege against law in matters of high concernment to the public is oppression, is tyranny, wheresoever it exists."

And, Sir, any secret society threatening people, any system or state of society in which crimes such as we hear of are perpetrated, that is a condition in which the people are subjected to the worst of all possible tyrannies. I confess it is very hard to resist the clear, cold logic of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If the Imperial Parliament, a Parliament under which we live and move and have our being, were to lecture us on our legislation in this House we should kick like an overfed steer. If we should regard it as impertinent on their part to interfere with us, *a fortiori* it is impertinent on our part to play the legislative pedagogue to them. They are responsible; they know all the facts. It is a serious thing to interfere with a Government dealing with the suppression of crime. It is a very serious thing to take any course under such circumstances which will weaken the Executive. I have in my hand a few sentences from Mr. Justin McCarthy's work, "The History of our own Time," on this point. Speaking of the interference of England with the Chinese Government, he says:

Mr. DAVIN.

"It was no business of ours to ask ourselves whether the Chinese Government were perfectly sincere in their professions of lofty morality, or whether they, unlike all other Governments that have ever been known, were influenced by one sole motive in the making of their regulations. All that had nothing to do with the question. States are not at liberty to help the subjects of other States to break the laws of their own Governments. Especially when these laws profess to concern questions of morals, is it the duty of foreign States not to interfere with the regulations which a Government sees it necessary to impose for the protection of its people."

So that, Sir, we take a very grave responsibility upon us. I find, on reading the debates of the English Parliament, from time to time—and I have an instance of it in my hands in *Hansard*—that speakers in that Parliament constantly refer to opinions in the States, and here and make arguments from those opinions; and if a Cabinet Minister—and I have here an instance where a Cabinet Minister actually made an argument from the opinion of the States and Canada—so acts, then it may be, after all, a proper and right thing for us to give our opinion in regard to the Coercion Bill and Home Rule, notwithstanding Mr. Gladstone's snub as quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe. There are a large number of Irishmen and their descendants in Canada, and it is to their credit that they take a deep interest in the rock whence they were hewn, provided they do not allow their interest in Ireland to override their duty to Canada, provided they keep intact their interest and devote the necessary portion of their time to Canadian affairs—it is to their credit that they do not forget Ireland and still take an interest in her affairs. And, therefore, under these circumstances it may be not inappropriate that we in this House should do what many hon. members and many people outside think is wasting the time of Canada. But, as I say, the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is, in my opinion, unanswerable as a piece of logic. If we were dealing with a matter of law, if we were dealing with anything but human beings, the speech of that hon. gentleman is unanswerable. But brilliant, logical, clear, strong as it was, it had one defect. It was defective in sympathy; and being defective in sympathy, I could not go with him and with his motion. But, Sir, we cannot afford—I speak now as an Irishman—Irishmen here and in the States cannot afford to do otherwise than to protest in the strongest possible manner against such crimes as are taking place in Ireland. An Englishman, a Scotchman, a Frenchman, may philosophise an excuse, if he likes, for such crimes; but there is one man that cannot do so, and that is an Irishman who is jealous for the honor of Ireland and for his own. He can find no excuse for these crimes, and the men that perpetrate them are the greatest enemies to the local government of Ireland and to Ireland's prosperity, for they are driving capital away from the country; and I learn there is great depression in Dublin in consequence of these matters. And, therefore, while I cannot sympathise with the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), yet in his attitude that those crimes must be denounced and put down I entirely agree. As to giving advice to English statesmen, I think, from one point of view, we are in a good position to do so. We live in a new country which emancipates us from Old World prejudices. In England and Ireland feudal structures anomalously linger in luxurious pomp or proud decay and prejudices cling round them like ivy round the long disused battlement. Under those circumstances a statesman like Lord Salisbury, or any English statesman, may actually not have so good a standpoint from which to arrive at a just conclusion on political questions, as have the people who breathe the broader and freer air of this continent. I confess, from what we know English statesmen have done for Canada, we cannot feel they are above the possibility of error; and looking back, as far as my reading of history goes, to the great names, as I suppose they will be called, the great statesmen who have ruled England, only three or four really understood how to deal

with Ireland. Mr. Burke, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox had a clear grasp of the way to deal with Ireland, but the Nottinghams and Norths and such men were utterly incapable of dealing either with Ireland or with the Empire generally. I have here a telegram which I saw yesterday in the newspaper, and I was sorry to read that Lord Salisbury spoke as follows:—

"He denied that the Cowper Commission gave the fall in prices as the sole reason for the tenants' inability to pay their rents. If the rents were revised now there would be no argument with which to resist the constant demands that would be made for revision upon the slightest grounds. Why should a tenant who entered into a bargain which turned out unprofitable be differently treated from a person in any other business? When able to pay their debts they should do so. When it was impossible to pay, society recognised the case and provided relief for the insolvent. He thought the precedent applied amply to the present case."

Now, Sir, it may seem presumption on my part, but I have often heard Lord Salisbury speak, I have studied that eminent statesman a little, and I venture to say that that is a very unsympathetic and very unstatesmanlike way of regarding this question. I think, moreover, that the present situation, the present opportunity, emphasises the great loss which England and the Empire sustained—to say nothing of the great loss the Conservative party in England sustained, in the death of Lord Beaconsfield. They were keeping his Primrose Day a few days ago, and that is only another instance, to which I could add hundreds, that you may build monuments to the prophets but you cannot catch their inspiration. Now, what is the meaning of our debating this question here to-day? I believe it was not before our constituents during the late election. What is the meaning of the Ontario Legislature discussing it? What is the meaning of the Quebec Legislature discussing it? What is the meaning of resolutions being passed in various assemblies, a large portion of those assemblies hardly caring one pin about Ireland? The fact is—and that fact had better be faced, if we are to understand the situation, and if we are to assume that attitude which is wise under the circumstances—the fact is that the poor, despised, down-trodden Irish Celt of half a century ago has triumphed. Beaten on the battle-field now by more skilful forces, now by larger numbers, treated now cruelly and now a little kindly by England—if he had been treated as cruelly as some desired he might have been exterminated, and if he had been treated more kindly he might have been reconciled; but treated as he has been he has remained unreconciled, and meanwhile what has happened? The battle has been transferred from the battle-field to the cradle, and the pure and therefore fruitful Irish woman has conquered. The cradle has won, and there is now a greater Ireland here. A Cabinet Minister has used the phrase that you have not only outside Britain a greater Britain, but you have outside Ireland a greater Ireland; and the significance of this debate, if it has any genuine significance that it is desirable we should lay to heart—I am not talking about looking after a vote here and a vote there—the genuine significance of this debate lies in that fact. I want to know if there is any general moral that an earnest man can take from this debate. Sir, there is, and it is this: to see and acknowledge the fact that while hon. members dislike the question, while some would like to see it kicked from the floor of the House, nevertheless the question is discussed, although it does not belong in any way to our business. What is the meaning of this fact? Its meaning is this: that this man that thirty, forty or fifty years ago was despised and trodden under foot, has become a power; it means that he insists on being considered, and that you have to consider him. Mr. Froude points out how the effort was made from time to time to decelticise Ireland, and points out also that it always failed. At the time Lord John Russell's Encumbered Estates Bill was passed—a measure which though I do not say it was an unwise measure, was certainly, passed at that particular

time, a cruel and short-sighted act—at that time I find that the London *Times*, the Thunderer, was writing about what that Act would do. It said this Act would give you Scotch and English tenants instead of Irish tenants; it would give you Scotch and English landlords instead of Irish landlords, and in a few years a Celtic Irishman would be as rare in Connemara as on the banks of the Manhattan. They were going to decelticise Ireland by means of the law of supply and demand. I remember that in 1882 I had a conversation with one of the most eminent men of the United States, whom I met on a train, and who was then aspiring to a high office. He told me his plans for annexing Canada to the United States, and his chief plan was that he had a millionaire, a man of English manners, one who had lived largely on the continent of Europe, and he said, I am going to send him to Ottawa, as a sort of diplomatist, and my directions to him will be to out-dinner Rideau Hall—he must beat the Governor General hollow in the matter of dinners. I said to him: Are you going to annex five millions of people with a gridiron? So these people were going to decelticise Ireland by the law of supply and demand. I need hardly say that experiment failed, and we are now face to face with the fact that we have, outside Ireland, a greater Ireland taking a deep interest in her affairs, though I am bound to say, not always a wise interest. But you must remember what I have shown you happened; and remember also that laws existed almost within living memory which kept the people of Ireland in ignorance. Remember all that, and remember too as this same eminent writer, Mr. Froude, lays down, you cannot, whether as a nation or an individual, commit a crime but you become a debtor—he puts it—a debtor to nature; I prefer to go higher than nature, and say that you become a debtor to the Power that rules this world, and the time will come sooner or later when the bill will have to be paid. Any such policy as was pursued towards Ireland would have been all right if you could have trammelled up the consequences. If the blow then given could have been the be-all and the end-all. But in these cases you teach bloody instructions which, being taught, return to plague the inventors, and by investigating and brooding on those wrongs, many of these wilder spirits in the United States have been inflamed. When I read what they say and do I feel humiliated as an Irishman. But we must remember what were the circumstances which are responsible for this result. And in this relation I believe it would be a good thing to have a local Assembly, I believe it would be a good thing to have a local Assembly that would give the Irish people the excitement of local politics, and would help to develop the country. In that way I believe a blow would be struck at an agitation which is educating the rising generation in Ireland to be unfit for everything like peaceful and industrial life. The hon. Member for North Simcoe said he was making an unpopular speech. I do not know whether I have been making a popular or an unpopular speech. I have not been aiming at making a popular or an unpopular speech. I have often spoken to my countrymen on questions affecting Ireland, and they know well that I have never flattered them, for they know that I love them too much to flatter them. I prefer to tell them their faults, and for my part I do not care one straw whether my speech is popular or unpopular, provided I tell the truth. As the great Florentine says:

"Pur che mia coscienza non mi garra,
Che alla fortuna, come vuol, son presto."

The meaning of which in plain words is this, that provided I satisfy my conscience, provided I have the self-approving hour, I care very little; I think that is above applause, and it is a barrier against disapproval. In case the amendment should not be carried, I will, should I have an opportunity, present an amendment to the House that will ex-

press more nearly my own views than either of the amendments now before it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I crave the indulgence of this honorable House for a short time while I express my opinion on the great question now under discussion. I am not an Irishman, but I sympathise very largely with the Irish people in their present and past distress. I feel as a Canadian as if I could wish that all people in the world could have that form of government that we have, and could enjoy the same rights to manage their own affairs that we enjoy. I was very highly gratified when the hon. member for Montreal Centre brought forward this resolution, and made, in my opinion, a very excellent speech, setting forth the claims Irishmen had on the sympathy and influence of this country. I was not so well pleased with the speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when he spoke of the political parties from whom Coercion Bills came. It matters very little to us as Canadians, and less to the Irish people, from what sources the Coercion Bills came. They suffered largely and long under those Coercion Bills, and it did not matter whether a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government in England was the author of them. It is our duty, and our privilege, to express our sympathy and give our aid, as far as we possibly can, to those who are in distress. My hon. friend from Assiniboia thought we were departing from the business of this country when we engaged the attention of this large House for so long a time in the consideration of Irish affairs. The Irish people look across the ocean to us as people enjoying the privileges of constitutional government, and they say to us: "Come over and help us." If we cannot go over personally to help them, we can at least place on paper the sympathy of the great Canadian people with them in their present difficulties. In that way we can not only help them to gain what they desire, but we can strengthen the hands of the great Liberal party in England which is attempting to extend to Ireland the right of constitutional government. When we consider the number of Coercion Bills passed since the union, it is perfectly astonishing that the Irish people have remained as loyal as they have. From the time of the union in 1800 to 1833, there were eleven years during which the Statute books of England were free from Coercion Bills, and twenty-one years during which Coercion Bills were imposed upon the Irish people. During the last fifty-three years there were only two years in which the Statute-books of England did not contain some measure of a repressive character in regard to Ireland. Need we expect anything else than the hearts of the Irish people will be alienated, to a great extent, from that loyalty and respect to the British Crown that we should like them to possess? Need we wonder that the population of that country has decreased from 8,000,000 in 1832 to 5,000,000 at the present time? Need we wonder that hundreds of thousands of the Irish people, driven from their own country by those harsh laws, and now living in foreign countries enjoying the liberties of constitutional government, will entertain a rancorous feeling in their hearts against the Government whose laws have driven them from their fair land and salubrious climate? I do not know that crimes are so rampant in Ireland that the present Coercion Bill is absolutely necessary for peace and harmony there. If we contrast the criminal statistics of the year 1832 with those of 1885, we find that in 1832 there were 248 homicides and in 1885 there were only 65; in 1832 there were 209 attempts to kill, and in 1885 there were only 65; in 1832 the total number of serious crimes committed was 6,014, and in 1885 there were only 1,057; and in the criminal calendar of the country the total number of criminal cases in 1832 is given as 14,000, and in 1885 only 2,644. Now, it is said that these Coercion Bills are highly necessary, and

Mr. DAVIN.

I agree with those who said it is important that as much order should be restored in that country as possible. But when they are putting into force Coercion Acts for the purpose of suppressing disorder, why do not the British Government at the same time bring forward some measure of Home Rule which we believe will be found a bulwark against disturbance and crime in that unhappy island? We, as others, regret those crimes. We are not here for the purpose of defending them. But we say that the British Government has tried coercion for the last 87 years, and that it is a failure, and we ask, why not give those people that measure of Home Rule which will before many years restore order in the country? As Canadians, we can deeply sympathise with these people, because we, ourselves, at one time were almost in the same position as they. Our fathers remember well the time when we had not responsible government, and when those who were working in the cause of responsible government were pointed out as opposed to British connection, as disloyal and disobedient to the Throne. We were said to be rebels, we were said to be agitating for the separation of this country from the Mother Country, we were charged with seeking to dismember the Empire. But our claims were granted, and what has been the result? The sequel proves that all those charges were false, that we became more loyal, that we esteemed our Queen in a higher degree, that our allegiance to the Throne became deeper and broader than ever before. We received responsible government, we legislated for ourselves, and the result was that, in appreciation of that gift, our love for our Queen and our loyalty to the Throne became vastly increased. So it will be with Ireland when she obtains her Home Rule. In having the right to manage her own affairs, to establish her own schools and universities, to build her own railways and bridges, and to do everything relating to her own local wants, Ireland will become as loyal and devoted to the Crown as the most enthusiastic lover of the British Empire could desire. The sentiments of her children, who, for years, have been forced to leave her shores, would become changed. Do you suppose it at all probable that these men who have been driven to the United States and elsewhere can, when their thoughts revert to their own land, harbor any feeling of friendship for the system that drove them away; but grant Ireland Home Rule, and I will warrant the assertion that in the future the Irish people who leave their country will look back longingly to their own green isle, with its beautiful climate and fertile soil, and instead of seeing her shores through the haze of enmity will view them with feelings of love and loyalty to the Empire. These people are now menacing Canada, because they are trying to strike Great Britain through Canada; but only accede to their just demands, and we will have peace, order and prosperity both here and at home. Therefore, it is our duty, even if in doing it we depart from the business of the day, to consider this great question, and assist as far as we can by our influence and our talents, if necessary, this long-suffering people to acquire what they are entitled to, the management of their own affairs. We are told by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the minority in Ireland would not submit to Home Rule. Surely the hon. gentleman is wrong. Surely the minority in Ireland are not rebels. Surely these supra-loyal men would not rebel against the British Throne because the majority in Ireland rule. Why, the majority in every country must rule. No; I have a higher appreciation of the minority. I know that the Protestant minority would not rebel, but would fall into line, and I am sure the majority would show the tolerant spirit that was shown by the Protestant minority in the old Irish Parliament when they extended to Irish Catholics the right to hold office under the Crown. The Irish Catholics were emancipated in Ireland even before the English emancipated them. The Roman Catho-

lies, under the system of local self-government, would be placed on their good behaviour, they would remember the concession of the Government of Ireland, when Lord Fitzwilliam was Viceroy, extended to the Catholics of that day, and they would, in return, extend to the Protestant minority corresponding blessings and advantages. Again, when these parties would be brought together in legislation, they would forget their difference, each would allow the other to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and all would unite shoulder to shoulder, mental capabilities to mental capabilities, for the purpose of developing the interest of the country, and thus they would combine to establish a condition of public affairs in consonance with the general interests of the country, making fair Ireland prosperous and happy. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) quoted the words of Judge Johnstone, of Cork: "We must give Ireland security," and he quoted them as an argument in favor of coercion. If Ireland gets security, then comes order, and when Ireland gets order, then comes peace, and when Ireland gets peace, then comes prosperity. Let us apply that axiom. Give Ireland security by allowing her to make her own laws, to control her own local affairs, to build her own railways, to manage everything pertaining to her own locality, and then comes order, and not until then; when order comes, then comes peace, and when peace comes all will be united for the purpose of making the country prosperous and happy. The day is not far distant when Ireland will begin to prosper. Do we expect the past to be wiped out the very moment Ireland gets Home Rule? Not at all. Suppose a person who has been sick of a fever becomes convalescent, he must still remain with traces of the sickness until he becomes restored to his former health and vigor. In his convalescence he is only ascending the ladder of health, which he will continue to ascend until he reaches the state of health and vigor. So, when Ireland obtains Home Rule, we must look for some disorder and want of harmony for a time; but all these conflicting elements will end by the people of all classes combining, and step by step the country will go on until she will have passed the final stage of convalescence and will stand forth prosperous and peaceful. It is said also that Home Rule will lead to the dismemberment of the Empire. That cry has been raised in our own country. In 1837, we were told that if we obtained responsible government, our connection with the Mother Country would cease; but the sequel has shown that responsible government did not, with us, lead to dismemberment. On the contrary, the bonds of affection and loyalty between the colonies and the Mother Country became strengthened. Again, in 1859, when we sought to have these Provinces confederated into one grand union, similar to that of to-day, what were we told by those who opposed that scheme? Ah, they said, the Reformers are taking another step to dismember the Empire. But the sequel has proved that Confederation did not lead to dismemberment, but to the binding together into one whole, the Empire and its Colonies, and in giving a strength and influence in the world. As the Colonies gain strength, influence and power, so were strength, influence and power added to the Empire. Again, when we agitated for the management of local interests in our western municipal government, we were told that we were seeking a republic. Again they said, these Reformers are trying to introduce a republican system; and their ulterior object is the dismemberment of the Empire. But, on the contrary, we became more loyal to the Crown, and loved, esteemed, and venerated our Queen more than ever before. We were told, two years ago, when the leader of the Opposition stood upon the floor of Parliament and asked that we should apply to the British Government for power to make our own commercial treaties with foreign powers, that to

do so would be disrespectful to the British Empire. Why, it would help the Empire, because it would add to the consolidation of the Empire, did we send our agents into foreign countries. In that way we enlarge our boundaries and increase our trade and commerce, we not only continue to be a portion of the Empire but we are at the same time extending the power and influence of the Empire, making the Empire stronger and helping to prevent disintegration and dismemberment. We are told that Ireland would separate from England. Grattan at one time, when discussing the question of the union of parliaments, said: "Looking across the St. George's Channel, it is too wide for union of parliaments, but, looking across the ocean, it is too wide for separation;" and this is just the position. Ireland cannot separate and conduct her Government with the same advantages she now obtains. Her market is in England. She sells her manufactured goods to England, she sends her linens there, she sends her cattle and the produce of her farms to England. It is a home market, and, if Ireland were separated from that country, would this trade be carried on so advantageously to the Irish people? No country is so advantageously situated for Ireland as England is. We were told to-day by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the exportation from Ireland to England amounted to something over £19,000,000 sterling. You will see what great interests are affected in connection with that, when I call your attention to the fact that out of exportations exceeding £19,500,000 to England, £10,617,000 sterling is paid by the tenants of Ireland into the pockets of the land owners of England. Over one half of the entire exports of Ireland passes into the hands of non resident land owners. This is another fact I desire to press upon this House and upon this country, that a large proportion of this £19,000,000, more than half consists of manufactured goods; and, when we consider that more than all the natural products of that land are required to pay the landlords for the use of the land, it must be a sad position for Ireland in this enlightened nineteenth century. We were also told that, by this agitation, Gladstone, the great leader of the Liberal party in England, had driven from his side no less than twelve of his most able and strong supporters. That is no argument against the agitation for Home Rule. When we were granted responsible government in this country, a large number of the party that gave it to us were opposed to its being granted to this country. Did that show that we were not entitled to the power we asked for to govern ourselves according to constitutional rules, and is that any reason why the Irish people should not ask for this power from the Government of England, simply because twelve of these men did not agree with Mr. Gladstone in his Irish Home Rule Bill? Allow me to point out another fact, which shows the hold that this question has taken upon the people of England. Gladstone went to the country not only with the influence and ability of these former followers of his against him, but with the influence of the aristocracy and the landed gentry, with all their millions of money, also on the other side. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Gladstone went before the country and pleaded as no other living man could plead, for the Irish people, and what was the result? Out of 3,000,000 people who voted at that election, Mr. Gladstone's opponents had only a majority of 75,000 votes. Does not that show that this question has taken root in the English heart? The delay is only for a short time. No matter what we may do here, the time for Home Rule is not far in the future, and I hope Mr. Gladstone will live to see that day arrive and to see his noble efforts crowned with the fullest success. It is our duty, enjoying the privileges of constitutional government, enjoying full and ample scope to develop our own resources largely attending to our own trade interests, to give our sympathy and support, as far as resolutions of this kind can

give them, to the people in Ireland who are asking for like privileges, and to hold up the hands of those noble men in England who are standing forth as men should in the interests of humanity, and trying to give to the Irish people that Home Rule which they should possess; and when that Home Rule comes, there will be in Ireland security, and following on the footsteps of security there will be order in that country, and following up that order and peace there will be hopes for the future. Every individual in this country—I, for one—will hail the day when the Irish people will be put in full possession of constitutional government, to enable them to control their own affairs and develop their own resources.

Mr. FREEMAN. After the very able addresses we have been given on this subject by hon. members who seem to understand fully this great Irish question—a question which seems to have baffled the ablest minds in Great Britain, not only the present Prime Minister but the Grand Old Man—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to allow me to interrupt him for a moment. I was going to propose that the debate be adjourned. I know a great many members in the House are called away to-night by other duties, and a number of members went away on Friday and Saturday who are not here and will not be here to-day. It is of great importance that this vote should be taken fully, and to enable the hon. gentlemen who are in the House now, and are called away by paramount duties elsewhere, to vote, and to allow the debate to be resumed when the other members return, I move the adjournment of the debate, to be the First Order of the Day to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the adjournment of this debate to be proposed on Friday evening because some hon. members desired to go away, and now it is proposed to adjourn it again because some other hon. members desire to go away: I do not know how much longer the debate is to continue, because it seems to me that the longer it takes the more there is of it. I fully expected, when the debate was adjourned on Friday, that there would have been no further interruption of it to-day, but that the discussion would be closed and the vote would be taken this evening. I am still of opinion that it would be for the convenience of the House if another whole day were not needlessly consumed in this discussion, but, if the general opinion of the House is that we should adjourn at six o'clock to-night, I do not propose to oppose the motion or divide the House upon the question.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned, to stand the First Order for Tuesday.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to enquire of the First Minister if he proposes that this debate shall close to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Considering the fact that there is a great deal of business, and a considerable number of discussions to come on, I think that the House is throwing away very valuable time by adjourning in this way.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to request the hon. members, whenever a motion is made to adjourn, that they refrain from noise and confusion until after the motion is carried, as I think such conduct is not dignified.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing names, occupations and callings of the gentlemen appointed on the Railway Commission, showing dates of their appointments. Also copies of any instructions given to the Commission, and of all correspondence between the Government and any member of the Railway Commission touching the matters to be enquired into by the Commission, and of the proceedings and evidence had and taken before the Commission, with statement showing (with dates) the places where sittings of the Commission have been held.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return of a copy of the lease from R. T. Wilson to the Dominion Government of the new public offices for the town of Dundas, in the county of Wentworth; report of the Post Office Inspector respecting the present and new Post Offices; also copies of petitions, correspondence, and all other papers relating to the removal of the post office.—(Mr. Bain, Wentworth.)

Return giving—1st. The total number of Chinese who have arrived at the different ports in the Dominion, from the 1st January, 1886, to the 31st March, 1887, specifying the ports. 2nd. The amount of duty on head money collected from Chinese during that period. 3rd. The amount paid to the Provincial Governments under the Chinese Restriction Act during the same period. 4th. The number of Chinese who have entered the Dominion during the same period under return certificates, and the reports (if any) of any Customs officer with reference thereto. 5th. The number of Chinese who have entered the Dominion during the same period, as students, men of science, or travellers. 6th. The cost to the Dominion of administering the Chinese Restriction Act for the last fiscal year.—(Mr. Gordon.)

Return showing amount owing by the Exchange Bank to the Government of Canada at the time of the bank's failure, and statement showing all sums (with dates of payment) paid on account of such indebtedness.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Copies of all accounts in connection with the Government wharf at Kamouraska, showing the amount paid to Madame V. Taché for the purchase of her wharf, and of the contract between the Government and Madame Taché in relation thereto; also copies of the contract between the Government and Polydore Langlois, Esquire, respecting the sale of his wharf at the same place, with a statement of the amount paid to him by the Government.—(Mr. Dessaint.)

Detailed statement of the sums charged to capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway for the years 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886.—(Mr. Jones.)

Statement from the records of the elections to the present House of Commons, showing the number of votes polled for the respective candidates in the several electoral districts and in the various sub-divisions thereof, together with the number of ballots rejected and spoiled in such sub-division at the last general elections, and each election subsequently held up to date; also the number of electors on the voters' lists, together with the population, as shown by the last census, of each electoral district and the municipalities thereof, whether there was an election by acclamation or a poll; and a separate statement in each case in which a recount or re-addition was made, showing the changes made in every sub-division on such recount, with the number of ballots rejected which had been formerly allowed and the number allowed which had been formerly rejected, with reason, so far as obtainable, for such rejection or allowance.—(Mr. Mills.)

Return of seizures of vessels or property in the Province of Nova Scotia, during the years 1885, 1886 and 1887; giving the date of seizures, names of parties, amount of fines imposed and collected and of fines remitted, and correspondence connected therewith.—(Mr. Jones.)

Return showing receipts and expenditure from 1st July to 20th April, in the years 1886 and 1887 respectively, with estimates for each year.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return of copies of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and the Government of British Columbia, having reference to the land on Vancouver Island, held in trust by the Dominion Government for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, under the conditions of the Settlement Act, 1884. Also, copies of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, or with any person acting for or in their behalf, in any manner referring to the said railway lands. Also, copies of all correspondence with any settlers or squatters upon said railway lands, or with any other person or persons with reference thereto. Also, copies of all references to the Department of Justice as to the rights of settlers and squatters upon said railway lands, the form of patent issued to settlers, and the form and conditions of the patents issued, or to be issued to the railway company; together with the report or reports of the Minister of Justice thereon. Also, the number of patents that have been issued to settlers upon the said railway lands by the Department of the Interior up to this date. Also, copies of any arrangement with, or security from the company for the prompt issue by them up to the 19th day of December next, of pre-emption records to persons desiring to settle upon said lands under the conditions of the Settlement Act.—(Mr. Gordon.)

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Porter.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act incorporating the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Brandon, Souris and Rock Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Manufacturers' Life and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

PUBLIC BILL—MORTGAGES.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the payment of mortgages.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a public Bill, and notice must be given.

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. SKINNER. I beg to give notice, that, as a question of privilege, I will, on Thursday next, draw attention to the papers in connection with the Queen's county return, and will move that the return be amended by the insertion of the name of G. G. King instead of that of Geo. F. Baird. I give this notice in order that the attention of hon. members may be called to it, and that they may be ready when the question comes up. I also give the notice because it might be said that it should have been pressed earlier, but, on consideration, I thought we would bring it up on Thursday.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) to amend the Canada Joint Stock Companies' Act. He said: The Bill is for the purpose of giving power to loan companies to borrow money upon debenture stock. Several companies have that power now by special Act, but this is to confer the power generally upon all companies which come under the Companies' Act, and are loan companies, to borrow money upon debenture stock.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—ALLOWANCE TO THE EX-WARDEN.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That in view of the valuable services rendered by Godefroi Laviolette, late Warden of the Penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, on the occasion of an outbreak among the convicts therein confined, and of the fact that in consequence of his energy and intrepidity on that occasion he received injuries resulting in permanent infirmity and incapacity to continue the

performance of the duties of Warden as aforesaid, it is expedient that, as an exceptional case, there should be granted to the said Godefroi Laviolette an allowance for life at the rate of \$2,800 a year, to date from the 31st January, 1887, and also a further sum of \$1,000 compensation for removal expenses, such sums to be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and such annual allowance to stand instead of any other superannuation allowance to which the said Godefroi Laviolette might be entitled.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask the Minister if any enquiry has been made into the outbreak and the causes of the outbreak which took place at St. Vincent de Paul some time last spring?

Mr. THOMPSON. An enquiry has been made into the causes of the outbreak.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman cause the result to be laid on the Table before this motion is taken up? It will be very important for us to have that information, as at present we have no data to go upon.

Mr. THOMPSON. What papers I can bring down I will.

Motion agreed to.

THE DEATH OF MR. MOFFAT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure the whole of the House will agree with me in sentiments of the greatest regret at the unexpected death of the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Moffat). To those gentlemen who sat in Parliament with him it is not requisite that I should say anything. He was, I believe, a man who was liked and esteemed by both sides of the House. Of a retiring nature, not at all apt to press unduly his own position in Parliament or elsewhere, yet he enjoyed the confidence of his constituents in a marked degree. He succeeded his father, who before him held that county for some Parliaments, and ever since then, ever since he succeeded his father, he has generally been acceptable as a colleague in this House. I do not think it requires me to say more with reference to this lamented gentleman. Young in years, he has been out off suddenly and unexpectedly. When he arrived here he was apparently in better and stronger health than he had been for some years before, and everything about him promised a long and useful life. Such is the uncertainty, however, of mundane affairs that we were informed suddenly that he was found in his bed dead, and all we can do is to regret the loss of a worthy, honest and upright colleague.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to add my mite of sympathy to the statements given utterance to by the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. I am sure that those who sat in this House with the late Mr. Moffat for years past and who knew him as intimately as I did, will feel his loss as keenly as they would feel the loss of a member of their own family. A more honorable and straightforward man does not sit in this House to-day; a man who more tried to discharge his duties as a representative of the people and to promote the interests of the county he was elected to represent, does not remain behind him. I have known Mr. Moffat since childhood. I believe I was the principal means of bringing him out in 1882, and it was with great reluctance that he came out to redeem the county and to restore the prestige of his father, who had represented it before. His course since his election has been such as to recommend him to every member who had the honor of his acquaintance, and we were all taken by surprise when we heard of his death, which no one in this House regrets more than I do myself. As an honorable man, he had a reputation not alone here, but in the county where he was born, and which he represented with so much honor to himself and advantage to the county. I am sure that we all join with the right hon. gentleman in expressions of the deepest regret for the loss of Mr. Moffat, and of sympathy for the family and the friends whom he has left behind him.

Mr. BURNS. I also desire to join in the expressions of sorrow and regret for the death of Mr. Moffat. For a quarter of a century Mr. Moffat was my dear friend, and I can truly say that where he was best known he was most honored and respected. As representative of his county he was always faithful and keenly alive to the interest of his constituents. His death will cast a deep gloom over that county in which he and his family had great interests, and not only in that county but wherever he was known; and in no county in New Brunswick will his loss be more keenly regretted than in the county I have the honor to represent.

PAPERS IN REGARD TO THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that on Friday last he said:

"I may say that my hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries, promised the papers relating to the Fisheries Question to-day, or on Monday at the latest. We have only to-day obtained permission to bring down the last papers which we have. We have obtained that permission to-day, so that all the papers will be laid on the Table on Monday."

Monday has passed, and the papers are not yet laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that the papers are not yet ready to be laid on the Table. As was explained by the leader of the Government, permission was only obtained on Friday last to bring down the latter portion of the papers, which portion was very large. They have been put into the printers' hands, and all available force is engaged on them. They will be before the House in printed form and for the use of members just as soon as they can possibly be prepared.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think that statement is at all satisfactory, Sir. I think that those papers which are printed—I presume the earlier ones have been printed—might be placed before us; or we might, at any rate, have the manuscript copy of the papers, to present which permission has been obtained. These papers have been laid on the Table of the Imperial House of Commons a number of days ago, but we do not see them yet. One copy would enable us to get the information within a few moments—all the substance of them; and through the press we will get them, perhaps, before the hon. gentleman's printers are able to prepare them. After having promised us on Friday last that we should get them on Monday at the latest, the hon. gentleman now, on Tuesday, makes a further delay, an indefinite delay, in order that they may be printed, which is neither in the spirit or in the letter of the pledge which was made to the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite concur in these statements of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I think that there is no question more important to the country than the Fishery question. Now, we have seen a statement in the press coming from English sources, and coming also from American sources, endorsing the statement that the Government of this country have proposed to give up our exclusive fishery rights, and renew the attitude we held under the old Washington Treaty. I am informed that the paper controlled by the present Minister of Fisheries—inspired, rather, by him—declares that that statement is untrue, that there is not a word of truth in it. Now, it is well that the country should be satisfied on that point. I do think that at the very earliest possible moment we ought to have these papers laid before us.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Curran (p. 46) on the subject of Home Rule for Ireland, the proposed motion of Mr. McNeill (p. 55) in

amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy (p. 98) in amendment to the said amendment.

Mr. FREEMAN. In the moment or two during which I had the floor yesterday, I said that, after the very able and eloquent addresses we had heard on the subject under discussion, from the statesmen of this House and other hon. members who seemed to be well acquainted with this subject, understanding not only the politics of this country, but those of the United Kingdom, it might be thought presumption in me, having no parliamentary experience, and supposed, I presume, to know very little about Irish affairs, to pretend to address this House. Sir, I propose to take up the attention of this House but a very few moments, and the only excuse I can offer for doing so is, that I have an inalienable right to an opinion, and a parliamentary right to express it within parliamentary rules. The resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) means, I think, that we shall express our sympathy with our fellow-subjects in Ireland, sympathy for them in their trouble and distress, and pledge our desire—for I suppose it can only be a desire—to lift them out of their trouble into a situation of contentment and happiness. Well, Sir, I conceive that the honest, benevolent, and kindly disposed members of this House will all join in this expression of sympathy and in this desire. We all feel, as well as people generally throughout this Dominion, a sympathy for the Irish people, and we all desire that they should be happy and contented, as we Canadians are. I think, therefore, we can all join in supporting the resolution of the hon. member, after he has amended it by accepting the very excellent suggestions, in my opinion, made by the leader of the Opposition. I was much pleased at the proposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I hope that his suggestions will be received and adopted, and that we shall have a resolution in which we can all join, and for which we can all conscientiously vote. Now, Sir, I am not an Irishman—I am not the son of an Irishman, even. After the Anglo-Saxon, all my race affinities are Teutonic rather than Celtic. But I hold that all the higher and nobler impulses of the soul belong to our common humanity. They are not limited or circumscribed by nationality, and, therefore, as a Canadian, I do most heartily unite in this feeling of sympathy for Ireland. I unite with her sons who have spoken here, I unite with her foremost friends who have spoken here, in expressing these generous sympathies for the people of Ireland. Ireland deserves well of every part of the British Empire. In the highest councils of the nation, in the difficult work of diplomacy, in the halls of legislation, and in the ranks of those great battalions which have fought on so many battle-fields, under the red cross flag, Irishmen have supported and been loyal to the Crown and have won for themselves position and honor second to none. And, therefore, I say, for these and other reasons, Ireland deserves our sympathy. But while I am in full agreement with the mover of the resolution with respect to this part of the motion, I do not so fully agree with him as to the remedy which he proposes, as to the remedial measure which he says is going to lift from Ireland that dark cloud which has hung over her for so many years. I hold that the evils which affect Ireland are of a different character from any that Home Rule can remedy. I hold that the evils of Ireland are commercial, social and industrial. This is the nature of the evils that affect Ireland, and they cannot be remedied by any measure that any Parliament may devise. The crime of Ireland is called agrarian crime. It arises out of discontent on the part of the peasant. That discontent grows up out of a feeling of oppression by the landlord, and the landlord thus oppresses the tenants because the tenants cannot pay their rents, and the tenants cannot pay their rents because the little patches of ground they cultivate yield barely a subsistence to keep

their families from starvation, and during the six months in which they do not engage in the cultivation of their patches of ground there is no employment for the peasants, and they cannot earn money to pay their landlords. If this is the case—and it will not be disputed—I should like to ask, where is the point of contact between the Home Rule Bill and the necessitous condition of the people? I should like to know how a Parliament in Dublin could provide money to pay the rent of those peasants any more than the Parliament of Westminster? I should like to know whether this Dublin Parliament can so affect the sun that shines and the rain that falls so that they shall come just at the right time and bring forth crops for the Irish people? I should like to know whether this Dublin Parliament will so affect the markets that any little produce Irish peasants may have to sell over and above their necessities shall bring a better price than it has been bringing for some years past? I should like to know whether this Dublin Parliament is going to revive the industries of Ireland? I should like to know whether this Dublin Parliament is going to bring capital into the country; and whether, before it brings in capital, it is going to establish peace and quiet in that country so as to secure the confidence of capitalists and encourage industry? I think that a Dublin Parliament is not any more likely to do so than is the Parliament of Westminster to which the Irish people send representatives? I will answer my own question and say, no, emphatically, no. There is nothing in this Home Rule question, there is nothing in any Home Rule measure, there can be nothing in any Home Rule measure which can affect Ireland in this way, and I am satisfied that the remedial measure which so many seem to think is going to remove the difficulties regarding Ireland will have no effect of that kind whatever. And I here beg it to be understood, clearly and distinctly, that I am in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. I believe the Irish people should have the privilege of managing their own local affairs. I believe they should have all the privileges in that respect we Canadians possess, considering the different circumstances of the country, and I for one would be willing to do anything in my power, to render any service possible that would in any way facilitate the granting of Home Rule to Ireland, such a measure of Home Rule as the wisdom of the legislators of Great Britain, such as the people of the United Kingdom are willing to approve, such a measure as might be thought best suited to the circumstances of the Irish people. Forty-eight years ago Ireland supported, we are told, eight millions of people. To-day we hear that she gives a bare subsistence to less than five millions. I may fairly ask this question: Has the absence of Home Rule depopulated Ireland, has the want of a Home Rule measure been the cause of the people leaving Ireland? I think not; I think that no such proposition can be affirmed and sustained. We next ask, What is it that has depopulated Ireland? The question may, to some extent, be answered by the experience of this our own Canada. What is it that sends our people out of the country, out of Canada which is as dear to our people as is Ireland to the Irish people? My own experience, and I have conversed with many who have left Nova Scotia for the United States and afterwards returned to that Province temporarily, is, that it was because they were unable to obtain employment they crossed the line, and they say that, notwithstanding all the advantages the United States possess, there are many things in our own country which are so dear to them that if they could obtain employment in Canada they would willingly come back and bid good-bye to the States. It is therefore, the want of employment which, in a very large measure, leads our people to emigrate. I know there is a feeling and a desire to see the world, and I would not give much for a young man who is willing to confine himself to

any particular country all his lifetime. I have felt that myself, and I rejoice when I see a young man desirous of going over the world and of ascertaining what other people are doing, mixing up with people of other nationalities, and seeking to ascertain whether he cannot possibly make a name for himself in some other part of the world. But, Sir, in the main our people after having gone abroad desire again to return to their own country, and Irishmen love their country so well that they have only left it because they have not had employment at home. And why have they not that employment at home which they had at one time? There was a time when Ireland had industries—when she had commerce and manufactures, but where are they now? They have gone, and that is the real trouble that affects Ireland. People are very apt to say that Ireland has no industrial resources, that all she is fit for is to raise potatoes. On that point I wish to quote from a writer who understood, I presume, what he was writing about—I refer to Sir Robert Kain, who, in his work on the Industrial Resources of Ireland, says:

“The constitution of the rocks and soil of Ireland, its extent of ores and fuel, its supply of water, its extent of lakes and rivers, its harbors, all fit it for industry in agriculture, in manufactures, and in commerce in a degree which, although not entitling it like England to grasp at the commercial and manufacturing supremacy of the world, should certainly enable it to be the source of employment and comfort to its own people.”

I know that various reasons have been given for the decay of Irish manufactures, and whatever the true reason may be, it is the one which makes this problem so difficult to solve, especially to the Parliament of England. I should be very sorry to be accused of any pretence whatever to lay down any rule by which this problem can be solved. But I hold to this, that the methods that some of us imagine are going to solve the problem will never solve it; Home Rule never will solve it. I trust, however, that there will arise some man among the friends of Ireland who will meet the difficulty and remove it. I feel satisfied that the gentlemen who are now at the head of the Irish party, however deserving they may be of credit, are not the men who are going to lead Ireland up to a state of peace and prosperity such as she enjoyed at one time. We want some other person possessing different views of the matter from those which are held by the men who now lead Ireland. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of this House. An hon. member said yesterday that of the large value of the exports of Ireland one-half the amount was paid out as rent to the landlords, and he characterised that condition of things in a very strong manner. I forget the exact words he used, but they were to the effect that it was something like a blot on the civilisation of the country that the peasants of Ireland should be required to pay such a large amount of money, received for the exports of the country, by way of rent to their landlords. Why, Sir, a very good authority tells us that the Irish people pay a very much larger sum for something that is of less value to them than the land for which they pay rent. A statistician of some note informs us that the drink bill of Ireland for the ten years preceding 1880, amounted to an annual average of \$65,000,000, being \$11,000,000 more than the rent paid for the land. Now, Sir, I say that any country of less than five millions of population which will pay \$65,000,000 in the shape of a drink bill, for something that does them no good, something that does them injury every time and continually, something which is degrading to the people of the country, something which is destroying their moral sentiment and feeling—I say any such people as that are making a grand mistake, and are themselves placing obstructions in the way of their prosperity. Give us another Father Matthew, another regenerator of Ireland like him—one who will say to the people of Ireland, You must get rid of this tremendous tax; and if

he should fortunately succeed in prevailing on them to do so he would confer a far greater boon on that distressed country than a Home Rule measure after Mr. Parnell's own pattern could confer. And this particular form of tax is not only a tremendous burden in Ireland, but in England and Canada. It is a tax which, I trust, we will some day throw off our shoulders; and as regards Ireland, at any rate, before she can become regenerated she must get rid of it, for it is one of the difficulties which stand in the way of the settlement of this great Irish question. Now, Sir, I do not desire in any way to detract from the honor of those patriots who are endeavoring to lift up Ireland. I have no doubt they are honorable and patriotic men—just such men as Ireland wishes to see leading her. But, from a Canadian stand-point, I confess that I would be much more inclined to give them credit for patriotism if, out of those large sums of money they are receiving from the United States and otherwise, they would contribute just a small amount to those poor people who are suffering for want of bread to eat. If they contributed something out of those funds for the relief of the people for whom they work so well, and agitate so strongly, I, at least, would be disposed to give them a little more credit for that feeling which we Canadians possess—a feeling of sympathy and love for our fellow-subjects in Ireland. It must have been very gratifying to Mr. Davitt when he took his beautiful bride from the United States to that unfortunate country—as it is sometimes called—to find that his friends in Ireland had so much practical consideration for him and for her, that they had provided him with an elegant mansion, and that their generosity enabled him to usher her into a house where her artistic tastes would be gratified, and she could enjoy herself. That was perfectly right. That young woman who was attaching herself to the Irish leader, and placing her fortunes in his hands, deserved something of that kind, and I say it was very right and proper that she should have a home provided for her. But, Sir, what about these poor, houseless and homeless Irish women and children, whom the cruelty and the want of consideration of these Irish landlords—mark you, Irish landlords—had turned out upon the streets? I have no doubt Mr. Davitt pitied them greatly; but when you and I are hungry, does pity satisfy that hunger? When you and I have been in distress, has pity lifted us out of that distress? No, Sir, we want something better than pity; and we should give the Irish people that something—give them the opportunity of feeding and clothing themselves and living in a little better way than in the hovels in which they now live. Give them a chance to restore the industries of Ireland to the position they were in at the time of the Union, and the Irish people will be happy and contented. Give to the Irish people their Home Rule—they deserve it; and if by any word this Dominion Parliament can influence the English House of Commons to eliminate from that Coercion Bill some of its objectionable features, let us say that word. Oh, Sir, I feel sad when I read some portions of that Coercion Bill. We have been told in this House that in Canada there is a Coercion Bill as severe as that. I am not prepared to contradict that statement; but if there is, Sir, we are not afraid of it—and why? Let every man answer the question for himself. Place Ireland in the position she ought to occupy, and then she will be no more afraid of a Coercion Bill than we are. Give the laboring people, the peasants of Ireland, a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and my word for it, Sir, they will be as loyal as any people in the world. The Irishman loves to be loyal. We have been told that when an Irishman just landed in the United States was asked by his friend which party he would support, "I am," he said, "agin' the Government every time." That is a burlesque on Irishmen. They love to be loyal; they are always loyal to their friends; and let them understand that the Government is their friend, and they

Mr. FREEMAN.

will be as loyal as any people in the world. Let such measures be carried into law, and let such measures be devised and put into operation as will give peace to Ireland, attract capital to the country, revive her industries, develop her resources, and call into action the latent capabilities of the people, and there will be no lack of loyalty or manifestation of discontent. I beg to thank this House for the kindness with which they have listened to my desultory and feeble remarks.

Mr. MILLS. It is worth while to notice how large a number of hon. gentlemen have expressed themselves in favor of Home Rule. Every one who has spoken, whether on that side of the House or this, has declared that he is in favor of Home Rule, though it is worthy of remark that those who have supported the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy), are ready to concede to the Irish people only such a plan of local self-government as they would be quite certain to reject. It is not many years since the vast majority of hon. gentlemen opposite were opposed to Home Rule altogether. They were then of opinion that a legislative union was preferable. They said that we, in Canada, were governed too much—that it would have been better had we but one Parliament and one centre of Executive authority; and, in their opinion, it would be a retrograde step were the present legislative union broken up and the power distributed. The zeal and earnestness with which the Irish electors of this country have supported the principle of local self-government in Ireland, have made many converts, and, it is to be hoped that those who have recently received new light, will give up the practice of encroachment upon provincial autonomy. If I rightly understand the hon. members from Muskoka and West York, they believe the Irish Home Rulers to be advocates of independence in disguise; they are disloyal, and will use any concession made to them as a basis for further demands. Were the Irish people loyal and law-abiding, they would concede a measure of Home Rule, but the present demand they will stoutly resist. They regard existing discontent as the necessary outcome of lawless perversity and incorrigible wickedness among the great mass of the Irish people. Every attempt to secure peace and goodwill, will only lead to more marked exhibitions of lawlessness and treason; every attempt to conciliate will only breed fresh disasters, and new crimes, born of innate perversity of mind, and imperishable rancor against the English race. If the hon. gentlemen were right, constitutional reforms would indeed be acts of folly. If they are right, there is no middle ground between giving Ireland absolute independence and giving her a military despotism. The hon. member for North Simcoe is very much alarmed lest this Parliament should exceed its authority, and encroach upon the legislative and administrative domain of the Imperial Parliament and ministry. The hon. member said it was our duty to consider our powers—that we have here only a delegated authority, and that the government of Ireland was not one of the matters entrusted to us. I do not know in what way the hon. member holds our powers to be delegated powers. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge, expressly decided that the power exercised by a Colonial Legislature was not a delegated power, but original authority. The same doctrine was laid down by Lord Chief Justice Vaughan more than two centuries ago. There is no principle better established than this: that an Englishman, into whatever portion of the Empire he may go with the view of colonising and making settlement, not only carries with him the ordinary common law of the country, but the right of representation as well; and it is upon this ground that representative government exists in the colonies. But it is not necessary, in the consideration of this question, to further

discuss this particular observation of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I readily admit that our constitution is a limited one; I admit that the powers we exercise are defined in the British North America Act; I admit that we have no authority to administer Irish affairs or to legislate for the Irish people; but I deny altogether that because we have not such power it is improper on our part to express any opinion with regard to the government of that country. Why, one sovereign State has no authority to administer the affairs or control the act on of another. If it had, the State over which it exercised such control would not be sovereign, but there is no fact better established than the fact that one State often does undertake to advise, does criticise, in its representative Assembly, the conduct of another State, and does, sometimes, go so far as to exercise active interference, when the manner in which the government of that other State is conducted is such as to disturb mutual relations, or create difficulties, or give rise to any danger. The principle we recognise in this matter is exactly the same as that which we recognise when one of us undertakes to deal with his own property as he thinks proper. No one claims the right to interfere with him unless he undertakes to manage his property in such a way that he endangers the rights of the owners of other property. My neighbor has the right to destroy his own house, provided in so doing he does not endanger the safety of mine. It is clear as noon-day that one State has the same right to express an opinion upon the actions of another as one man has, under certain circumstances, to remonstrate against the conduct of his neighbor. It is not necessary that a State should be independent to possess this right. In expressing an opinion on this Irish question we are not exceeding our authority a whit more than is a sovereign State when it expresses an opinion upon the action and conduct of another sovereign State. Now, when the hon. member for North Simcoe assumes that, because we have not the power to legislate, we have, therefore, no right to speak, I utterly dissent from that proposition. Were that doctrine to be acted upon, what would be our position with regard to the Fishery question. We have no immediate connection with the United States, we have no sovereign authority to deal with them with the view of settling the difficulty; but upon what grounds do we claim to possess the right to express an opinion? We do so because our interests are concerned, because we feel that we have a practical interest in the question; and in proportion as our interests are at stake, in the same proportion do we claim the moral right to impress our views upon that sovereign authority which acts on our behalf with regard to whatever negotiations may be had. The hon. gentleman thinks we ought to express no opinion; that whatever our views may be we ought to conceal them. We had better leave this question to those who are authorised to deal with it. We have twice spoken upon this subject before. The hon. member says we only expressed an opinion upon a general principle, but now we are called upon to pronounce upon a specific measure. The hon. member is mistaken. We were quite as specific in 1882 as we are asked to be on this occasion. Does the hon. gentleman forget that we expressed then an opinion on the Kilmainham imprisonment? I agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that we had better proceed by Address, but I do not agree with him when he thinks that it would be better still not to proceed at all. The hon. gentleman, both in his speech and in his motion, assumes that this House has no right to express to the Crown an opinion upon any subject upon which it has not the power to legislate; and that we are, in reason and in the fitness of things, as completely excluded from interfering with all Imperial concerns as the Governments and Legislatures of the Provinces are from interfering with the work which we here undertake. I

deny that proposition. We are here as representatives from the same people who return members to the different Provincial Legislatures. These members sit in the Provincial Parliaments for the purpose of discharging certain defined duties within the limits of the constitution. They may exercise the ordinary powers of rational beings upon the general policy and conduct of their own affairs, and if our course in this Parliament were outrageous, if it encroached on the rights of the Provinces, they would equally have a right to remonstrate with regard to our conduct. But we speak here for the same population, we act on behalf of the same people as do the legislators of the Provinces, while in the Imperial Parliament we have not such representation as they have in the Dominion Parliament. The Imperial Parliament holds in this respect a position different altogether in relation to the outlying portions of the Empire from that which we hold towards the Legislatures of the Provinces within the limits of the Dominion. As we speak on the subject of Fisheries, so we may speak upon every other subject of Imperial concern that may in any way affect us, or in which humanity may prompt us to speak. Take, for instance, the case of the slave trade. The Imperial Parliament and Government sent a large force to the African coast for the purpose of suppressing the slave trade, and they entered into negotiations with other States for that purpose. What interest had the people of the United Kingdom in that particular question? What right had they to interfere with those of other States engaged in piratical enterprises of that kind, any more than we have the right to engage in the discussion of the Irish question? There is no difference between the two in principle. We know that their conduct in that matter is justified on the grounds of humanity, and upon those grounds, as well as upon the grounds of our political and material interest, we may justify our expressing an opinion on the Irish question. There are Imperial interests concerned. There is a large Irish population in Canada, and there is also a large Irish population in the United States. We know how hostile the latter are to the United Kingdom; we know how a portion of them were armed, drilled and organised, and how this country was by them hostilely invaded. We know to what expense this country was put by that invasion. Well, responsibility and authority are commensurate in the nature of things. Where we have duties imposed upon us, we have also the right of expressing our opinion. We have the right to say to the Imperial Parliament that, in consequence of your misgovernment of Ireland, you have imposed upon us larger burdens than we would otherwise have been called upon to bear, you have affected our material prosperity by affecting our relations with the neighboring Republic, and we call on you to remove the difficulty by dealing with this Irish question in the way the people demand. Give to the people of Ireland that local self-government which they seek; you will conciliate not only the Irish people residing in Ireland, but you will conciliate the people of that greater Ireland, to whom the hon. member referred, who has his bright home in the setting sun. That being the case, we are exercising the ordinary right of a legislative body in expressing an opinion upon this Irish question, and in pressing the Imperial Government to settle it in such a way as to conciliate the Irish population, so as to minimise our difficulties and increase our opportunities of establishing more intimate and more favorable commercial relations with the neighboring Republic. We all remember, those of us who have read something of mental pathology, the inhuman manner in which the insane were treated fifty years ago. At that day nothing was thought of but strait-jackets, manacles and the lash. Men whom we would suppose to be rational beings, capable of exercising sound judgment in regard to affairs, seemed to think it was the proper thing to subject to severe

punishment those who were deprived of their reason, with the hope that, by exercising such control over them, they would restore them to the possession of their faculties. It seems to me that the Government of the United Kingdom has been equally barbarous, and is open to an objection of precisely the same character. There is a want of rational adaptation of means to the end, and that irritation and all the evils which arise from irritation and misgovernment, are attributed to the mental defects of the population, instead of to the obvious fact that the people are being misgoverned. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said in his speech that he did not know whether the Coercion Bill was wise or otherwise, and he was sure that every hon. member who had spoken on that subject knew even less on that subject than he did. Were it a Canadian statute, he could construe it and criticise it, but, being an Imperial Act, and dealing with a high question of State, he did not think himself competent to express an opinion upon it, and he thought the House would be acting wisely to abstain altogether from a discussion of the question; in fact, the hon. gentleman reminded us that we were all colonists, and that, being colonists, it was no part of our business to deal with any question of this sort. The hon. gentleman, it seemed to me, had brought himself to a proper state of loyal humility. It reminded me of the story told by Mr. Tims of an Irishman who was on trial, and was asked by the magistrate: "Don't you think you deserve to be hanged?" He said: "Your honor knows best; it is not for the likes of me to express an opinion upon so important a question;" and so the hon. gentleman thinks it is not for this House to express an opinion upon so important a subject as the question of local self-government in Ireland. I remember that, in the life of Sir John Eliot, by a distinguished writer, Mr. Forster, tells us a story of the towering passion into which King James I was put by a deputation of the House of Commons waiting upon him to remonstrate against the Spanish marriage. The King ordered stools to be brought in, he told the deputation to take seats, he recommended that dunce caps should be furnished them, he wanted to know at what sovereign's feet they had learned statecraft; and the hon. gentleman seems to think that, because here we are not possessed of sovereign authority, because in this country we have not the power to deal with the question of local self-government in Ireland and have not within our reach the legal remedies, we ought not to express any opinion on the subject. These views are not suited to this age. I do not think we are disqualified from doing what England did in the case of Denmark, in the case of Poland, in the case of Turkey, what she did in regard to the unification of Italy. I do not think we are precluded from expressing an opinion on a matter which affects the well-being of the Empire of which we form a part, when one sovereign State is not precluded from expressing an opinion and remonstrating against the conduct of another sovereign State. But the hon. gentleman said also that this Bill, called a Coercion Bill, was not a Coercion Bill, or, at least, in his opinion it was rather a Bill relating to criminal procedure, and that even such a Bill was not one with which we ought to interfere, that we had not the means of forming an opinion, and that we ought not to increase the difficulties of the parent State by expressing any opinion on the subject. He told us that the law in this case was aimed, not at the innocent, but at the guilty. Why, there never was an instance in which an arbitrary Government admitted that its conduct was intended to affect the innocent. There never was an instance in which those who exercised arbitrary authority admitted that they desired to do otherwise than to maintain law and order and to uphold legitimate authority. In fact, the most hateful acts of tyranny are acts having their origin in these principles of procedure of which the hon. gentleman has spoken. Does the hon.

Mr. MILLS.

gentleman not know that this Bill of Mr. Balfour's, if carried, will seriously interfere with the liberty of the subject? Does he not know that it will seriously imperil free discussion? The hon. gentleman says that this is simply procedure, and therefore it is not a matter which specially concerns us. The observation of the hon. gentleman reminds me of a Boston literary man who, thirty years ago, was spending a few weeks in North Carolina. The people in the place where he was stopping were anxious to pay him some attentions and do him some honor. A deputation waited upon him and invited him to come to the town hall, where a public address would be presented to him. They waited upon him to accompany him there. On the way they were met by a southern fire-eater, who said, "Why, you are honoring an abolitionist; this man I met at an abolitionist meeting in Boston, and there I saw him and heard him speak against the return of a slave to his master; he is a man who would rob us of our property, and deprive us of what rightfully belongs to us." After a few moments' discussion, the mayor, who was leading the procession, said, "We will make a slight change in the programme; I think, instead of going to the town hall, we had better go to Col. Johnson's tar-kilns." There was only a slight change in the procedure, but it made all the difference in the world to the unfortunate man who was the subject of these attentions; and so the hon. gentleman, when he says that this Bill makes a slight change in the procedure, admits that it makes a change which is of immense consequence to the Irish people. It takes from him the ordinary means of trial which the common law gives him; it gives to his landlord an opportunity of exacting the last shilling that he can wring from him without his having an opportunity to combine with his fellows with a view to agitate for amelioration or reform. It means that all the minor securities which the law gives will be taken away. It means that what is not now a crime, may be made a crime, and that what is now a constitutional means of redress, may become a crime. It means that neither platform nor press may be used for the purpose of agitation, or for the purpose of securing the necessary reforms, except in so far as those who possess a controlling interest in the direction of public affairs, and whose interest it is to maintain things as they are, choose to permit him to do so. The hon. member says that there is nothing novel in this proposition, that there is a summary trial before two magistrates, that the right of trial by jury is taken away. Oh, but, he says, the hon. leader of the Opposition, in 1877, at the time of the strike on the Grand Trunk Railway, introduced a Bill doing precisely the same thing; he says that he introduced a Bill taking away the right of trial by jury and establishing a summary trial before two magistrates. The hon. gentleman referred to the Act. Now, I beg to say that the hon. gentleman misled the House, whether intentionally or not, upon that question. The hon. gentleman knows that the party who is accused and arrested under that law, cannot be tried by two magistrates without his consent. If he asks for a trial in the ordinary way, he is entitled to have it. The Act was not intended to promote the interest of a railway corporation, or any other powerful corporation; it was intended to furnish facilities for an innocent man to regain his freedom at an early day. The ordinary sittings of the court may have passed but a short time before. The man is arrested; he is a stranger; he may be a locomotive driver who came but a few weeks before from the continent of Europe, from the United Kingdom, or from the United States. He may have no acquaintances or friends, and be unable to get bail. If he was subjected to trial in the ordinary way, he might be compelled to remain in gaol for months. Now, the Bill of my hon. friend gave him an opportunity of being tried summarily and immediately before two magistrates, giving him an opportunity to regain his

freedom. It was not intended to furnish facilities to any one to hold an arbitrary trial, or exercise arbitrary authority over him. It was not because there was any distrust of the ordinary tribunals of the country, it was not because any one claimed that justice could not be done, it was not because any one said that the people sympathised with the offenders and that it was impossible for the law to be administered through the ordinary channels. The position was entirely different. There is no analogy between the Act proposed by Mr. Balfour and the Act on the Statute-book. The hon. gentleman knew, he must have known, that such was the provision of the law. Why, then, did he conceal the fact that the party was not compelled to be tried summarily by two magistrates, but he had the option of being so tried if he thought proper to seek a trial in that way in order to obtain an early discharge? Why, Sir, there is an instance, an ancient Roman precedent, of trial by two magistrates. We have an account of a trial on one occasion by two magistrates in Judea. They did not sit together; Herod and Pilate sat separately, but their sitting separately, and sitting as judges in the same case, seemed to have had the effect of making them friends, and the necessary inference would be that these gentlemen afterwards sat together. And so the hon. gentleman might have found in sacred writ an instance of the summary trial of an innocent man by two magistrates, and he might have found in that instance a better illustration of that Bill, upon which he asks us to abstain from expressing an opinion, than in the Act of my hon. friend which he misrepresented and misquoted in this House. Now, we know what the intention of the Imperial Government is in introducing this Bill. Lord Salisbury has not left us in the dark, for more than a year ago he declared that arbitrary government established in Ireland for a period of twenty years might so educate and discipline the Irish people, that they would be fit for the ordinary government of a civilised community. Lord Salisbury proposed to revive the ancient system of "Thorough" in Ireland, and this Bill, it is clear, is simply carrying out the exact intention of his lordship. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said in his speech that the Irish are better off than any other portion of the people of the British Isles, so far as their government is concerned. They are more favored. The hon. gentleman says that the Irish tenant is protected by the court from exorbitant charges. He admits that a man occupying the position of an ordinary Irish tenant, is not free to make a contract with his landlord; he admits that Mr. Gladstone, in his measure, properly interfered with the authority of the landlord; but the hon. gentleman says, having so interfered in carrying this measure, the Irish tenant is better off than a tenant either in England or Scotland. Now, the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that a very large portion of the Irish tenantry are not holders under Mr. Gladstone's Bill. It is only those who have complained and gone before the Land Courts and had their case adjudicated upon, that are so placed. Then, further than that, we know that there has been such a fall in the prices of agricultural produce that the tenant who has secured a reduction based upon prices as they were, is now no better, or little better off than he was before the Court interfered. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the opposition with which this measure was met. He has forgotten that men high in place denounced it as a robbery of the landlord. He seems to have forgotten the views that were expressed by the Duke of Argyle, by Lord Salisbury and other noblemen, who interfered on behalf of the landlord, and who altered and changed the Bill, and who made it a very much less beneficial measure than it was as it passed the House of Commons. He knows that they have exercised sleepless vigilance with a view to protecting what they claim to be their interests, against any possible concession to the vast majority of the Irish people; and knowing such to be the case, I think the hon. gentle-

man would have been warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Irish people had not been legislated for in their interests, and in the interests of the Empire, but their interests have been subordinated to those of the small minority who have long exercised a controlling and mischievous influence in the government of the country. The hon. gentleman said: Mr. Parnell and his associates are rebels, and the associates of assassins; that Mr. Parnell has sympathised with assassination; that a letter appears over his signature showing that to be the case; and that, until he purges himself of that accusation, this House ought not to express an opinion upon the question of Home Rule, nor our disapprobation of Mr. Balfour's Bill. How is Mr. Parnell to vindicate himself? The *Times* publishes a letter; that letter is in the possession of the *Times*. It is asserted, and I dare say, correctly so, that every expert in handwriting has been retained in the interest of the *Times*. Well, where will Mr. Parnell have this matter tried? Wherever he may go those paid witnesses will appear in court against him. There is not a place he can go where jurymen who have strong political feelings and prejudices might not be had. Although there might be eleven out of the twelve to pronounce him guiltless and hold the letter to be a forgery, one jurymen would be sufficient to damn his reputation under the existing circumstances. We know with what fierce animosity Mr. Parnell is pursued by a very considerable portion of the people of the United Kingdom. The publication of the article in the *Times*, the challenge that has been put forward, all indicate the very strong feeling of animosity that actuates those who are attacking Mr. Parnell in this matter. But suppose Mr. Parnell were guilty, suppose it was true that he had written this letter and had associated himself with persons who were criminals, who were of as vile a character as the *Times* has asserted, is that any reason why the Irish people should be misgoverned and oppressed and deprived of local self government? Is that any reason why we should abstain from expressing an opinion upon the question? Everyone remembers the charge made against Mazzini, that he was accused of plotting the assassination of King Bomba and other petty tyrants in Italy, and yet the people of England did not abstain on that account from sympathising with the cause of Italian nationality. Take the case of Louis Napoleon. He was elected President of the French Republic, and swore to uphold and maintain the Republican Government in France. He, however, conspired to overturn that Government, and he did it by shooting down men, women and children in the streets of Paris and wading through the blood of those whom he ought to have protected to the throne; and when he got there Lord Palmerston sent him a letter of congratulation. It is true Lord Palmerston was dismissed from office. It was not, however, on account of the moral turpitude of his act, but because he did not agree with Baron Stockmar and Prince Albert. Afterwards the Government of Lord Aberdeen entered into an alliance with Napoleon and carried on the war with Russia. Did any public man in England, did any portion of the press denounce that alliance because of Napoleon's character. Napoleon was an ally of Count Cavour when he was seeking to secure the unification of Italy in 1859. We find when public men are dealing with important public questions, they do not stop to consider whether there may be men of bad reputation taking the same side. Why, if Christianity itself had been subjected to such a trial it could not have succeeded. That is not the rule. During the American war General Hooker was, for a short time, commander of the army of the Potomac, and General Jackson was a very prominent officer on the Confederate side. Hooker had the reputation of being a very profane man, and Jackson that of a man of very great piety and of unsullied private character. What would be thought if a northern man had proposed to desert Hooker because of his profanity

and join the Confederate side because of Jackson's piety? Everyone knew there was something more than the private character of the leaders on each side involved. There was some other issue than that of the private worth of men who came to the front on each side. The Almighty had heard the cry of the slave and came down to deliver him. Every one, whether belonging to the northern army or southern army, knew that the struggle was respecting slavery, and that if a man deserted the northern army to join the south he was not only a traitor to his cause but a traitor to the great cause of freedom and modern civilisation. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that the people of Ireland are not oppressed, because they have in proportion to their population a larger measure of representation in the House of Commons than the people of England or Scotland. That is no doubt true, thanks to Mr. Gladstone's efforts. But we know right well that Lord Randolph Churchill, Lord Salisbury and others who now control the Government, complained that the franchise was given to 400,000 Irish people living in mud huts, who were thereby placed on a footing equal to those in better circumstances. We know right well that, notwithstanding there is a large representation, its members are overborne by those who have prejudices against them, who are not willing to concede them the rights which they believe to be essential to the peace, well-being and prosperity of Ireland. What part in the government of Ireland has any one of its leaders ever had; what part had any prominent Irishman seeking to bring about Irish reform ever had in the direction of affairs of the United Kingdom? We know that O'Connell, although the ablest man of his day from Ireland, was never invited to be a member of any Administration. We know that the vast majority of those who now rule the United Kingdom would no more think of inviting a member of the Home Rule party to become a member of the Government and assist in the direction of its affairs, than would the President of the United States think of inviting a freed man to become a member of his Cabinet. We know the outcry raised when Lord Melbourne made two or three Roman Catholics members of the Privy Council, although it was simply an honor; we know that his Government was materially shaken because certain gentlemen high in social position were made members of the Privy Council. There is a tide in the affairs of nations, as well as in those of individuals, which, taken at the flood, may lead to general prosperity and general contentment. Such opportunities have occurred in the history of Ireland more than once. Such an opportunity occurred at the time the Treaty of Limerick was negotiated. Such an opportunity occurred in Ireland again when the Union was brought about. If the people who had suffered for a century under misgovernment in Ireland, who had been degraded, persecuted, impoverished, and beggared, had been fairly dealt with at the time the Union was established on the plan which Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt contemplated, there is no doubt that the Irish people would have been content. But, as far as Ireland was concerned, the Union was the only portion of that determination which was carried into effect. The moment the Union was carried every other necessary reform was neglected, and Castle government continued, as far as Ireland was concerned, during the eighty-seven years which have elapsed since the Union as it had continued during the one hundred and five years between the Treaty of Limerick and the Union. If the Union had been carried out upon the plans which had been originally contemplated by the statesmen who proposed it there is little room to doubt that the people of Ireland would have accepted the union with England, as the people of Scotland did their union with that country in the time of Queen Anne. But it was because those plans were not carried out, because the Government was still left in the hands of those who had before abused their authority,

Mr. MILLS.

because the minority—the persecuting and intolerant minority who had inflicted such greivous wrong on the country—were allowed to continue their course, that Ireland has been discontented with the Union, as she was discontented with the system of government which prevailed before the Union was established. I have stated that since the revolution there have been two opportunities—I might say three opportunities—for reconciling the Irish people with the other portions of the United Kingdom. The first of these was in the negotiations for the Treaty of Limerick. Under that treaty the Irish nobility were to have been restored to their rights, notwithstanding that the cause for which they had fought was lost, and the Irish disabilities, which were then few in number, were to have been removed. But the moment that General Sarsfield surrendered an intolerant faction insisted on the treaty being disregarded, and its provisions being limited to those who had been confined within the walls of Limerick. The men who were the natural leaders of the people were driven into exile; they sought the service which—denied to them at home—their bravery and their genius secured for them in Spain, France and Austria. The necessary bond by which the great mass of the people would have been united to the Government of the Empire was driven out, and the people were in a great measure left without leaders. We know the kind of intolerant legislation which existed at that time; we know the disabilities which were imposed. We know that there was legislation during the century which preceded the Union, such as that which is to be found on the Statute-book of no other country in Christendom. We know that there were laws forbidding Roman Catholics to be educated at home or abroad; laws providing that if property were lost at sea, during a war with any continental power, by any Protestant in any portion of Ireland, it should be made good to him by a tax imposed on the Roman Catholics in the county in which he lived. There were laws disfranchising the Roman Catholic population; laws forbidding any private gentleman to engage an Irish Catholic as a gamekeeper; laws forbidding Roman Catholics from practising as solicitors, barristers or medical men; laws prohibiting them from engaging in teaching. They were not even permitted to serve as private tutors, without a license from the Protestant Bishop of the diocese in which they resided. This was the kind of legislation which that minority that hon. gentlemen are so anxious to protect, inflicted on the Irish people during the century that the government was in their hands. It is true that during the seventeen years in which Grattan's Parliament, as it is called, existed, some remedial measures were proposed. It is true that Roman Catholic Irishmen and Non-conformists were allowed to hold certain civil and military offices. It is true that they were, in a better position for a time than they were before. But we know it was the influence of Lord Rockingham, Lord Grey, and other gentlemen pressing upon them for the time being, and controlling the placemen, as they were called, who numbered one hundred and twenty out of three hundred Irishmen, that enabled them to carry out these measures. We know that the moment that these Liberal statesmen were driven from office in England the old system was revived, even in Grattan's Parliament. We know the extraordinary persecutions that took place after the rebellion of 1798: how men were shot and hanged, pitch-capped and cropped; their scalps covered with powder which was then set fire to. We know that General Abercrombie declared that the soldiers who were let loose to butcher the Irish population were dangerous to everybody but the enemy. We know that Lord Cornwallis declared that even at his own table the murder of the peasant population was a common topic of conversation, and the principal pastime of the military. These men knew that they ran no risk in taking the

life of an Irish peasant because the House of Commons would not interfere in his behalf. This was the condition of things which existed when the Union was established, and it is because Irishmen had been so ground down, persecuted, oppressed and wronged that they were ready to accept the Union, if it had carried with it the freedom which was intended when Pitt proposed the measure. I say, then, that an opportunity existed at that time by which the people of Ireland might have been united to the other portion of the United Kingdom, as the people of Scotland and Wales are at this moment. Why was it not done? It was because the same system of intolerance, though perhaps milder in form, was perpetuated under the government of the Union, as it had been under the Government which preceded it. We know, Sir, that when Lord Granville's Government, in 1807, proposed that certain offices in the army and navy and in the civil service might be held by Roman Catholics, he was driven from power; that the vast majority of those in authority were against him; that a new Government was organised which laid down, as a maxim of its policy: "The King, the Church, and no Popery,"—two positive and one negative plank in its platform. It was on that line that the government of Ireland and the United Kingdom was conducted down until Mr. O'Connell secured Catholic emancipation in 1829. Everybody knows that the effort put forward by O'Connell secured emancipation. He adopted a course that the people were ready to pursue, because they were devoted to him and regarded his advice as wise. But we know that the Government who granted that concession declared that they did so, not because they thought it was right or just, but because they said that otherwise there would have been civil war. It is not surprising, therefore, that this concession, made after thirty years of denied justice and hopes deferred, the people of Ireland refused to credit to their enemies the victory due to their own exertions and to the patience, perseverance and eloquence of their leader. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the circumstances surrounding that concession. Mr. O'Connell had been elected for Clare. Because he was Roman Catholic he could not take the Oath of Supremacy, and he was not allowed to take his seat. The measure of Catholic Emancipation having been carried, it would have been a gracious act to provide in the same Bill that he should be entitled to take his seat. But the Government was hostile to him because he had forced the measure upon them, and they compelled him again to seek election after the measure became law. Before emancipation was granted the qualification of the Irish voter was a freehold of the annual value of £2, which was at once increased to £10; so that while Emancipation was granted, the vast majority of the Irish voters were disfranchised; and that continued to be the law until 1884, when Mr. Gladstone put the people of Ireland in this respect upon a footing of equality with those of other parts of the United Kingdom. But let me turn for a moment to the legislation had since the time of the Union regulating the relation between landlord and tenant. In 1816 a measure was carried in the British Parliament to enable the landlord, in anticipation of a loss of rent, to take possession of the crops and the estate of his tenant—to put a caretaker in charge and harvest the crop if he chose, at the expense of the tenant,—not because the tenant had been guilty of any forfeiture or failure in the performance of his portion of the contract, but as security against such failure. Then, by the Act of 1818, the landlord could bring an action of ejectment against the tenant, against which the tenant could make no defence until he first gave security for costs; and as many of the tenants could not give such security, they were deprived by Act of Parliament of means of defending their rights. And yet we are told that the people of

Ireland ought to be contented with the general policy of the Government since the Union. I might, Sir, give other instances to show the way in which the government of Ireland has been administered; but I think I have cited sufficient to show this House that General Buller did not express himself too strongly when he said that the law was in the interest of the landlord and against the tenant; and that has always been the policy of legislation for Ireland until remedial measures were proposed by Mr. Gladstone. Now, let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the measure of 1870, for that was the first measure in a period of seventy years in the interest of the peasant population of Ireland. One of the provisions of that Act is that a tenant, if he is evicted, may recover from the landlord compensation for his improvements to a limited extent, but that compensation cannot exceed the rental value for a certain number of years. Under that measure the landlord had the power of indefinitely increasing the rents, but the tenant had no power to collect any portion of the moneys he expended in improving his landlord's property so long as he was not disturbed in his possession. It was only when he was evicted that he could obtain any compensation. A provision was inserted in that measure in the House of Lords, providing that if the tenant was evicted for non-payment of rent, then he could collect nothing, even though his improvements might have exceeded in value seven-fold the amount of rent due. That is the measure which has been spoken of as a measure for robbing the landlord of his rights. Are men who are so prejudiced by their interests and by a long course of legislation in their favor, capable of dealing fairly with the great mass of the peasant population of Ireland? Sir, we are told that the Irish people are lawless and discontented, that they set law at defiance, and are therefore not entitled to our sympathy or moral support. I hold in my hand the *Nineteenth Century* for 1886. Among the articles in it is one upon the subject of Home Rule, by Mr. Godkin, the very able editor of the *New York Nation*, a man who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, and whose observations are worthy of all consideration. He describes the condition of the southern States during the period that the carpet-bag governments existed there, when the Freedmen's Bureau was established, and when the state governments set up by the people of the north exercised a controlling influence over the affairs of the south. The Ku-Klux Klan was called into existence. This secret society committed depredations far more outrageous and numerous than those committed upon the landholders in Ireland. The governments of those States were practically powerless. When one reads the report, of which Mr. Godkin gives a summary, that was made in the Committee of Congress on the subject, one imagines he is reading a report of the condition of things in Ireland, as described by the present Irish Secretary. This is what the committee state in their report:

"There is a remarkable concurrence of testimony to the effect that, in those of the late rebellious States into whose condition we have examined, the courts and juries administer justice between man and man in all ordinary cases, civil and criminal; and while there is this concurrence on this point, the evidence is equally decisive that redress cannot be obtained against those who commit crimes in disguise and at night. The reasons assigned are that identification is difficult, almost impossible; that, when this is attempted, the combinations and oaths of the order come in and release the culprit by perjury, either upon the witness-stand or in the jury-box; and that the terror inspired by their acts, as well as the public sentiment in their favor in many localities, paralyses the arm of civil power.

"The murders and outrages which have been perpetrated in many counties of Middle and West Tennessee, during the past few months, have been so numerous, and of such an aggravated character, as almost baffles investigation. In these counties a reign of terror exists which is so absolute in its nature that the best of citizens are unable or unwilling to give free expression to their opinions. The terror inspired by the secret organisation known as the Ku-Klux Klan is so great, that the officers of the law are powerless to execute its provisions, to discharge their duties, or to bring the guilty perpetrators of these outrages to the

punishment they deserve. Their stealthy movements are generally made under cover of night, and under masks and disguises, which render their identification difficult, if not impossible. To add to the secrecy which envelops their operations, is the fact that no information of their murderous acts can be obtained without the greatest difficulty and danger in the localities where they are committed. No one dares to inform upon them, or take any measures to bring them to punishment, because no one can tell but that he may be the next victim of their hostility or animosity. The members of this organisation, with their friends, aiders and abettors, take especial pains to conceal all their operations."

And so on. The committee report as to the condition of things that existed in the southern States. In 1876 Mr. Hays withdrew the military from the south. The carpet-baggers were compelled to follow. The Government passed into the hands of the natural leaders of the population, and what was the effect? All difficulties disappeared, and the law is as effectually administered in the southern States at this hour as it is in any other portion of the North American continent. All these crimes have disappeared, all these political offences are matters of history and no longer matters of actual occurrence. Mr. Godkin goes on to say:

"What I seek to show is that the Irish are not peculiar in their manner of expressing their discontent of a Government directed or controlled by the public opinion of another indifferent or semi-hostile community which it is impossible to resist in open warfare; that Anglo-Saxons resort to somewhat the same methods under similar circumstances, and that lawlessness and cruelty, considered as expressions of political animosity, do not necessarily argue any incapacity for the conduct of an orderly and efficient government, although I admit freely that they do argue a low state of civilisation."

Everything Mr. Godkin there said with regard to the condition of things in the south has been said with regard to the condition of things in Ireland. Those who have examined into the question know that crime was manifold greater in the south under this secret organisation than it ever was in Ireland by her resisting the arbitrary exercise of authority on the part of the landlord. I believe it is wholly impossible at this day for the people of Ireland to be fairly governed, so far as all their local affairs are concerned, by any other than themselves. No one who has examined into the administration of justice there can be ignorant of the fact that there is no justice administered as between one class of the community and the other. While the ordinary magistrate may act fairly between one peasant and another peasant, and as between one landholder and another, he does not act fairly between the landholder and the ordinary peasant. The great mass of the population have been subjected to and governed by regulations that are no part of the law of the land. On nine-tenths of the estates a peasant cannot permit his son or daughter to marry without a license, or certificate from the agent. He cannot harbor anybody over night, he cannot exercise ordinary hospitality without a license from the agent. More than that, we find that the peasant is subjected to extraordinary charges, sometimes amounting to very much more than even the amount of his rent, which is exorbitant. I hold in my hand the account of one Irish agent, who, in the course of a few years, in addition to his salary as agent, managed to save £7,600, which he had arbitrarily wrung from the peasants of the estate of which he was agent. He is a magistrate, his landlord is absent, and provided he collects and remits the rent, his landlord cares nothing further. The cases in which he sits are practically between himself and the tenants, and he imposes such fines and makes such charges as he pleases. True, the tenant might appeal, but if in arrears, he is at once evicted so that he must choose between submitting to regulations of this sort and being driven out on the highway. Let me read one or two extracts to show how some of the estates are managed. In one case, reported by Mr. Crosbie, he says:

"An old man, Peter Shea, of Ardea, lived to the age of eighty-eight years as tenant on the estate. He was one of those persons whom philosophers would call benefactors to mankind, for he made many a blade of grass grow where none ever grew before. In his young days he entered upon a barren waste, built a house. With two out-houses,

Mr. MILLS.

he subsoiled a great part of the land, erected a thousand perches of double fence, and made such other improvements as his skill enabled him on that patch of mountain. During his lifetime he did well. But he lived too long. For at the advanced age I have mentioned he violated the matrimonial regulations by allowing his son to marry a widow possessed of some means. The obnoxious couple were satisfied to emigrate to America, and did in fact go, like the rest of the expatriated, at the expense of the estate. But the poor old man of eighty-eight, with his wife, eighty years of age, was ejected from his little holding."

He reports another case equally outrageous, in which the wife of a man who had been ejected, was given, while ill of fever, shelter. The tenant who gave her shelter was fined a gale of rent. Driven out, and with every tenant on the estate afraid to afford her a refuge, the miserable woman went about two miles up the mountain, and, sick as she was, and so situated, took shelter in a dry cavern, in which she lived for several days. The cave was the common possession of those tenants, and when it was found the woman had taken refuge there, they were each mulcted in a gale of rent. Let me take an instance of the manner in which the agents who are magistrates conduct the affairs of the realm. I take the case of one Mr. Quill who is an agent on an estate. There is a tenancy of fourteen acres at £14. A lease is given, and Mr. Quill draws the lease and charges £3 less 2s. Then his wife demands pin money, and he gives £2 as pin money. Mind, the total amount of the rent is only £14. He had borrowed the amount of £2 18s. to pay for drawing the lease and £2 as pin money for the wife. She says: It is not enough; and so sells his cow in order to pay her £3 more. This is a fair illustration of the way in which many of the Irish estates are managed. I would like to know what justice the great mass of the population are likely to receive at the hands of magistrates so appointed, and whose interests point in such a direction. What confidence can the people have in the law when they find that the law is made an instrument of oppression to the advantage of the class who are practically their masters? It is only when the Government passes into the hands of the great mass of the population that this evil can be remedied. The minority in Ireland have had an opportunity of governing the country for nearly two hundred years, and they have signally failed, and I think it is high time that the majority should now have their turn. I think that this House would be wanting in its duty to itself and to humanity if it failed to express an opinion disapproving of the Coercion Bill, and recommending to the Imperial Parliament a measure of Home Rule such as the Irish people are themselves willing to accept.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I had not intended to offer any observations on the resolutions now before the House, but I think, from the opening remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, it is perhaps necessary for persons occupying the position I do, to define our position in regard to this question. That hon. gentleman seemed to infer that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), in moving their amendments, were opposed to the system of Home Rule for Ireland. I cannot remember his language exactly, but I think the purport of it was that they had expressed the view that there was a deep-seated hatred in the people of Ireland towards English rule, and that they would be satisfied with nothing less than entire separation from Great Britain. I do not think that the remarks made by those hon. gentlemen justify that inference. At all events, I do not wish it to be inferred that because I support the amendment which has been moved, I entertain views hostile to a system of Home Rule for Ireland. I am one of those that regret that this discussion has been again forced upon the attention of this House. I sympathise with the view that it is entirely outside of our line of duty as representing the people of this Dominion. It is certainly a question over which we have no power to legis-

late, and, whatever may be our rights in regard to this matter—this question has been ably discussed by the member who has just sat down and the hon. member for Simcoe—whatever may be our rights in regard to it, I cannot see how the discussion which has taken place here during the last few days, or any resolution which we may pass, can be of any permanent good either to the Irish cause or the Irish people; and I feel that, so far as my own constituents are concerned, and I believe the greater portion of the electors of this Dominion, they would prefer that the time of this Parliament should not be spent in discussing questions of this character, in which we are not directly interested and the discussion of which we cannot influence. While, therefore, I support the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Simcoe, and shall vote for it, I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to a just measure of Home Rule for Ireland. This term "Home Rule," however, appears to be a sort of ambiguous or indefinite term. From the majority of the speeches which have been delivered here, I believe, it is generally understood in this House that Home Rule for Ireland means giving them a constitution somewhat similar to the one which we enjoy in the Dominion of Canada at the present time. If by that we mean that Home Rule for Ireland places Ireland in the same relation to Great Britain that the Dominion of Canada stands in to-day in relation to the British Empire, I believe that such a scheme is utterly impossible. I cannot conceive it possible that the people of Ireland in the position in which they are placed, could occupy such a relation, that they could have the same character of a Parliament, that they could have the same legislative powers that we as a Dominion enjoy to-day. But, if, on the other hand, it is meant by Home Rule for Ireland that they should stand in the same relation to Great Britain that the different Provinces of this Dominion occupy towards the general Government, I can conceive that such a scheme may be practicable. I am quite prepared to advocate some such scheme as that, or at all events to support it. Indeed, Home Rule as I understand it means giving to the people of Ireland control of their local matters, matters which are purely Irish matters as distinguished from subjects affecting the welfare of the United Kingdom; and I may say that, if that is the meaning of the term, I for one sympathise with the advocates of Home Rule, and I am further in favor of extending the same principle not only to Ireland, but to England, and Scotland, and to every other section of the British Empire. The resolution which was moved by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) goes much farther than expressing our approval of such a measure of Home Rule. The most objectionable feature in this resolution is its reference to the measure, the Crimes Bill or the Coercion Bill, or whatever we may choose to call it, which is at the present time being discussed in the British Parliament, and which, since this resolution has been introduced, has passed the House of Commons, I believe, by a majority of about one hundred. I fully sympathise with the view which has been expressed that we are not in a position here to pass an intelligent judgment upon this measure. We have not the necessary information. We have not that measure before us, and we are not acquainted with the circumstances under which the British Government may consider that measure necessary, or the evidence which has led them to introduce it in the British Parliament. I rather incline to the opinion, from such evidence as we have before us, from the light which we have been able to obtain on this measure during this discussion, that it is not so very stringent a coercive measure, as the hon. mover of this resolution would lead us to believe. I rather incline to the opinion that it is a reasonable measure, and, perhaps, a necessary measure for the preservation of order and the protection of life and property under the state of things existing in Ireland at the present time. But, however that

may be, the greatest objection I see to introducing such a clause as that in any resolution we may pass, is that to my mind it offers a direct encouragement to violence and crime. Whatever may be the views which we, sitting in this Parliament, entertain with regard to Home Rule for Ireland, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that a large number of those who are engaged in this agitation consider Home Rule for Ireland synonymous with the entire separation of that island from Great Britain, with the establishment of an entirely separate and independent people. We cannot, either, close our eyes to the fact that the more violent among those who are engaged in the agitation, are openly advocating assassination and the use of dynamite; that they are continually inciting the people of Ireland to murder and crime, and other forms of violence, in order to secure their object. Now, the objection which I think can be urged against the resolution as it was originally introduced is this, that while it can be of no practical good to the Irish people, by influencing the British Parliament and Government, it would be a direct encouragement to the class of people to whom I have just referred as being engaged in promoting this agitation by acts of violence. I do not mean to say that such is the intention of the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution; I do not believe it is the intention of any of the hon. gentlemen who support that resolution that it should have this effect; but, nevertheless, this will be the practical effect of it; it will be interpreted by the more violent class of agitators, both in the Old Country and in America, as an endorsement of the course which they have pursued in the past, and an encouragement for them to pursue the same course in the future. Under these circumstances I think it is not wise that this Parliament should pass the resolution. The expressions which are used in this resolution, I think, fully justify the inference, or the statement, I have just made. It refers to the present Bill in the British Parliament as a most stringent coercive measure by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to British subjects. It expresses regret that this measure has been introduced, and asks us to protest against it. In speaking of the measure of Home Rule, which we wish the people of Ireland to enjoy, it says a measure similar to that of the Dominion of Canada, one which shall satisfy the national aspirations of the people of Ireland. I think these are sentiments which, if expressed in a resolution by this Parliament, would justify the class of agitators to which I have referred, in regarding it as an endorsement of the views which they entertain, and an endorsement of the policy which they are pursuing. It is for this reason that I, for one, while quite favorable to granting to the people of Ireland a just measure of Home Rule, which will give them control of their local affairs, cannot support that resolution in its present form, therefore I shall have pleasure in voting for the amendment introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); if that fails I shall cast my vote in favor of the amendment of the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill).

Mr. GIGAULT. The propriety of passing resolutions like those now before the House has been already admitted, and I do not think any more discussion upon that point is necessary. We have, I think, only to examine whether the measure of Home Rule proposed by the resolution is calculated to do good to Ireland and England. The hon. member for Queen's, N. S. (Mr. Freeman) who spoke this afternoon, said: What will a Dublin Parliament do for Ireland? If he does not know what a Dublin Parliament will do for Ireland, we know what the Imperial Parliament has done to destroy the happiness and prosperity of Ireland. Mr. Froude, a most eminent historian says:

"England governed Ireland for her own interest, as if right and wrong had been blotted out of the Statute-book of the universe."

I can also quote another high authority, Lord Dufferin, who, in speaking of Ireland, says :

"One by one each of her nascent industries was either strangled in its birth, or bound to the jealous custody of the rival interest in England, until at last every fountain of wealth was hermetically sealed."

Is local self-government a good thing? The best authorities who wrote on that subject all say, that when a country is inhabited by men of different creeds and different origins, we must resort to local self-government to secure the peace and tranquillity of such a country. Here is what De Maistre says of the constitution and of the laws which should be adopted to secure the welfare and prosperity of a people :

"Qu'est-ce qu'une constitution? N'est-ce pas la solution du problème suivant: Etant données la population, les mœurs, la religion, la situation géographique, les relations politiques, les bonnes et mauvaises qualités d'une certaine nation, trouver les lois qui lui conviennent?"

That is the reason why local self-government is necessary in order to have a good government. Every time that legislators have departed from the principles propounded by De Maistre, the nation thus legislated for has been unhappy. As long as the Hungarians were deprived of local self-governments there was no happiness for them. The Poles and the Irishmen have been unhappy because they had no local self-government. Moreover, the argumentation of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) proves that local self-government is absolutely necessary in Ireland. He says that if Mr. Gladstone's scheme is adopted the Protestant minority, as to their religion and institutions, will have to suffer. Well, if that hon. gentleman thinks it is a bad thing to leave the Protestant minority of Ireland at the mercy of the Catholic majority of that country, yet he wishes to leave the Catholics of Ireland at the mercy of the Protestant majority of England. Such is the logic of the hon. member for North Bruce. If such reasoning was adopted by every legislator, I would despair seeing justice reigning in any country. But the hon. member for North Bruce said he was willing to grant some form of Home Rule for Ireland, and he spoke in favor of the Imperial federation scheme. I think that by that scheme we would give to the Imperial Parliament much more than we would receive from it. For my part I am completely opposed to that scheme, and to deprive ourselves of any powers we now possess. When we see how the present Ministers of England are treating Ireland—that they are adopting a Coercion Bill in order to force upon that country laws that do not suit it, I do not want Canadians to be ruled by the Imperial Parliament and to be exposed to any Coercion Act. I was not surprised to see the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) oppose the present Home Rule resolution. In pursuance of his antecedents, when we remember that he is the chief promoter in this country of the Imperial federation scheme, we might easily come to the conclusion that he was opposed to the passing of the resolutions proposed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). We know that the member for North Simcoe is not very friendly to minorities, for we remember he said in his speech at Barrie that French Canadians would be a danger to the confederacy so long as they would remain French. What does that mean? The hon. gentleman wants French Canadians to forget their past, to give up the use of their language, to abandon their institutions, for otherwise, according to his opinion, they would be a danger to Confederation. I hope the present resolutions will have the good effect of assisting Irishmen in procuring Home Rule and self-government; but if they have not that good effect they will have had, at least, the advantage of making known the principles of certain members of this House. The merit or demerit of a political man or party consists of the principles proposed and supported by that man or by that political party,

Mr. GIGAULT.

and we must trust or mistrust that man or that party according to the nature of those principles. I always understood that to be a Conservative it was not necessary to be a Tory; because, if I had thought that to be a Conservative it was necessary to be a Tory, I would never have followed the Conservative party. I hate toryism as much as I hate demagogism and radicalism. I know that fifty years ago Conservatives were Tories, that they then refused the minority the right to administer their own affairs, and to have its legitimate share in the administration of public affairs. I had thought that toryism could not be found any more in the ranks of the Conservative party; but I am sorry to see that some members of the Conservative party from Ontario have decided to be yet Tory and to follow a Tory policy. In his speech the other night, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), did violence to historical truth. He contended that the French Canadians were opposed to the Act of Union because they were opposed to responsible government.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, the hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. I was answering the hon. member from Quebec Centre (Mr. Laurier), who said that they rejoiced in responsible government. My argument was that they obtained that responsible government by that Act of Union to which they were opposed.

Mr. GIGAULT. If we opposed the Act of Union it was not because it was granting us responsible government, but because it contained some unjust and arbitrary clauses; it was because, as Mr. O'Connell said in his speech in the House of Commons, the French Canadians were not put upon a footing of exact equality with the other inhabitants of the country, for they had not the number of representatives to which they were entitled by virtue of the number of their population, and the liabilities of Upper Canada were to be paid in such a way as to be an injustice to Lower Canada. I rejoice that Mr. O'Connell thought fit then to defend the French Canadians, and I am glad to say that almost all the French Canadians sympathise with the Irishmen in their efforts to obtain Home Rule. In doing so we are only paying a debt of gratitude to Mr. O'Connell, or rather to the people whom he represented; and I hope that sooner or later, we shall see local self-government in Ireland, that it will help to secure the satisfaction, the harmony and peace of that country, and will make the bonds between Ireland and England closer than they are to-day.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. In making the few remarks which I intend to offer, after the debate which has gone on for the last three or four days, I may be permitted in the first place to express the satisfaction I feel that the debate should have been conducted in a spirit so free from acrimony, considering how exciting the question was that has been under our consideration. I desire to thank hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House for their kindly allusions to myself and the manner in which I presented the case I had in hand, and to state that the tone of the present debate is certainly something upon which we may congratulate ourselves, if we look back to some of the circumstances that have surrounded like discussions in the past. We have, Sir, before us not merely the main motion that has been presented to this House by myself, seconded by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), but we have presented to us two amendments, neither of which I believe can be acceptable to the vast majority of those who hold a seat in this Parliament. I may as well declare at the outset that it is my intention, with the permission of the House, to adopt the suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and

if this House should not consent to my doing so, then an hon. gentleman at the proper time will adopt those suggestions and present to the Chair a resolution in amended form. In passing briefly in review the speeches that have been made in opposition to the resolution I proposed, I think it my duty to do so in the kindest spirit, although a certain amount of violence of language was used, more particularly by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). It is not my intention to discuss the speech which that hon. gentleman has delivered on the floor of this House. I think that the hon. member is not altogether responsible for the speech that he has delivered here. In fact, in the most good natured manner I can possibly put it, I would say that I really believe that the hon. gentleman came into this world about eighty years after his time. He should have figured in the old days when "they were hanging men and women for the wearing of the green." Certainly I cannot say anything more severe of him, because I actually prefer that he should give me the blunt, direct opposition he has given me on the present occasion to the peculiarly unfortunate support he gave myself and friends at the time the Home Rule question was before the House last Session. I now proceed to allude briefly to the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) who moved the amendment. I certainly cannot complain of the tone in which he discussed this question; in fact, I ought to be grateful for the exceedingly complimentary manner in which he alluded to myself and the observations I made. However, if he is not with us, if he has a strong love, as he says he has, for the old land; if he be an Irishman—and no doubt he is—and loves Ireland, I think there is one thing pretty clear, and that is that he loves England and the British Government, of the present day, a great deal better. He will not be convinced by what has convinced the whole civilised world. He would not be convinced by what has drawn forth the blame and censure of nearly every journal you take in your hands, from either the neighboring Republic or the Dominion of Canada. He will not say that the system of coercion should be changed. He cannot find it in his heart to express even a regret that that system should not be changed. On the contrary, he absolutely refrains from saying one word in connection with this drastic measure, which has been foreshadowed as something which would completely eclipse anything in the shape of coercion that has taken place for many years past; he cannot find it in his heart to blame that, or to say one word with reference to it in connection with the gentlemen who are now controlling affairs in the Imperial Parliament. But, Sir, I believe the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that he belongs to the Orange organisation, and that there is one thing at all events, as a newspaper said a short time ago, that we can feel a certain amount of pleasure in, and it is this: that even a member of that organisation, with its past history, having lived in this Canada of ours, having enjoyed Home Rule and seen its influence and its benefits in bringing men together of the most diverse opinions on other subjects, has brought forward a resolution, no doubt speaking in the name of those with whom he is associated, in which he has declared emphatically that he reiterates the good wishes for Home Rule that have been expressed in this House on two occasions, and that he himself would like to see, and those for whom he speaks would like to see, a measure of Home Rule which would satisfy the Irish people and at the same time give protection to the minority in Ireland. No man in this country, of any party, can object to such protection being given, to checks and guarantees in the constitution being given, to the minority in Ireland, just the same as we have checks and guarantees for the protection of the minority in each of the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. And although in the Province of Ontario a howl was raised some time ago, and an attempt made to impress on

the people the idea that those checks and guarantees and rights should be interfered with, one thing is certain, throughout the length and breadth of the land the cry went up from the Canadian people, not merely where that unfortunate and nefarious cry was raised, but everywhere throughout the length and breadth of Canada, that the crusade inaugurated on that occasion against the rights of the minority would not be tolerated, and the electorate of the Province where the cry was raised showed that they did not appreciate that attempt. For my own part I have no hesitation—Home Ruler as I am to day, and as I have been since I was a boy, taking an active part in support of Home Rule, as I have on the platform and in the press, and subscribing my money on every occasion when the call was made to advance that cause—I have no hesitation in saying that I trust that the greatest provision for such protection will be made in the Parliament of Ireland; and in the constitution which is to be given to Ireland within a brief space of time. I believe ample protection will be given to the Protestant minority there, and the same guarantees given to that section of people that are given to the minorities in the various Provinces in the Dominion. Now I leave the hon. gentleman I trust without any harsh feelings. I trust I have not said a word which will cause him to feel that I have spoken in any other than the most friendly spirit, and I shall allude for a few moments to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Simcoe which has been admirably answered this afternoon by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The latter gentleman has, indeed, relieved me from the greater part of the duty I had to perform. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), opened his speech with the declaration that he himself was a descendant of the Irish race, that he was proud to belong to that race, and that he did not hesitate to say so here or elsewhere; and, Sir, if he be proud of belonging to the Irish race, so far as his intellectual gifts, his eloquence, and his power of argumentation—even though it be of a sophisticated kind when he has a bad case—are concerned, Ireland has no reason but to be proud of him. But those who have the Irish cause at heart have reason to grieve that one so highly gifted as he is should be found delivering the oration that he did in this House against the proposition I have laid before you, designed to give expression to the sympathy of the people of Canada for Home Rule for Ireland, and their regret that such a measure as that now before the British Parliament should become law. I said a moment ago that the hon. gentleman's arguments, though brilliant, are mere sophistry. I say so with all respect to the hon. gentleman; but I think it will be admitted by any one who knows anything at all about law, or who has ever had a gown upon his back in the courts of this or any other country, that when he comes before this House and tells us that the law has not been changed, but merely that the procedure in courts has been interfered with, he intends to impose upon the credulity of people outside, who are not acquainted with the subject as fully as most gentlemen who occupy seats in this House. Why, Sir, does he pretend to say that because the law has not been changed, there can be no oppression? What is the procedure of our criminal law? Why, Sir, it is the prisoner's protection. It is that which has grown up after years and years of experience, hedging in the rights of the subject against oppression and injustice. If you take away the protection which is extended to the vilest criminal in our courts—the right to preliminary examination, the right to cross-examine witnesses, the right to be brought before the grand jury, and to be tried before a jury where he has his challenge preemptory, and for cause—all these safeguards which have been thrown about the citizen to protect him in his liberties—what will be the condition of those unfortunate men in Ireland who happen to be, not accused, but suspected, and dragged to gaol by a Star Chamber of magistrates not versed in the law? Because, when the question was asked

if men versed in the law would be magistrates under this Coercion Act, the Minister answered no. My hon. friend would wish this Parliament to say that because there is no change in the definition of offences, the whole procedure might be done away with, all the rights of the prisoner might be swept away, and there would be nothing that this House could complain of or pronounce upon, and we have no knowledge that the rights of men in Ireland are to be invaded under the Bill. But there was something more. My hon. friend, in discussing the speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), stated :

"It is not correct to compare the situation of the people in this country before responsible government was granted to us, with that of the Irish people to-day. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) told us this afternoon that since we had been granted responsible government sullenness had disappeared from our midst, and peace, happiness and loyalty to the Crown prevailed throughout the land; but does not the hon. member forget that the Bill which gave him the right was forced upon the people of Lower Canada against their wishes?"

"Mr. LAURIER. It was the Act of Union they opposed.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, and it is by the Act of Union that the hon. member got responsible government and the liberty to govern himself of which he has boasted, and which he says, has enabled his people to live happily and prosperously under the British flag. That Act was passed in the British Parliament, against the will of the people of Lower Canada, and yet that union with the people of Upper Canada which lasted until the time of Confederation, was found, as my hon. friend has had to admit, to confer happiness and peace and prosperity upon all of us."

Without referring to arguments that have been adduced by other hon. members to show the inaccuracy of this statement, I would say this: Suppose it were true that this Act was imposed on the people against their will, and that it gave them peace and happiness and prosperity, and produced loyalty in their hearts, the very statement made by the hon. gentleman shows that the Government of England to-day is singularly at fault. Why do they not come forward in response to the appeal of the majority of the people of Ireland, backed up by the urgent request of this Parliament and of the civilised world, and impose upon the people of Ireland some kind of Home Rule, some measure of fair play and justice; and although it might not, perhaps, be acceptable to the leaders of the Irish people, yet, if it were a just and comprehensive measure, calculated to develop the industries of the country and to promote its prosperity, even though it be imposed on them against their will or the will of their leaders to-day, may we not expect a result in Ireland similar to that which was so eloquently pointed out by the hon. member for Quebec East as having taken place in Lower Canada? And should the leaders of the Irish people to-day not acquiesce in it, but attempt to raise their voices against it, their fate will be the same as that of the Hon. Louis Joseph Papineau in this country, who, when he sought to raise a cry against the measure of self-government which his fellow-countrymen received, found that his influence had faded away, and the people would no longer hearken to his eloquent appeals and fiery denunciations. The people of Ireland would be found to accept any just measure of Home Rule that would be granted to them to-day in the same spirit as the French-Canadian people of Lower Canada. Now, Sir, in the course of this discussion, which has been singularly free from any allusion to Canadian politics, there were one or two gentlemen who did venture, I think very unfortunately indeed, to drag into it the conduct of certain gentlemen on this side of the House on a former occasion, and to endeavor to make political capital out of a question which I can assure every man in this House and this country, and before God, I have sought to deal with without any political or party desire whatever, but in order to cement together all the friends of the old land in one phalanx on this particular question, and to bury, if possible, the animosities of the past. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us that in my introductory remarks, I had mentioned the fact,

Mr. CURRAN.

and it is a fact, that no newspaper in this country of any importance, on either side of politics, had ever, within the past few years, written a line of editorial against Home Rule. But, he said, I had made a mistake, since the *Ottawa Citizen*, only a few days ago, had an article against Home Rule, whilst no Reform journal had written anything of the kind. That I can assure the hon. gentleman is an entirely false impression on his part. There was no such article in the *Citizen*, but there was a correspondence in that paper signed by the gentleman who wrote it, and to that correspondence I very briefly alluded. I think it is a great mistake for any man who professes to be a friend of Ireland in Canada and who wishes to strengthen the cause of Home Rule in Ireland, to go about searching for a journal opposed to Home Rule. It would seem to cast suspicion upon his own honesty in his advocacy of the Irish cause, because I, for one, am always prepared, and, I believe, the friends of Home Rule are everywhere prepared, to extend the right hand of friendship and fellowship to every one who labors for the cause. It is not friendly to point out that here, there or elsewhere, there is a weak spot or an attempt on the part of any person of influence to belittle the cause or deprive it of recruits. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) also alluded to this matter in the same connection, and I think in so doing he also made a great mistake. A proposition was laid down to-day by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which I think, no one can contradict, which, I think, every member of this House may study with a great deal of profit and perhaps no man more than the hon. gentleman who so eloquently laid it down. In discussing a public question he said, we do not stop to enquire into the opinions on other subjects of those who happen to be on the same side as ourselves. That is a sound doctrine. When men go together to vote on any particular question, it is the value of the cause itself, the value of the question at stake, the value of the proposition that is laid before the people, that should be discussed, and not the value of the man who casts his vote. One should not turn round at the poll and say to his neighbor: Sir, I must decline your assistance, although I desire that this cause should triumph, I beg of you, on account of your antecedents or opinions or on some other particular account, to abstain from voting, and let me carry this cause to success alone. In asking this House for permission to alter a few of the words of the resolutions I have proposed, I desire to say that I accept, in the spirit in which it was tendered, the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. He bears an Irish name, and so do I. Upon this question I hope that we shall always be found acting in unison, and that if in the past there has been anything done calculated to drive the friends of Ireland asunder, such things will be avoided in the future. I hope that no imputations will be made, and that such a line will be adopted as will enable us, to use the hon. gentleman's own words, to act together to secure the greatest unanimity. I make this allusion on account of what has taken place since we last met in this House, and I may be pardoned, having been the principal victim of a sort of conspiracy, as it were, of a systematic persecution, to say a few words as to what has taken place. In the second paragraph of this resolution, after reciting that in 1882 we passed resolutions favorable to Home Rule for Ireland, it is stated that in 1886 we passed a similar resolution, reiterating a hope that a measure of Home Rule will be given. I regret to say that, whatever may have been the opinions, whatever may have been the expressions of Reform journals in this country with regard to the cause of Home Rule, from the biggest down to the smallest in importance, there was not one that did not hound down the Minister of Inland Revenue and myself as having voted against Home Rule. This proposition which I bring forward

to-day, and which I have no doubt will receive the assent of the vast majority of the House, will be sufficient answer to that slander, which was sent forth, no doubt, merely for electioneering purposes, but there was something still more. My hon. friends the Irish Catholic members on this side came in for their share of misrepresentation. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue and other hon. gentlemen were by them pointed out as those who had betrayed the cause of Ireland. But there was a special emissary engaged, a special personage employed more particularly to hound me down in a very special manner. I believe and I know in my heart, and I said all through the campaign, that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House, is a sincere Home Ruler, a sincere friend of Ireland, because, no matter what might be the consequence, I was determined the Home Rule cause should not suffer by having it stated that any man who upheld it was not sincere in his advocacy. Whilst I am proud to think that his great gifts, gifts that are given to so few, those high intellectual qualities and the magnificent accomplishments by which they have been brought to such perfection, are always, when required, at the service of the land of his forefathers. I believe, and I know as a fact, that although the Minister of Inland Revenue may not have the same brilliant talents to lay on the altar of his country, there is one thing every Irishman in this country will admit he would be ready to do at a moment's notice, and that is to lay down his life for the cause of Ireland. What was the course pursued against myself? Down to a day or two before the close of the election contest, we found this language circulated in a journal supposed to be published in the interests of Catholicity, and edited by a personage drawn from God knows what purlieu of journalism—a man without any faith whatsoever, an apostate from the old faith, an apostate against christianity itself, a man whose private character is as vile as vile can be. What did this man call me? He declared in the columns of this so-called Catholic paper, on the 28th January, that I was a traitor to the cause of Home Rule, that I was as bad as any "scurvy sneak, informer, spy and traitor, ever employed by the British Government to bring Irish patriots to the gallows." "If I should be elected," he said, "every trimmer, time-server, place-hunter, apostate, renegade, traitor and mercenary would find every villainy he might contemplate justified in advance." Benedict Arnold was a saint in comparison; Judas Iscariot and his thirty pieces of silver were made to do service as the only illustration suitable for the occasion. I was to be buried out of sight beneath the ballots of Montreal Centre. What I regret is that no member of the party on the other side, high or low, ever felt it to be his duty to raise his voice against such a system of moral assassination as this. A leading journal of the Dominion—I may say the leading evening journal of the Dominion—felt constrained to say that writing such as that had caused the death of the most brilliant Irishman ever in the Dominion of Canada. I trust we have seen for the last time in the public press of our country any such vile and slanderous writings as that I have just referred to. Can we not, we who profess to love Ireland, love Ireland without hating one another? For myself, as I said a moment ago, I am prepared on all occasions to work with gentlemen on the other side or upon any side of the House in favor of the cause we all have so much at heart, and if I have alluded to this matter to-day it is for the last time, because I trust we shall never have a resurrection of such writings as I have alluded to. Now, a few words in conclusion in regard to the moral to be drawn from the maxim laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In the past it has been sought to introduce into this country an Orange and Green war, which has, in its time, desolated Ireland and been the cause of a great deal of its misery. We have had attempts made to arouse the vilest

passions, to arouse the worst prejudices, to set man against man in this country, and all for the purpose of furthering the interests of political parties in this country. In this land we see the Catholic and the Orangeman going to the polls together to vote for those things which they consider are for the material interests of our Dominion, and I can say fearlessly that such a state of things is what the patriots and poets of Ireland and every man who has loved Ireland have sighed for and prayed for in the past. If that state of things could exist in Ireland, if the Irish Catholic and the Irish Orangemen could go to the polls together and vote as they do here for the material interests of the country, if we could see there as we do here that, under the benign influences of our liberal and free institutions, those people could labor in common and side by side for the advancement and progress of their common country, then we would see the triumphs dawning for the national cause there. It has been for years and years the complaint, and the saddest complaint of the best men in Ireland, that the people would not come together and join hands. They are doing it to-day. When we take up any Irish paper, we find the Irish Catholic and the Irish Protestant ranging side by side in this great movement; we see the old prejudices disappearing; and are we in this country going to revive the old war, are we going to make it a crime for an Irish Catholic to join hands with an Irish Protestant, whether Orangeman or not, for the advancement of the material interests of his country? To do such a thing would be to inaugurate a war here which has produced such disastrous results in the land we have been discussing for the last four days, and whose interests we have been seeking to advance as far as we can. Whilst thanking this honorable House for the favor they have done me in thus listening to these observations, I trust there will be no dissenting voice, and that I shall be allowed to make such alterations in this document as have been suggested by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I do that in the spirit in which he extended it to me, because I feel I am acting in such a way as will secure greater unanimity. Members from both sides of the House have come to me and asked me to eliminate those words of protest against the adoption of the law, and to express the hope that such a measure will not become law. I do that with pleasure, and I also take out the section which refers to the adoption of a system similar to that in the Dominion of Canada, and substitute, as the leader of the Opposition has suggested, a substantial measure of Home Rule for Ireland. The resolution, in that shape, I think will meet the wishes and views of every man in this country, who desires to send across the Atlantic an expression of sympathy to the old land, an expression that will have its effect, if not upon the rulers of Great Britain to-day, at all events upon the people of Great Britain who, after all, are to be the ultimate judges of this matter. When the people of England, the people of Scotland, and the people of Wales, see that in this Home Rule country there is such a love of Ireland, such a desire that the privileges we enjoy should be extended to them, then those who have been laboring for the past few years to give to Ireland those great benefits, will be encouraged and cheered on in their course; and those who have been opposing a just measure of Home Rule for Ireland will feel, at all events, that it is time for them to stand and think; think over the course they have been pursuing, and to place in office those who will be willing to endeavor to rule that country by some system different from that which has prevailed for the last eighty-seven years, and that has produced such results amongst the people of those two great countries, who are destined by God and by nature to be bound together, who should be bound together in the bonds of brotherly love and common citizenship, but who have been driven apart, who have been made to hate one another, not by nature but by bad laws, laws which we trust to see repealed, laws which,

not being enforced to-day, having been enforced in the past, we hope never to see re-enacted. I thank this honorable House for the kind hearing they have given me, and I trust this resolution will be carried by such an overwhelming majority as to bring joy and gladness to every part of the old land, to every part of England, of Ireland, and of Scotland, where the love of liberty exists. I will read the resolution in the form in which I propose to amend it :

That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted an humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland ; and

That in the year 1886, by Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that such a measure of Home Rule would be passed by the Imperial Parliament ; and

That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Bill enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and earnestly hopes that a measure so subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland may not become law.

That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland a substantial measure of Home Rule which, whilst satisfying the National aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.

That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this Her Jubilee year, and, if possible, render Her Majesty more dear to the hearts of Her already devoted and loyal subjects.

That the present Resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and Charles Stuart Parnell, M.P.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. McCarthy (p. 98) : to the amendment of Mr. McNeill (p. 55) :

Yeas :

Messieurs

Baker,	McCarthy,	Rykert,
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),	Scarth,
Boyle,	McKay,	Shanly,
Brown,	McLelan,	Small,
Campbell (Digby),	McNeill,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Cargill,	Madill,	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Mars,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Marshall,	Taylor,
Davin,	Masson,	Tisdale,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),	Tyrwhitt,
Denison,	O'Brien,	Wallace,
Foster,	Perley (Assiniboia),	Ward,
Gordon,	Pope,	White (Renfrew),
Haggart,	Porter,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Hesson,	Reid,	Wood (Brockville), and
Hicky,	Ross,	Wood (West'md.).—49.
Jamieson,		

Nays :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Edgar,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Audet,	Ellis,	Mallory,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Mitchell,
Baird,	Flynn,	Moncreiff,
Barron,	Gaudet,	Montague,
Bécharde,	Gauthier,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Patterson (Essex),
Blake,	Girouard,	Perley (Ottawa),
Borden,	Godbout,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Platt,
Bowman,	Guay,	Purcell,
Brien,	Guilbault,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Hale,	Riopel,
Burns,	Holton,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron,	Innes,	Robertson (Kg's, P.E.I.)
Campbell (Kent),	Ives,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jocas,	Robillard,
Carpenter,	Jones,	Roome,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenny,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Kirk,	Scrivner,
Casey,	Labelle,	Seiple,

Mr. CURRAN.

Oasgrain,	Labrosse,	Shakespeare,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Skinner,
Choquette,	Landry,	Somerville,
Cimon,	Lang,	Stevenson,
Clayes,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Cook,	Laurier,	Thérien,
Costigan,	Lavergne,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Lister,	Trow,
Couloombe,	Livingston,	Turcot,
Coursol,	Lovitt,	Vanasse,
Couture,	Macdonald (Huron),	Waldie,
Curran,	McCulla,	Watson,
Daly,	McDonald (Victoria),	Welsh,
Dawson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wilmot,
De St. Georges,	McGreevy,	Wilson (Elgin),
Desjardins,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Lennox),
Doyn,	McKeen,	Wright, and
Duchesnay,	McMillan (Huron)	Yeo.—133.
Dupont,		

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. INNES. I noticed that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has not voted ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. member for Russell voted ?

Mr. EDWARDS. I have not voted for the reason that I paired a short time ago, and the time has not yet expired. Had I the opportunity of voting, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish now to move the amendment that I would have moved last night if the Rules of Procedure had permitted me to do so. I beg, therefore, to move in amendment to the amendment that all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—

This House learns with regret that it is considered necessary to pass a coercive measure for Ireland, and it re-affirms its convictions as expressed in the Resolutions of 1882 and 1886, that a plan of local government for Ireland which would leave unimpaired the links connecting Ireland with the British Empire and guard the rights of the minority, would be conducive to the prosperity of Ireland and the stability of the Empire.

That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Marquis of Salisbury.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you put that amendment, I claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments. Our position, it appears to me, is rather unfortunate to-night. We are deprived of the guidance of those to whom many of us have been accustomed to look for instruction in constitutional matters ; and it is of the more importance, seeing that one, at least, of those hon. gentlemen recently twice moved the adjournment of the House in order that the vote might be as large as possible. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of late in and out of this House touching a certain party known under the name of Bolters, but I did not expect to see so large and early and important an accession to their numbers.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is increasing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt of it. But I must say that it does strike me as rather odd that on a question which undoubtedly does involve issues of great importance to the British Empire, the Premier *in esse*, and, shall I say, the Premier *in posse*, are both depriving us of the light of their countenance and their assistance on this occasion ; not to speak of the valuable information the House might have derived from the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who is also absent on this interesting occasion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Another Premier *in posse*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And there is the hon. member for Terrebonne, the Secretary of State, who has delivered himself very eloquently and very impressively on more than one occasion in reference to the rights of Ireland also absent. I must say that while I compliment the other members of the Ministry on the courage with which they have stuck to their guns on this occasion, I think we have some

right to express our regret that my hon. friend's invitation was not accepted and some information was not given to us by the leader of the House on this important question. For my own part I may take occasion to say that I have always felt that *primd facie* there was a very great deal to be said for the contention of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and for the contention of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). There can be no doubt that *primd facie* we here in Canada need to justify ourselves before we undertake to interfere or advise the Empire at large as to matters more particularly affecting a portion of the United Kingdom. But however it may appear to the House that that view is justified at first sight, I think that a later consideration will show that that after all is but a superficial way of looking at this question, that there are much larger and more important issues involved, and that not only in our capacity as citizens of the British Empire, but in our capacity of citizens of Canada, we have every right respectfully, but firmly, to advise the British Government on this question. Sir, if this House wants to understand thoroughly the grounds on which that right depends, they will have to carry their recollections back for a period of some two and twenty years, when a gang of murderous miscreants availed themselves of our hospitality to attempt a raid into the United States, with a view to embroil these two countries in war. I refer to the occasion of the St. Albans raid. And I may call the attention of those members of the House and the Government who were in the old Parliament of Canada at that time, to the fact that the moment that outrage took place, every possible exertion was used by the people of Canada to put a stop to such outrages for the future, that extraordinary powers were given to the Government of the day, and a large sum of money was voted by the Canadian Parliament to indemnify our American neighbors for the wrongs committed on them and for the injury done to their property. Sir, about twelve or fifteen months later another murderous outrage was committed in Canada, this time coming from the other side. Gangs of miscreants were enrolled and drilled on American territory, with the full approval and assistance of prominent American citizens, and they made raids into Canada; Canadian citizens were shot down defending their homes, and much injury and damage then and afterwards resulted to the people of Canada. When about three or four years afterwards questions of great importance arose between the two countries, when it was proposed that a settlement should be made between Great Britain and the United States of all matters then in dispute between them, it is also in the recollection, I dare say, of many of the members of this House that the question of the compensation be granted to Canada for the wrongs then committed upon her people was brought up for consideration, and, as the British Government had granted to us the right of having a Commissioner, and that Commissioner the Premier of Canada, amongst the gentlemen appointed to negotiate the Washington Treaty, we had certainly some right to suppose that after we at our own cost and charge had compensated the American people for wrongs and outrages, committed from our territory upon their citizens, they, in turn, would willingly compensate us for wrongs and outrages committed on Canadian territory by American citizens. I need not remind the House of the terms of the capitulation, for such it was, that was then entered into. I need not remind the House how the just claims of Canada were passed over and ignored, apparently with the full consent of the Canadian Commissioner for the time being. But if there be any gentleman here who desires to know why it is that the people of Canada claim for themselves the right to advise Her Majesty with respect to the conduct of Irish affairs I have to tell them that it was the action of British statesmen

gave them that right, and it cannot be taken away. What was the reason assigned by the English press, and assigned too by English statesmen of repute, for not entertaining the just demands of Canada on that occasion, when Britain was prepared to compensate the United States for the piratical outrages committed by cruisers fitted out in her ports. We were then told that it was not possible, in view of the hostility of the Irish element in the United States, to obtain redress for the wrongs that Canada had sustained. From that day, a new departure took place in our affairs; new relations were established as between Canada and the Empire, at all events in regard to all Irish matters. So long as British statesmen tell us they cannot claim compensation for outrages committed on Canada, because it would be likely to bring American statesmen into collision with the Irish element in the United States, so long as that is said, and what is more, is done, so long Canada has a perfect right under those circumstances to advise the people of Great Britain as to conducting themselves in all matters pertaining to the good government of Ireland, so as to remove from us and from our fellow-countrymen the danger of being exposed to the hostility of the Irish people of the United States. That is a painful subject, and I do not wish to prolong it too far. I desire to say, however, that I hold that as between the sovereign state and dependencies there is perfect reciprocity of rights and duties. I would not have supported a motion to interfere with Great Britain in matters pertaining to Ireland had not British statesmen first seen fit to declare to us that they could not obtain redress for our manifest wrongs because in so doing they would come into collision with a powerful portion of the people of the United States. Then, Sir, there is another good reason why the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) should have brought in this motion now. I am sure he regrets as sincerely as I do, or as any on this side of the House can do, that the amendment which was made last year to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) had, whether it was intended so or not, a very prejudicial effect indeed on the debate in favor of granting Ireland a measure of Home Rule, and I say it is highly desirable that the earliest possible moment should be taken for repairing and redressing the injury which, no doubt unwittingly, the hon. gentleman and many of his friends were parties to committing on the rights of the Irish people. I may add that there is another reason yet, as those who took part in the late political discussion know. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) was denounced without stint and without measure as a traitor to the Empire and the accomplice of those who want to rend the Empire asunder, because he brought forward that motion, and it is highly desirable, therefore, that an early opportunity should be given to all and sundry to affirm what their sentiments are on this measure, and to demand that the Parliament of Canada declares whether it does or does not endorse the views submitted by my hon. friend then, and practically re-endorsed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre now. This is a question on which it is right and proper that hon. gentlemen should announce their real sentiments. I was glad to hear the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), come out squarely and fairly and state their views on this matter. Having taken the stand they did in the recent elections, having spoken as they did on the question, having expressed the opinion they did about my hon. friend and other gentlemen who opposed their view, they could do no less, but it was equally creditable to them I think that they did so, and I have only to regret that other hon. members of this House, still more highly placed than they, have not seen fit, directly or indirectly, to express any opinion on the subject. Now, Sir, in the absence of the hon. the First Minister I shall not proceed with some

remarks I had intended to make, called forth by certain statements made during last election. An opportunity for investigating those matters may perhaps occur again. But for myself I say—and I think I am as sincerely concerned in promoting the interests of the British Empire as any man on the floor—I say, and I believe, that it is in the very highest degree in the interests of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, it is in the very highest degree in the interest of every English-speaking man in the British Empire to see that the claims of Ireland are satisfied in a rational and reasonable way. Sir, if ground were wanting for the action we are taking, or are going to take this night in this House, it may be found in the fact that our own census returns show that there are 957,000 persons of Irish origin in the Dominion of Canada—a larger number, let me tell the House, than have reported themselves as of either English or Scottish origin; while, Sir, in the United States of America, of Irish origin, I believe there are to be found to-day at least ten times that number—probably nine or ten millions in all. Now, we know that for a very long time back a very large number, though not all of these persons, have been to all intents and purposes hostile to the British Empire. Sir, I have always hoped to see a better state of things brought about, and I say that no true statesman, either in England or Canada, can render a greater service to the Empire at large than by promoting measures which are calculated to remove any just grievances that may exist in those people's minds. I say that when a statesman rises in England who understands, as I think Mr. Gladstone does, how important that is to the welfare of the Empire and the welfare of our whole race, such a statesman may do very great things indeed for England. And I say, Sir, that when that hostility is removed very much greater things are possible to be done for the welfare of the Empire than can be done by either or any of the schemes now on foot for promoting what is called Imperial Federation. But I may say this, that I do not believe that the passage of the eighty-seventh Coercion Bill is at all likely to pave the way to harmony. There are two ways, and there have been for hundreds of years two ways, in which Ireland can be governed. I admit that the mode—I will not say foreshadowed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but I think partially foreshadowed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), is one way. You have your choice. On the one side is Lord Salisbury and his Coercion Bill—the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, as it used to be called—and martial law, and on the other there is Mr. Gladstone's proposal to allow Irishmen to manage Irish affairs. For my part I heartily concur with the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that side. I believe the true way to pacify Ireland, and to remove those grievances to which I have alluded—the true way, in my opinion, to bring about such a state of things as will remove one of the greatest stumbling-blocks which has existed for these many years to the cordial alliance and good will which ought to prevail between the two great branches of the English race—is to grant such a measure of Home Rule to the Irish as will enable them completely and entirely to manage their own affairs at least as fully as we, in the various Provinces, are able to manage our local affairs. And as the hon. gentleman has consented to accept the wise suggestion of my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I have to say that I will have great pleasure in supporting his motion, as amended.

Mr. IVES. I think it is much to be regretted, indeed, that within a moment after this House has, by a majority of nearly one hundred votes, adopted a resolution which is supposed to be in the interests of Home Rule, when irrespective of party both sides of the House, with practical unanimity, with as great unanimity as can be expected on

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

any question of this character, have voted in favor of this message from the Parliament of Canada to the Parliament of England—I say I think it is very much to be regretted that within a moment after the recording of that enormous majority the hon. member who has just spoken should rise with a view of seizing some petty party advantage from the fact of the absence of one or two members of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Four of them.

Mr. IVES. It only shows that the hon. gentleman and those who have voted with him in the division which has just been taken have been actuated by the same motives on this occasion that, as far as we can judge from the ground they took on the occasion of the last general election, actuated them with reference to the conduct they pursued in this House at the last Session. I have stood up in my place and have recorded my vote in favor of Home Rule for Ireland on every occasion when a proposition of that kind has been made since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. But notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding that my course has been consistent from first to last, I was charged during the late election with being an enemy to Ireland, with being opposed to any measure of Home Rule, charged with being an Orangeman; and other false accusations were brought against me, in the endeavor to satisfy the people that, so far from being a friend of Ireland, I was an enemy of Ireland. Friends of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat went so far as to obtain the subornation of perjury to defeat me at the last election, notwithstanding the fact that I have been as consistent a supporter of Home Rule as my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), or my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake.) The hon. gentleman has seen fit to refer to those Ministers who were not present when the last vote was taken as bolters. Now it seems to me that the member of Parliament who can properly be charged with being a bolter is not the one who was absent when the question was read, and remains absent during the division, but the name rather applies to one who is here when the motion is read from the Chair and then runs out to escape the division. Now in my experience in this House, before the leadership of the Opposition was put in the hands of a syndicate, before it was put in commission, I have seen the leader of the Opposition act the part of a bolter by leaving the House after the question was read. Now that the Opposition is lead by a syndicate, now that the leadership has been put in commission, I have been curious—seeing that the charge was made that members of the Government were absent—to see how many of the syndicate were absent. I find that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has bolted, if the term is a proper one in such connection; the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) was absent; the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is absent; and if members of the Government are to be called bolters who were not in their seats when the question was put, then in the same fairness these hon. gentlemen deserve that term. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies)—another member of the commission—has not come to the House at all this Session, and I have as much right to say that he has remained out of Parliament altogether until the question was disposed of as the hon. member has to say that the Premier or the Minister of Finance left the House, or did not come to the House, for the sake of avoiding this vote. We are discussing a question which ought not to be a party question, which is not a party question, when we are stretching our powers so far in order to lend a helping hand to the people of Ireland, I do think it is a very inappropriate occasion for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to endeavor to gain a party advantage, the first occasion which has presented itself during this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I certainly must express my surprise that in a debate of this kind, the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, should undertake to make the criticisms he has done upon gentlemen upon this side of the House in their absence. I have no right to speak for anybody on this side of the House, except myself, unless I may be classed among the bolters, as I sometimes am; and I shall only be too happy to speak for them, or to have them speak for me, when occasion calls for it. But I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should attempt to make a comparison between the cases of the gentlemen on his side of the House and those of the gentlemen to whom he referred, from the Maritime Provinces. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the hon. member for St John (Mr. Weldon) left in a legal capacity, on a most important matter, which has occupied the city of St. John many a day—the failure of one of the great banking institutions—and that he has been away for several days? Does the hon. gentleman not know that the hon. gentleman from the city of Quebec, whose absence he commented upon, is detained from his place in this House by the sickness, almost unto death, of his wife? And I must say, I think it extremely bad taste for him to make the reference he has done. Does he not also know that it is a matter of current rumor that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is only kept away by the fact that his wife is in a delicate and critical condition, which has prevented him from being present during the present Session. Well, Sir, I think it adds to the bad taste of the hon. gentleman that he should lead in laughter at what I have said about the very improper remarks he made in regard to that gentleman. No one who knows Mr. Davies will deny that if travelling night and day could bring him here to vote on this question he would come, and there is no man on either side of the House less liable to shirk his vote than he. I have no right to speak for these gentlemen, but in their absence I think it my duty to express my disapproval of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made. Is there any similarity between their absence and the absence of the members of the Cabinet? Where is the Premier of the Dominion when a matter is under discussion that affects the interest of the whole Empire? Why is he not in his place to give the House his opinion upon it, and to advise them what course they ought to take on a question to which the hon. gentleman says there is no partyism? If there is not, why is not the Premier here to give his assistance in a matter affecting the political relations not alone of Canada, but of an integral portion of the Empire, and one affecting the social relations with the great nation to the south of us, which contains many millions of Irishmen and Irish descendants. If there ever was a question before this House demanding the calmest and coolest consideration of its members, it is the question we are considering to-night. Why is the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) not in his place? Why is the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) not in his place? And why is not the hon. Secretary of State? Everyone of these gentlemen knew that this vote was coming on. They knew that it was postponed last night. Was it postponed to give them an opportunity of being absent? I am not prepared to say that such is the case, but the matter certainly looks a little suspicious. I am not going to take up much of the time of the House, after this question has been so fully discussed on both sides; but it is a matter of too much importance for me to give a silent vote upon it. My sympathies are in favor of giving self-government to every section of the Empire capable of it; and will any man here say that with the intelligence, the valor and the talents the Irish people have shown in all positions they have occupied in the Empire and out of it, they are not entitled to the fullest measure of Home Rule? I think no man will say it. Then why not give it to them? The British Government

have tried coercion; they have tried suppression of liberty and public speech; they have adopted every course to bring about quietness and peace in Ireland, except conciliation and have failed. Now that the Premier and the hon. Minister, of the Interior have come into the House, I may repeat what I said in their absence, that I was surprised that they were not present on such an important occasion to direct this House what course it ought to pursue. If they were absent under circumstances which they could not control, they can perhaps explain that. I was about to repeat the words of an eloquent English statesman: "We have tried everything but kindness, let us try kindness [now]." What does this Coercion Bill propose to do? If the House will bear with me for a few moments, I will read from a paper a description of it given more succinctly than I can do it. It says:

"But few persons living in this age know anything about the 'Whiteboy Acts' passed by Irish Parliaments of last century, for the violation of which men are to be tried before a court of summary jurisdiction if the Coercion Bill of the present British Government becomes a law, and yet it is by the reviving of these Acts, or rather by making them a part of the Coercion Bill, that the extraordinary temper of the Government toward Ireland is most clearly shown. By the terms of the Act of 1776, to which the Coercion Bill particularly refers, any person who, armed with any offensive weapon, or disguised, or wearing any particular badge, dress, or uniform not usually worn by him, or assuming any particular name or denomination not usually assumed by his Majesty's subjects, shall rise, assemble, or appear by day or night to the terror of his Majesty's subjects, was guilty of a misdemeanor. This was the clause which gave rise to the famous line in the ballad:

'They're hanging men and women there for the wearing o' the green.'

"This clause was subsequently repealed, but the penalty of hanging still remains for the sending of threatening letters, for attempting to rescue a prisoner committed on a capital charge, and for a variety of other misdemeanors.

"The Act of 27 George III, chapter 5, which is also made a part of the Coercion Bill, makes death the penalty for unlawful meeting, and for the printing of any document tending to incite a riot. Sundry amendments have been made to the Acts since their original passage, but the number of offences for which indictments may be found under them has by no means decreased. Under the Whiteboy code sending a threatening letter, compelling another man to leave his farm, habitation, or lawful employment, maliciously causing any door to be opened by threats or menaces, rescuing a prisoner, and imposing an unlawful oath, are all criminal offences, and if the coercion law passes they may all be passed upon by courts of summary jurisdiction completely under the control of the Government at Dublin Castle. These are all serious offences and worthy of severe punishment, but they cannot, except in a spirit of pure tyranny, or without wrenching justice very materially, be taken from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of the land in which the offences are committed.

"Under the Whiteboy Acts the Government may, if it chooses, make a criminal offence of almost any act committed by an opposing political party. Under the Act of 27 George III, chapter 15, which is expressly included in the Coercion Bill, twelve persons meeting together and not dispersing on the proclamation of the magistrate, or not dispersing when the magistrate has been prevented from making such proclamation, are guilty of felony and may be sentenced to death. This Act puts an end to all meetings of the opposition should a magistrate be found bold enough to enforce it. But the most oppressive of the Whiteboy Acts is section 3, chapter 44 of 1 and 2 William IV, which practically muzzles the press of Great Britain. This section is worthy of reproduction, as showing the extent to which the enemies of Home Rule are willing to go in the way of coercion. It reads:

"And be it enacted, that if any person or persons shall knowingly print, write, post, publish, circulate, send or deliver, or cause or procure to be printed, written, posted, published, circulated, sent or delivered, any notice, letter or message exciting or tending to excite any riot, tumultuous or unlawful meeting or assembly, or unlawful combination or confederacy, or threatening any violence, injury or damage upon any condition or in any event or otherwise, to the person or property, real and personal, of any person whatsoever, or demanding any money, arms, weapons or weapon, ammunition or other matter or thing whatsoever (for example, asking reduction of rent), or directing or requiring any person to do or not to do any act, or to quit the service or employment of any person, or to set or to give out any land, every person so offending shall be liable to be transported beyond the seas."

"These are but samples of the provisions of the Whiteboy Acts which the coercionists intend to place within the jurisdiction of summary courts of procedure. They are the laws of Great Britain to-day. But many of them have been looked upon as obsolete, especially the clause just quoted. The Coercion Bill, if it becomes law, will revive them in all their original force, and with them will revive the spirit of lawlessness which first prompted their passage."

Now, I ask this House if it were proposed to legislate in that sense in Canada, how long would we stand it? Is it possible to believe that any legislature within the bounds of

a free country like Canada would tolerate such legislation? Yet we are informed that is the legislation intended to be imposed by means of the Coercion Bill. Can it be wondered at that Irishmen and their descendants throughout the British territories, and in foreign lands, should attempt to prevent legislation of that kind being forced upon their friends and relations and co-nationalists at home? I am not surprised that they should, but I am surprised that as much toleration has been shown as has been in the discussion of the question. I am not going to take up the time of the House further, for I feel this subject has, at this stage of the debate, passed beyond the period of discussion, the House having already declared by nearly three to one that this House has the power and the right to address the Throne upon the subject of legislation, which they consider likely to lead to great trouble and to the disturbance of the peace of the Empire. Therefore, I think we are quite justified in the course we have pursued, and I shall be happy to support the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran).

Sir DONALD SMITH. I do not desire to detain the House beyond a few moments. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), the other evening, twitted the Right Hon. the First Minister with contemptuous indifference with regard to this momentous question, and this evening the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as well as my friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), complained that several members of the Government were not present. I certainly am not the apologist of these gentlemen; but I do think that rather than find fault with them for not taking control of the House on this question, we have cause for congratulation that it has been left an open one. While outside this House, as Englishmen, as Irishmen, Scotchmen or Frenchmen, as men of any nationality, we have the right to give our opinion with regard to what is passing on the other side, in the Imperial Parliament, yet since we are here in this House as Canadians, since it is only as such we are here forming this portion of the Parliament of Canada, it is far better for us that we should leave those who know all the circumstances intimately to deal with the Irish question in the Parliament of Great Britain. Will the hon. gentlemen who voted for this resolution of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), assume that with them alone rests sympathy and feeling for the oppressed, whether in Ireland or in any other part of the Empire? Do we not feel equally with them for those who may be oppressed and for those who are certainly suffering great misery in Ireland as well as in Scotland and England? For do we not know that the condition of affairs is such, in the United Kingdom as well, that at present many who were in comfortable, aye, and affluent circumstances a short time ago, are now suffering very much. No, I am sure that those hon. gentlemen who will vote against the measure of the hon. member for Montreal Centre will feel as deeply for our Irish fellow-subjects as those who may express themselves averse to his measure in this House. What we all wish is I am sure that there should be a measure of Local Legislature given Ireland, that, call it Home Rule or anything you will, there should be given to them, so soon as, in the opinion of those who are responsible for the government of the Empire, it can be properly conceded, some measure of local government or Home Rule which will enable them to conduct their local affairs and leave the Imperial Parliament all its vitality and all its power, and we must believe that the only guarantee we have for the unity of the Empire is that the Central Government should remain with all its dignity. I desired to say these few words to justify the vote I have given and the vote I may give this evening.

Mr. BRIEN. This question has been so fully discussed, not only in this House, but in the public press and on the
Mr. MITCHELL,

public platform, and has been especially so ably and eloquently treated by the leader of the Opposition, that it would seem very little more remained to be said. However, I think I would be derelict in my duty, as a descendant of the people of that Emerald Isle, as a member of this House, and as a citizen of the country in which Home Rule has had such a happy result, if I did not, by my voice as well as by my vote, support the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), as it has for its object the strengthening of the hands of those noble statesmen who are trying to relieve Ireland from that state of bondage from which she has long, and I may say so patiently, suffered. Neither would I be acting in accordance with the policy of the Liberal party, or as a true Liberal, if I did not support any measure, and add whatever strength I could to any measure which would have the effect of relieving suffering humanity, which would have for its effect the relief of the oppressed and the aid of the needy. For a long time past, in centuries past, the great difficulty seems to have been the same as it is now. It is the democracy against the aristocracy, the weak against the strong, the poor against the rich. The prayer of the Liberal party has ever been: "God bless the poor and the rich can help themselves." It is true that the Imperial Government have intimated, through Her Majesty's Colonial Secretary, that she will be guided by Imperial advice alone, but this should not deter us from doing our duty in this matter. With all due deference to the wisdom of the Imperial Parliament, we are aware that the institution is a human one, and therefore liable to err. Surely it cannot be successfully denied, that while we remain part and parcel of this great Empire, we have a right to tender our advice in this case. I say it is clear that we have in an advisory, though I would not say in a dictatorial, manner. You cannot affect one part of the Empire without in one way or the other affecting the whole, and I assure you that this is already affecting Canada as far as immigration is concerned. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said we had not the papers or the necessary information before us. I think we do not require much information in relation to this matter. It is simply a question of principle, and the main question is whether Ireland shall be governed by military rule, by force, or by the freely expressed will of her people through her own representatives by a large majority. It may be perhaps a delicate question, but it is one that should be approached in a calm and judicial spirit, free from any religious or political prejudice. It has been fairly and truly said, by previous speakers, that the land question is the great trouble, but we believe there are other contributing causes to this trouble, and it had its origin at the Union, at the unhal- lowed and unholy Union in 1800. Rather than give merely an opinion of my own, I will give the opinion of statesmen who were, at the time, conversant with the whole affair. Mr. Fox, in 1806, characterised the Union as "atrocious in its principle and abominable in its means." "It was," he said, "a measure, the most disgraceful to the Government of the country that was ever carried or proposed." Mr. Gladstone is of a similar opinion. "I know," he says, "no blacker or fouler transaction in the history of man, than the making of the Union between England and Ireland." The view of the historian coincides, in this matter, with the view of the statesman. "There are," says Mr. Lecky, "indeed, few things more discredit- able to English political literature, than the tone of palliation or even of eulogy that is usually adopted towards the authors of this transaction. Scarcely any element or aggravation of political immorality was wanting; and the term honor, if it be applied to such men as Castlereagh or Pitt, ceases to have any real meaning in politics. Whatever may be thought of the abstract merits of the arrangement, the Union as it was carried was a crime of the deepest turpitude, a crime which, by imposing with every circumstance of

infamy a new form of government on a reluctant and protesting nation, has vitiated the whole course of Irish opinion." We believe that much of the discontent has had its origin there, that Ireland was deprived of her Legislature against her own will at that particular time and through means which were unfair. Is it to be wondered at that the memories of bye-gone wrongs and the recollection of former greatness should be a constant source of humiliation and irritation to a people who are imbued with a strong feeling of national pride? In legislating for any people, it is the duty of the statesmen to take into consideration the character of the people for whom the legislation is proposed, and we believe that Ireland has been governed since that time by English ideas and without a proper study of the Irish character. There have been so many quarrels on this account in Ireland, that her people have obtained a reputation abroad as a quarrelsome nation. This reminds me of the Irishman who landed in New York about the time of a political campaign, and who, when asked what his politics were, said: "I am agin the Government anyhow, and I have no politics." That does not apply to the people generally. We find that everyone is ready to acknowledge—and Irishmen are pretty well represented on this side of the House as well as on the other, and we wish they were more on this side of the House—that the Irish character is that of a most genial spirit and nature, accompanied with the tenderest of passions, but as the plant of delicate and luxurious growth nipped by the frost completely dies, so in this case whatever loyalty may have existed in the hearts of Irishmen may possibly be destroyed by this kind of oppression. When Ireland has asked for freedom she has received a tightening of the chains; when coercion has failed it was said to be because the measure was not coercive enough. An objection is raised on the question of the separation of Ireland, but that has been already answered. I do not think that anyone in this House would believe that the Irish people would wish to be separated from England. Their interests are with the Mother Country, and they hope to remain in connection with it. Another great objection, and the strongest, seems to be Catholic domination. In other Catholic countries, in France and in Austria, where Catholics predominate, we see there is no such thing. Why then should this predominance of Catholics affect Irishmen more than any others? We notice that the domination of catholicism and the downfall of protestantism seems to have a peculiar history. The ebb and flow of this cry seems to accord with the vicissitudes of the great Tory party. We are aware that the Conservative or Tory party in England at present owe their term of office to this feeling and this fear which exists, with the support of a few traitors who have deserted their post and swallowed their principles and betrayed their party in order to gratify an insatiable ambition. Lord Hartington also accuses Mr. Gladstone of frequently changing his mind. Sir, I admire a man who changes his mind according to his own convictions, and so expresses himself. It is said that a wise man changes his mind once in a while, but a fool never. Lord Hartington says again, that there is a revolutionary party which must first be overthrown. Well, all the speeches which we have heard from hon. gentlemen who oppose the resolution of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) seem to take it for granted, as was stated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that the minority would not submit to Home Rule if it were granted. Then it is the minority which is the revolutionary party; which is to become disloyal. Those who are in favor of Home Rule have never yet said that they would not continue loyal to the British Crown, although it may be doubtful—the time may come when patience ceases to be a virtue. I think that the Irish people have exercised a vast amount of patience. They have been more peaceable than we could have hoped, and I trust that in the future they will be obedient

and submissive and avoid any bloodshed or rebellion. It is said by an eminent historian that rebellion is never raised for motives of aggression, but it has always arisen from long and unendurable oppression. It is quite consistent for the Tory party, especially in this country, to maintain that there is no possibility of anyone being loyal except themselves. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) in speaking on this question referred amidst the lively cheering of his friends, to the legislation of 1877, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the object of which has been fully explained to-night, and fully defended. I will not discuss the merits of that legislation, but I must say that the hon. member for North Simcoe, in bringing that forward, had recourse to a far-fetched argument. He said what was fair for the goose was fair for the gander, and I presume you will allow me to use the same argument. But I will not go back any farther than 1882. He is referring to that legislation as radical and objectionable. Why, Sir, we will take the Gerrymander Act of 1882, the Franchise Bill of 1885, and I say there is no act on the Statute-book that is so tyrannical in principle and so cowardly in purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BRIEN. I presume that those hon. gentlemen find my remarks distasteful. You know that if you give food to children which they are not accustomed to, it is liable to make them sick. These hon. gentlemen seem to be displeased, I presume, because I am a new member with not much parliamentary experience, and I am very likely to tell the truth, and the whole truth, and that is what they do not like. But I wish to notice a remark made the other day by the Minister of Inland Revenue who was trying to conciliate the action of himself and his friends last year, and make it in accordance with the feeling of those who are anxious for Home Rule. The hon. gentleman was referring to his vote last Session on the Home Rule resolutions. Well, I have an article here from the *Irish Canadian* newspaper, supposed to be written by the editor of that paper. The article, by which he tried to show that his action was in accordance with the Irish people, was not an editorial which appeared before the true state of affairs were made known. A letter had appeared in the *Irish Canadian* by Mr. Jas. Brady, in which the writer stated that Mr. O'Brien, when passing through St. Thomas, Ont., on his way to the Chicago Convention, had told Father Flannery that it was a great misfortune that Mr. Blake's resolution, as first introduced, had not passed. The veracity of this statement having been in question, Mr. Brady wrote to Father Flannery. Here is the latter's on testimony:

"St. THOMAS, 18th September.

"JAMES BRADY, Esq.,
"Ingersoll.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 14th inst., requesting me to state in writing what I told you of the conversation I had with Mr. Wm. O'Brien, ex-M.P., of Tyrone, on the railway platform here, I have merely to reiterate the statement that, in my presence and the hearing of Dr. Wilson, M.P., and of many others, Mr. O'Brien said: 'It was a very great pity and misfortune the resolution, as introduced by Mr. Edward Blake, did not pass the House of Commons of Canada, as it would have strengthened our hands very materially in the Home Rule debate.'

"I am, dear Sir,

"Yours very respectfully,
"W. F. FLANNERY, P.P."

Justin McCarthy, speaking at Toronto on 24th November last, said:

"I thank my friend, Mr. Blake, for the manner in which he has spoken out for Home Rule, and we know that this is not the first time he has given his eloquence and his earnestness and his influence to champion that cause, and that at a time when it had far fewer supporters than it is lucky enough to have at present."

Mr. Michael Davitt, speaking at Montreal on 26th November last, said:

"You will understand that I stand here on non-political grounds, recognising neither parties (hear, hear), but I can assure you that the

people of Ireland have appreciated fully the great services rendered by the Hon. Edward Blake to the cause of Home Rule. (Tremendous applause.) I hope that his political opponents will follow his good example on the subject, and realize that we only want the same just rights accorded the Irish as are granted to the English and Canadian people."

Before taking my seat I wish to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) for the great and labored efforts which they put forth in making their speeches in such manner as would not have any tendency to catch votes. Innocent fellows! they do not care for votes;—no, not they!

Mr. WRIGHT. Allow me in the name of the House, to congratulate you (Mr. Haggart in the Chair) on your elevation, which I trust is only an omen of good things in the good time coming. I had not intended to make any remarks on this occasion, but as I came in from my country home on Monday, an old Irish friend of mine who, in season and out of season, in sunshine and in storm, had been my supporter, said to me: "Will you not speak one word for the good Old Land?" I said: "I had not intended to speak, but as you wish me to do so, I will say a few words," which I now propose to do. I think, Sir, that we may congratulate the House on the tone of this entire debate. I think the mover of these resolutions, my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), deserves the thanks of the House for the moderation and the eloquence and the ability he has manifested throughout the conduct of this somewhat trying debate. I think, also, he has been followed in the same spirit by almost every other member of the House. For my own part, as the House well knows, I have always sympathised with every movement in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. It has, as my hon. friend for Montreal West has said, been the dream of my life. My relations and connections with the Irish people of this country and in my own county have always been of a very particularly interesting character, as have been my political and social relations, and they have always given me a most generous, warm and hearty support, and therefore to-night it affords me the greatest pleasure to state that I shall vote heart and soul for the resolutions of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. If he could have made them a little stronger it would have afforded me very great pleasure to have voted for them in that form. But I understand perfectly well the feeling that animates a great number of hon. members. I listened with great attention to the able and scholarly address of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), which I am sure commended itself to every hon. member for its kindness, moderation and the strength of the argument adduced. But for all that, to me it had a melancholy ring; it had the sound of the bugle which rang out when Sarsfield and his exiles sailed away from Ireland and carried with them the hopes of the people. It was a great speech; but to my mind it conveyed the idea of disunion, of difference, which has driven Protestant and Catholic Irishmen alike from their native land, to fight most gallantly the battles of other nations. That disunion which has abased Ireland in the dust, and made her gallant sons as weak as water when they stand face to face with the awful problem of the deliverance of their native land. If Irishmen would only forget the traditions of the past, if in the supreme crisis of her nation's destiny they would join hands together and work for their common good, the triumph would be achieved and the hour of her deliverance would be at hand. As it is, notwithstanding the terrible odds, I have no doubt of her ultimate triumph. I have no doubt but that the dark night will soon be passed and the light dawn upon that unhappy land. But to my mind no measure of Home Rule will be complete which does not give the Irish land to the Irish people. I trust that some measure will be introduced which, while it might remun-

Mr. BAIN.

rate the landlords for their property fairly, will convey to the Irish people their old heritage. In this way happiness and peace will be secured. I do not speak in the interest of any party, or any class, but I consider the interest of the great body of the Irish people. It would be an appropriate inauguration of the jubilee year that the reign of our glorious Queen should be consecrated by such an event, and would be the proudest monument that could be erected to her. In this way Ireland would, instead of being a menace, be a source of benefit to the Empire. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) used what was to my mind a strong argument in favor of our intervention. We are told that we have no right to interfere, that it is impertinent on our part to do so; but, after all, we have to hold this lone outpost of the Empire, and we must hold it against all odds. Is it not of interest to us that every ship arriving at our ports should be freighted with happy and generous friends instead of with dark and dangerous foes? That is of the utmost importance; and, therefore, I shall give my vote very cheerfully for the resolution favoring a measure for the pacification of that most unhappy land. And I agree most cordially with the suggestion that in this year of Her Majesty's Jubilee, it would constitute the highest monument that could be reared to build up in the hearts of the people of Ireland that love and reverence for our great and glorious Queen which animates the rest of the nation. I have always felt very strongly on this subject, and I trust this House, by a very large majority, will vote for the resolutions of the hon. member for Montreal Centre; and, I repeat, if they were made stronger I would still vote for them with extreme pleasure. For my part, in season and out of season, whenever I have occasion and opportunity to raise my voice in favor of the Irish, Protestant and Catholic alike, many of whom have been hunted like partridges on the mountains, who have been driven from their lands, and if I can do anything to aid them here and their people at home, it will afford me the greatest pleasure to do so.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Before the amendment to the amendment is submitted I desire to say on behalf of the hon. member for Montreal Centre and myself as the seconder of the motion that we have accepted the modifications suggested by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his very conciliatory speech of a day or two ago; that is, instead of recommending a particular measure of Home Rule, it is simply stated "a measure that will be satisfactory to the hopes of the people of Ireland," not specifying what sort of local self-government should be bestowed upon them, which would be a matter for the Imperial Parliament to decide. Again, instead of using the word "protest," in order to secure the largest possible vote in this House, and the greatest unanimity, the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham is accepted, and that part of the resolutions will read in this way: "and earnestly hopes that a measure so subversive of the rights and liberties of the people may not become law." As so modified, the resolution merely reiterates the Address to Her Majesty which was passed unanimously or almost unanimously by this House in 1832. In that year the House in its Address suggested a measure of Home Rule, and it also expressed the hope that the persons who were then languishing in Irish prisons without trials, a great majority of them not knowing for what reason they were imprisoned, might be given their liberty. In that resolution we asked that the persons deprived of their liberty as a consequence of a Coercion Act which was then in force might be released. Now we ask that a new Coercion Act be not passed, an Act which would produce similar consequences. So I think the House, having almost unanimously, in 1832, passed an

Address, can, without stultifying itself, still pass a resolution which embodies so moderately all the sentiments and nothing more expressed in that Address. I do not see, for my part, how we can accept the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I do not see how that hon. gentleman can consistently vote for his own amendment. The hon. gentleman has assured the House, by his vote, that he thinks this is a subject on which we have no right to interfere. Having satisfied himself on that point, I do not think we are to be led in this matter by him, and I trust the hon. members who acted with us in this matter, and voted down the amendment, will continue to support the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre, as modified according to the suggestions of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. DAVIN. The remarks of the hon. member for Essex call for a few observations.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that in my absence considerable interest was shown in the fact that my seat was vacant. I was more pleasantly and quite as profitably engaged elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, as profitably as this debate will result. It has been said that we are bound by our previous resolutions of 1882 and 1886 to follow in the same course and to support the resolution of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. I do not think so. And, moreover, I think considering the fact that the resolution of 1882 has caused a recurrence of the discussion of the subject in 1886, and again in 1887, that it is almost unfortunate that that resolution—or that Address—was carried in 1882. I would have been well pleased if in 1832 that Address had not been moved; but moved as it was by my hon. friend and present colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan), it was one I could not refuse my assent to. It was expressed in the most loyal terms. It said—and said truly—that under our system of Home Rule in Canada we had been prosperous and happy, and the statement that the Irish population who were unhappy and discontented when they remained in Ireland, under the changed circumstances in which they found themselves when they came to Canada had become happy and contented was a truism so true that one could not refuse to vote for it. It was guarded and loyally guarded. It said we hope that circumstances would allow the Imperial Parliament to pass such a measure as would convey the same content, the same prosperity, to the people in Ireland as was enjoyed by their countrymen who came to Canada, provided always that it was consistent with the integrity of the Empire. That resolution, I believe, we had a right to pass. I quite agree with all those hon. gentlemen who said it was within our competence to express our opinion on that subject, or on any subject really of public interest. However, that was denied by Her Majesty's Government. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) entered into an elaborate argument to show that we had the right to do so as we did in 1882. It was not necessary, it seems to me, to have addressed that argument to this House. The country had received with approbation our course in 1882, and therefore, there was no necessity, I think, for that argument having been gone into. Who raised the point that we had no right? It was not the people of Canada; it was not the Parliament of Canada; it was Mr. Gladstone—Mr. Gladstone's Government. One hon. member stated—I do not know whether it was in the present debate or not—that it was merely a letter from the Colonial Secretary. It was much more than that. It was a solemn answer by Her Majesty's Government to the respectful and loyal Address the contents of which I have just spoken of;

and we were told that while any representations which were made concerning the interests of Canada would be listened to with great interest and respect, so far as regarded the subject of our Address in 1882 it was the exclusive province of Her Majesty's Government to deal with, and Her Majesty would only listen to her Imperial advisers. That statement was one that I do not at all concur in. But it was not the mere statement of Lord Kimberley, because if you look in the English *Hansard* you will find that, in answer to a question, Mr. Gladstone used language literally so nearly approaching the language of that despatch that it is quite clear he dictated the despatch and was personally responsible for it. He had then a different line of policy, and therefore he snubbed Canada for pursuing a course which to-day he will, perhaps, thank us for and be very grateful for. Mr. Speaker, the recurrence of subjects of this kind is greatly to be regretted. It is greatly to be regretted that we do not confine ourselves to matters which are strictly within our competence and within the interests of the people of Canada, and we should as seldom as possible stray away from that course into subjects so foreign or so far from being of direct interest, or direct subjects of consideration, for the Canadian Parliament. If we could suppose that this resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Centre Montreal (Mr. Curran), and pressed upon the consideration of this House with so much ability and so much moderation and courtesy, would do any good to the people of Ireland I would for one, strain a great point to go with it. But it can be of not the slightest service to the people of Ireland. It cannot have the slightest effect on the measure before the Parliament of England. We know that the second reading of that Bill—after the measure with all its details was before the people of England; we know it was discussed in the public press of England; we know it was of burning interest in England, Scotland and Ireland; we know that every possible argument was used in the press of one side and the other—and yet at the end of the discussion the second reading was carried by a majority of one hundred and one. So it is quite certain that this Bill—be it good or be it bad, be its results unfortunate or beneficial—is to become the law of that land and, therefore, if this resolution is introduced and voted for in this House with the idea that it will be of any benefit in amending that Bill, in obstructing its passage or preventing its being the law of that land, then you might go beyond our legitimate sphere and vote for it in the hope that it would be of service to Ireland. But that measure is going to be the law of the land in a few days; it will be passed by the House of Commons in a few days; afterwards it will be passed by the House of Lords, and I have no doubt the Royal Assent will be given almost immediately afterwards. So, then, it can be of no benefit to the people of Ireland in any way whatever. It cannot prevent the evils which have been so strongly pressed in England and Ireland and reiterated here. The people of Ireland will be under that law for good or for evil; it will be put in force for good or for evil, and our resolution will be of no benefit or advantage in relieving or alleviating any of the unfavorable or disastrous consequences which are prophesied to result from that Bill. But while it can be of no good to the people of Ireland, is it not of great mischief to the people of Canada that this subject of discord should be introduced here? We have people here of different opinions. We have people in Canada who are as strongly in favor of this Bill, as the majority in this House are as opposed to it. It is setting neighbor against neighbor in Canada; it is making this a matter of political difference, whereas we should be joined together, when we can be joined together, in developing this young country. We should all apply our minds, and, without respect to party, should endeavor to elevate our country, to promote its interests, and remove from it as far as we can every element of social, religious or

political discord. Let us agree to differ, when we do differ, conscientiously on the various subjects which affect Canada itself. Let us join together when we can agree upon what is best for the country, and when we differ let us do so conscientiously. Let us vote like men according to our consciences, and according to what we think is best for the interests of Canada. But let us endeavor as much as possible to keep out of the political arena, and keep ourselves free from questions which are calculated to arouse the hostile feeling of people who should otherwise be friendly. Let us try to reduce to a minimum the number of questions that are the cause of irritation and ill-feeling, socially and individually, as well as among classes, of our people in Canada. If I had been here, I would have voted for the amendment moved by my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I reiterate what I have already stated, that I believe it is perfectly within our competence to deal with this subject as far as to express our opinion. I believe we had a right to send the Address we did in 1882; I believe we had a right to reiterate our opinion in 1886; and I believe we have a right now to express our opinion on this question. But at the same time, seeing that it can produce no good results, that it cannot help Ireland or the Irish people in any way whatever, I believe, in the language of my hon. friend's resolution, that it is unwise and inexpedient that we should concern ourselves in a subject so purely a matter for Imperial consideration and legislation as the amendment to the criminal law so far as it relates to Ireland. Now, Sir, I wish to keep myself perfectly free and colorless as to an expression of opinion whether that Coercion Act is right or wrong. I quite agree with the amendment of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). We have not the Bill itself before us. Before this discussion took place in Parliament I had not even read the Bill, and I certainly have neither read nor seen nor considered the evidence on which that legislation is based; and I venture to say that the majority of the members of this House have not read either the debates arising on the measure or the arguments used by the Government in introducing it, or the papers and blue-books laid before Parliament, as the justification and the basis for it. We are not in a position to say whether that legislation is right or wrong, or whether the state of Ireland is such as to require it. There has been a great deal of confusion in this debate resulting from mixing up the question of Home Rule with the question of criminal legislation. The questions are quite different. I am strongly in favor of Home Rule, guarded as it was proposed to be by the resolution of 1882, and yet I cannot understand or believe that because the Imperial Parliament does not agree with me, or with the majority of the people of Ireland, on that subject, therefore there may not be such a state of lawlessness and outrage in Ireland as to call for and justify stringent criminal measures. Mr. Gladstone's Administration introduced and carried into law coercive measures more stringent than the present one, and more than that, enforced it, in the opinion of all Irishmen, in the most oppressive style. With regard to the measure now before Parliament, how can we know, unless we have applied our minds to the study of the whole evidence, and to the consideration of the actual state of Ireland, whether there has not been such an absence of all law and order as to require an increase in the stringency of the criminal law? I am not prepared, and I do not believe the majority of this House are prepared, to decide without full knowledge and cognisance of the facts, whether this coercive measure is right or wrong, whether it has been called for or not, or whether it is oppressively forced on the people of Ireland without any necessity for it. Therefore, Sir, while the introduction and discussion of this subject is not calculated to do Ireland any good, I say again—I cannot repeat it too often—that, in my opinion, it is disastrous to the best interests of the people of

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

Canada—it is disastrous to the good feeling that ought to exist among the people of Canada—to have this question thrown upon us. I draw a great distinction between Irishmen in Parliament, who, full of sentiment and feeling for their own country, are wrapped in the consideration of the wrongs of Ireland. I can quite understand and appreciate and justify the course of my hon. friend from Montreal, and of the gentlemen of Irish birth or Irish parentage who, thinking only of their country, are led away from the consideration of the fact that the expression of these views will not do their country any good. I can draw a great distinction between them and other members of this House who are pressing this subject, not because it is going to do any good to Ireland or to Canada, but because, for political reasons, it is going to split the people of Canada. Then, Sir, there is another consideration. I believe it is not only the duty, but it is the interest of the people of Canada and their representatives, to avoid all matters of difference between the Imperial Government and Canada. We are connected with England so closely, our interests are so interwoven, England can do so much for us, that it is of the very greatest importance that, unless any right of privilege of ours is infringed upon, we should avoid all difference of opinion between Canada and the Imperial Government, no matter what party may be in power in England. Thank God, of late years, and ever since I have had anything to do with colonial affairs, I have found it made very little difference to Canada whether the Liberal or the Conservative party was in power in England. I am proud to say that during my time at least—and I can look back at forty years of public life—England has always been kind and good to the people of Canada; that whenever we went to the foot of the Throne we found the Imperial Government and the representatives of the English people in the Imperial Parliament ready to meet us fairly, to give us their support and countenance, and ready to aid us in many and most of the schemes and enterprises that have been undertaken by Canada for her own development; and even when we did not receive all the assistance we asked for—and sometimes we asked for a good deal more than we expected to get—during the whole of that long period, never has there been a single step taken by Her Majesty's Government or the people of England as represented in the Imperial Parliament, which affected or impaired a single right or privilege of the people of Canada, either as colonists, as British subjects or as free men. Therefore, it is of the very greatest importance that we should avoid, as much as possible, coming into collision, whether the Government be Liberal, extreme Tory or Conservative—my good friend opposite from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) drew a distinction between the Conservative and the Tory party—with the Home Government. We have got one burning question, the fishery question, upon which the interests of Canada—I merely quote this as an instance—are greatly interested. It is a matter in which a powerful nation close to us is taking a course antagonistic to what we consider not only our interests, but our rights. Her Majesty's Government is giving us that support which we have the right to expect; Her Majesty's Government believes that Canada has certain rights, and that Canada has acted rightly within the law and within the bonds of the treaty with the United States in asserting those rights. It is of some little importance, therefore, that we who are looking for this support from Her Majesty's Government, that we who are expecting to get, in the course of the negotiations now going on, a continuance of that support—it is important that we should not, with the imperfect evidence before us, with the want of evidence, and when it can do no good to the people we desire to serve, snub the Government, if I may use that expression. It is important we should not cast into the teeth of the Government whose support we are asking that

they are altogether wrong, that they are acting oppressively, that they are crushing a portion of Her Majesty's subjects and a great portion of the Empire in the Kingdom of Ireland. I would not hesitate, notwithstanding it might injure or prejudice our Canadian interests, to risk injuring or prejudice those interests, if we were called upon to do so with the hope and expectation and belief that our course would be beneficial to Ireland; but, as I have already, perhaps *ad nauseum* stated, it cannot be benefited, and therefore, without any evidence whatever, or with evidence so imperfect that it amounts to no evidence, we are actually quarrelling with Her Majesty's Government, as it were, and injuring ourselves without doing good to anybody else. Before sitting down, I would say, in consequence of a remark from my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) who drew a distinction between Conservatives and Tories, that whether the party was Conservative or Tory—and I think Conservative and Tory mean pretty much the same thing—I would say to that hon. gentleman that he quite misunderstood the line of argument followed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). My hon. friend stated that because a measure might be adopted by force or by fraud it did not at all follow that that measure was not good in itself and might not produce beneficial results, and he quoted the instance of the Union between Upper and Lower Canada in 1841. That measure was passed without the consent of the people of Lower Canada, and everybody knew that the whole population, or at least the vast majority of Lower Canada, was against the Union. In Upper Canada it was equally unpopular. The hon. gentleman says that the Bill was opposed in Lower Canada because its provisions were unfair and because of the special unfairness in the distribution of representation. Sir, it was most fortunate for the Province of Lower Canada that the provision in that Act, to which they so much objected, was in the Act, and that was that the representation in each Province in the united Parliament should be equal. Then the Province of Lower Canada had a larger population than Upper Canada. No doubt there was, in the first place, opposition against the whole Bill. The majority of Lower Canada was against any union on any terms with the Province of Upper Canada, and they specially objected to the clause providing that the representation of each Province should be equal. But that has been the salvation of Lower Canada. In the course of a few years the population of Upper Canada equalled that of Lower Canada. This was all right, the representation was as it ought to be, but, by-and-bye, the Province of Upper Canada gained on the sister Province; by-and-bye her population became largely in excess of that in Lower Canada, and then the whole Liberal party of Upper Canada, as one man, joined to insist that there should be a majority of representatives from Lower Canada, and the object of that pressure was avowed. It was not secret, it was not hidden. The great leader of the Liberal party of that day, the Hon. George Brown, announced that they insisted upon having a majority of representatives in the united Parliament, because they had a majority of the population, and they declared that it was for the purpose of making French Canada English; for the purpose of forcing English institutions upon their French fellow-subjects; for the purpose of pressing Protestantism upon the people of Upper Canada; for the purpose of doing away with the use of the French language, as the official state language of that part of the country. The whole aim, and end, and object of the whole of the Liberal party, headed by the Hon. George Brown, was to crush out the institutions, the language and the religion of the people of Lower Canada. The people of Lower Canada were protected from this great wrong, this great outrage. Who were they protected by? By the Tories of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken so unfavorably. Why, I, as the exponent of the Conservative Tory minority in Upper

Canada, stood in the breach. Year after year we opposed the wishes of the majority of the people of Canada. We said, no, we will not do so; we accepted with every complacency the Constitution of 1841, when we were inferior in population. We had then an equality in representation, now that we are in a majority we must deal the same mode of justice, we must follow the same system that we claimed for ourselves, and obtained for ourselves, when we were in a minority. Year after year I was cried down, year after year we were in a minority, year after year were we insulted by being called slaves to French domination, year after year we were said to be priest-ridden and yielding to the pressure of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and, therefore, I think the hon. gentleman ought to feel a little more grateful on the part of his countrymen, when he looks back historically and finds that if representation by population was not carried, if there was not a majority of men of the Liberal party in the Parliament of old Canada, sworn as it were, to crush them out in all that they held dear, it was due altogether to the Conservative majority led by the humble individual who now addresses you. This, however, is perhaps an aside, but I thought it right I should speak to this subject as it was introduced by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault). Now, I have read with interest the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I must say that it meets my views exactly. I will vote for it with great pleasure. The resolution is:

That this House learns with regret that it is considered necessary to pass a Coercive Bill for Ireland.

It does not state whether that consideration is right or wrong, but it states, what we must all regret, that it is considered necessary to pass a coercive measure for Ireland. Would to God there was no necessity for such legislation, if there be any necessity for any such legislation. Would to God that Ireland, England and Scotland could be governed by the same law, civil and criminal. We can all express our regret that it is considered necessary by Her Majesty's Government in England to pass a coercive measure for Ireland. Then it goes on:

And it reaffirms its conviction, as expressed in the resolutions of 1882 and 1886, that a plan of local government for Ireland which would leave unimpaired the links connecting Ireland with the British Empire and guard the rights of the minority, would be conducive to the prosperity and stability of the Empire.

That is a repetition of motions which I voted for with much pleasure in 1882 and 1886, and I should hope that this House will adopt this amendment. If, however, it is lost, I shall, for the reasons given by the mover, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) vote for his amendment; and for the reasons I have given now I shall certainly vote against the resolution of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran.)

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say a few words on the subject of this resolution which has now been proposed for the consideration of this House, and in reply to the very extraordinary speech addressed to the House by the leader of the Government. It will, I am sure, seem very extraordinary to many members of the House who remember the motion which was introduced here in 1882 and the motion which was introduced here in 1886, when they remember the course which the leader of the Government took upon both those motions, to listen to the extraordinary speech the hon. gentleman addressed to the House a few moments ago. In 1882 the hon. gentleman boasted that the resolution of the hon. member who is now Minister of Inland Revenue could not have been carried in the House without his support. He sought to impress upon the friends of Home Rule everywhere throughout the country that he was the friend of Home Rule, and that he had given it his cordial support on that occasion; and last year the hon. gentleman supported a resolution on the

same subject in this House. If the hon. gentleman believed that we could do no possible good by voting for such a motion as that which has been submitted by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, why did not the hon. gentleman express in 1882 the sentiments which he has addressed to the House to-night? The hon. gentleman tells us that this is a measure of discord thrown in amongst the population of this country. Did the hon. gentleman not know what the views of the people of Canada, those who settled in this country from the North of Ireland, were in 1882 as well as he knows them to-day? What new light has the hon. gentleman received upon this question which has induced him at the present time to declare to the House and to the country that a motion recommending Home Rule for the people of Ireland will do serious damage to the interests of the people of this country? If the hon. gentleman was sincere in 1882, I must say that the position he has taken to-night was a most extraordinary one. But we know what the hon. gentleman's sentiments were. We know that when the measure of Confederation was carried, he declared that he was in favor of legislative union.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has forgotten what he said; I remember it. The House will see that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the principle of a federal union, that he was opposed to a principle of provincial autonomy and local self government. These were the sentiments of the hon. gentleman; but, before the elections of 1882 and the elections of 1887, they were not prudent sentiments to give expression to in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that the elections are now over, and, having no confidence in the breed, it is easy to assume a position of independence and to give expression to that feeling of hostility which it is well known he has long entertained. The hon. gentleman says now that Mr. Gladstone has declared that this is none of our business. We know that Mr. Gladstone or his Government declared that, and I admit that Mr. Gladstone was responsible for the views communicated in Lord Kimberley's despatch. But that was known before the hon. gentleman supported a motion in favor of Home Rule last year. Why did he not at that time put forward the views which he has put forth to-night? He had the information last year as well as he has it to-night. What new light has the hon. gentleman received since then? Has Lord Salisbury communicated to the hon. gentleman his strong disapprobation of any measure of Home Rule, and is the hon. gentleman too much devoted to the Tory party in England and to their policy of coercion to permit this House to express any view hostile to that policy? He says that this measure which has been introduced by Mr. Balfour is one relating to the administration of the criminal law, and why should we express any view upon it? Why did the hon. gentleman express an opinion in 1882 in reference to the Kilmainham imprisonment? Where is the difference? Was not that a particular case under the criminal law? Was not that a case of the confinement of men upon the evidence of which he had no means of forming an opinion? And yet, knowing the drift of public opinion, knowing that the opinion of this country was in favor of conceding to the Irish self-government, and knowing well, as he does, that the disorder grew out of the want of Home Rule, he was prepared to recommend the release of those parties, as well as a measure of Home Rule, on that occasion. If the measure of Home Rule were conceded to the people of Ireland, if justice were done them, if the Government would concede to them what has been obtained by the people of Canada and has produced content out of disorder here, then this measure of coercion, this new law procedure, would have been altogether unnecessary, and it is because of the absence of Home Rule in Ireland

Mr. MILLS.

that a measure of coercion has been found necessary. It is not necessary for us to consider whether the Irish people have been guilty of criminal conduct or not. We know well the origin of the misconduct, if there has been misconduct. We know that it originated in the maladministration of the Government. We know that maladministration will continue until the people of Ireland control their own affairs, and remove the cause of this bitterness, the cause of this misconduct, and then a measure of coercion will be altogether unnecessary. Now, I am opposed, I need not say, to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). That purports to be an amendment in favor of Home Rule. I would like to know what member here can be deluded into such a view after the speech of the leader of the Government. Was that a Home Rule speech? Was it in favor of the principle of conceding Home Rule to Ireland? Was it in favor of the interference on the part of this House in that direction? Not at all. The hon. gentleman knows that that measure if carried, will be quoted by the enemies of Home Rule as an evidence of the hostile sentiments of the people of Canada, and of their representatives in our Parliament, and therefore he can safely support such a proposition. There is no danger of offending Lord Salisbury or his Government. It is only necessary to examine that amendment to see that it admits in the first place, that coercion is necessary. We deny that proposition. In the next place it proposes that if Home Rule is granted, it shall be a minimum of Home Rule, not what the people of Ireland desire, but what the enemies of Ireland are ready to concede. Then it misrepresents the public opinion of this country by intimating that all these restrictions that Mr. Chamberlain and the Liberal dissentients in England have put forward are reasonable objections and ought to be considered before a measure of Home Rule is agreed to. In the last place, it ignores the friends and supporters of the principle of Home Rule altogether. To whom is it proposed to send this resolution? Why, to Lord Salisbury, to the man who declared that a measure of "Thorough" was necessary in the government of Ireland, that the people of Ireland ought to be arbitrarily governed for twenty years, and then, perhaps, they might be so disciplined under such a measure as that they might be entrusted with a larger share of self-government than they have had hitherto. There is no proposition to send this measure to Mr. Gladstone or to Mr. Parnell.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister for England when we voted on the subject last year, and the hon. gentleman proposed to send it to Lord Salisbury as well as Mr. Gladstone. Now, Mr. Gladstone is leading the Opposition. Mr. Gladstone, it is well known, is an ardent advocate of the principle of Home Rule, and it is proposed to send it to the enemy of Home Rule and not to its friend. Why, Sir, if this proposition was favorable to the principle of Home Rule, the hon. gentleman would not attempt to offend Lord Salisbury by sending him a resolution of this sort. It is because he knows it may be quoted by those who are enemies of Home Rule that he has made the proposition which he has done. I dare say that the hon. gentleman was familiar with this resolution before he read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What resolution?

Mr. MILLS. The resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that he is much mistaken. I saw it first when I got it from the Speaker's hand.

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, it seems exactly in accord with the sentiments the hon. gentleman has expressed to-night. The hon. member for West Assiniboia is to be congratulated.

on the accuracy with which he has interpreted the sentiments of the First Minister. The hon. gentleman must be a kind of clairvoyant; he must have measured the intellectual and political capacities of the hon. gentleman, and prepared a resolution that is in exact accord with his views. Well, we know precisely what this resolution means. When we had a measure of a similar character presented to us last year, we had some difficulty in understanding it. The hon. gentleman declared that it meant Home Rule. Well, Sir, the commentary with which this amendment is accompanied in the speech of the hon. gentleman, will not permit any hon. member on this side of the House to fall into a mistake in regard to the matter.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davin (p. 126) to the amendment of Mr. McNeill (p. 55):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Baird,	McCarthy,	Ross,
Bowell,	McCulla,	Rykert,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),	Scarth,
Brown,	McDougald (Pictou),	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Digby),	McKay,	Small,
Cargill,	McKeen,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Carling,	McLelan,	Smith (Ontario),
Carpenter,	McNeill,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Madill,	Taylor,
Daly,	Mara,	Tisdale,
Davin,	Marshall,	Tupper (Pictou),
Davis,	Masson,	Tyrwhitt,
Denison,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wallace,
Foster,	Montague,	Ward,
Gordon,	O'Brien,	White (Cardwell),
Haggart,	Perley (Assiniboia),	White (Renfrew),
Hesson,	Pope,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Hickey,	Porter,	Wilson (Lennox),
Jamieson,	Reid,	Wood (Brockville), and
Macdonald (Sir John),	Robertson (Hastings),	Wood (Westm'l'd.—60.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Armstrong,	Edgar,	McMullen,
Audet,	Eisenhauer,	Mallory,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ellis,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Baker,	Fiset,	Moncreiff,
Barron,	Flynn,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Freeman,	Mulock,
Bergeron,	Gaudet,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergin,	Gauthier,	Patterson (Essex),
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Perley (Ottawa),
Blake,	Gigault,	Perry,
Borden,	Gilmor,	Parcell,
Bourassa,	Girouard,	Putnam,
Bowman,	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Guay,	Robertson (King's, P. E. I.)
Burdett,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burns,	Guillet,	Robillard,
Cameron,	Hale,	Roome,
Campbell (Kent),	Holton,	Royal,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Ste. Marie,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Ives,	Scriven,
Cartwright (Sir Richd),	Joncas,	Semple,
Casey,	Jones,	Shanly,
Casgrain,	Kenny,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Kirk,	Somerville,
Charlton,	Labelle,	Stevenson,
Choquette,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Cimon,	Landerkin,	Thérien,
Clayes,	Landry,	Thompson,
Cook,	Lang,	Trow,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Turcot,
Coughlin,	Laurier,	Vanasse,
Coulombe,	Lavergne,	Waldie,
Coursol,	Lister,	Watson,
Couture,	Livingston,	Welsh,
Curran,	Lovitt,	Wilmot,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Desjardins,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Wright, and
Dessaint,	McGreevy,	Yeo.—128.
Doyon,	McIntyre,	
Duchesnay,	McMillan (Huron),	

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

18

House divided on amendment of Mr. McNeill (p. 55).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Baird,	Landry,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Scarth,
Boyle,	McCarthy,	Shakespeare,
Brown,	McCulla,	Small,
Cargill,	McDougald (Pictou),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Carling,	McKay,	Sproule,
Carpenter,	McLelan,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	McNeill,	Tisdale,
Daly,	Mara,	Tupper (Pictou),
Davin,	Marshall,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Masson,	Wallace,
Dawson,	Mills (Annapolis),	Ward,
Denison,	Montague,	White (Cardwell),
Foster,	O'Brien,	White (Renfrew),
Gordon,	Perley (Assiniboia),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Haggart,	Pope,	Wilson (Lennox),
Hesson,	Reid,	Wood (Brockville), and
Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),	Wood (Westm'l'd.—56.
Jamieson,	Ross,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Edgar,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	Madill,
Audet,	Ellis,	Mallory,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Mitchell,
Baker,	Flynn,	Moncreiff,
Barron,	Freeman,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Gaudet,	Mulock,
Bergeron,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergin,	Geoffrion,	Patterson (Essex),
Bernier,	Gigault,	Perley (Ottawa),
Blake,	Gilmor,	Perry,
Borden,	Girouard,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Porter,
Bowman,	Grandbois,	Purcell,
Brien,	Guay,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Guilbault,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hale,	Robertson (King's, P. E. I.)
Cameron,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Digby),	Innes,	Robillard,
Campbell (Kent),	Ives,	Roome,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Joncas,	Royal,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Kenny,	Scriven,
Casey,	Kirk,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Labelle,	Shanly,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Skinner,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Smith (Ontario),
Choquette,	Lang,	Somerville,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Stevenson,
Clayes,	Laurier,	Temple,
Cook,	Lavergne,	Thérien,
Costigan,	Lister,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Livingston,	Trow,
Coulombe,	Lovitt,	Turcot,
Coursol,	Macdonald (Huron),	Vanasse,
Couture,	McDonald (Victoria),	Waldie,
Curran,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McGreevy,	Welsh,
Desjardins,	McIntyre,	Wilmot,
Dessaint,	McKeen,	Wilson (Elgin),
Doyon,	McMillan (Huron),	Wright, and
Duchesnay,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Yeo.—133.
Dupont,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CURRAN. With the permission of the House I desire to alter two or three words in my motion, to make verbal changes.

Mr. SPEAKER. By the unanimous consent of the House the hon. gentleman may make those alterations.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not rise to make any objections to the alterations mentioned by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, but I rise for the purpose of making a personal explanation in answer to the charge made across the floor of the House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Certainly I am not going to inflict upon the House a defence of all my statements, or an answer to the arguments advanced in reply to those which I ventured to use

the other night; but when an hon. member charges me across the floor of the House, as I understand him to do, with wilfully misstating the law, I think it is due to myself, certainly due to the House, that I should answer a charge of that kind. Now, if I misstated the law, I have got the authority of the Consolidated Statutes for my misstatement; for in the Statutes consolidated under the Act prepared by the hon. member for West Durham, I find that the offence is triable before two magistrates, just as I said. But I am inclined to think, upon further investigation, that it is not a correct consolidation; nevertheless, it is the authority upon which I made the statement. The clause in the Consolidated Act is, that for these offences the party shall:

"On summary conviction before two justices of the peace, or on indictment, be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$100, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor."

That is the way it is consolidated. On looking back at the Act itself, I find that it refers to two other Statutes. It refers to an Act passed in 1872, to an amendment to that Statute passed in 1876. On reading these two Acts together—which I had not done, assuming that the consolidation was correct—I find that the earlier Act which permitted a trial before two magistrates, was repealed by a later Act, and gave the party the option or privilege of refusing to be tried before two magistrates. That was the change that was made. However, I think that statement is due to the hon. member for West Durham, but it does not at all affect my argument. My argument was this: That we in this Parliament permitted two magistrates to try and imprison without trial by jury. It was incorrect to say that the hon. member for West Durham was the author of this legislation; but in 1872, and from that to 1875, that was the law of this land—that two magistrates, for offences of violence, could try without a jury, without the party having an opportunity to elect to be tried by a jury, for offences similar to those which by the so-called Coercion Act in England, are to be tried by two magistrates, the difference being in the length of the term of punishment. That statement, I think, I ought to make, and that is all I propose to say in answer to what has been said in reply to my remarks the other day. I do not at all propose to follow the different charges made against myself. The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Claves), spoke of me as being the leader of the Orange faction in the House, I think, and being an Orangeman, or something of that kind; the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) spoke of me as desiring to oppress minorities. What my opinions are in reference to those charges I do not suppose the House would care to listen to at this hour, but some other opportunity may be afforded for me to explain and to justify what I have said.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that his argument was not at all affected by the correction made by the hon. member for Bothwell, and in some sort restated by himself; but his argument was an *argumentum ad hominem*—

Mr. McCARTHY. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. Specially directed to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. It was an indictment against me quite proper to be urged in respect to the impropriety of this Coercion Bill, inasmuch as I have been the author of a Coercion Bill in the Canadian Parliament. That was the position which the hon. gentleman took. To-night he has to admit that the Coercion Bill which, he says, did not affect his argument, was somebody else's act. It is quite true; it was the act of his leader. It was quite true that what the First Minister did in the laws with reference to certain acts of violence, provided that they should be tried before two justices. That was the state of things in 1872 under the

Conservative Administration of that day. In the year 1876, when I was called upon to deal with the question, I altered that, and I caused to cease to exist the Canadian coercion law which the hon. gentleman—

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will excuse me for one moment. Will the hon. gentleman say what he did in 1875? I think he was then in the Administration.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not.

Mr. McCARTHY. At all events his party was, and the law of 1872 was amended in 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know at this moment what was done in 1875, I was not in the Administration. I am now speaking of what I did. I say that in 1876 I altered the law thus:

"Where a person is brought before a functionary or tribunal named in the second section of the said Act of the 35th year of Her Majesty's reign, cap 31, in respect to any offence under the provisions of the first section of the said Act as amended by the second section of this Act, the accused may on appearing before such functionary or tribunal declare that he objects to being tried for such offence by such functionary or tribunal, and thereupon such functionary or tribunal shall not proceed with such trial, but may deal with the case in all respects as if the accused were charged with an indictable offence and not with an offence punishable on summary conviction, and the accused may be prosecuted on indictment accordingly; and this section shall be read as part of the said Act."

So that I restored to those who were chargeable under the Act of 1872 their right, their absolute right to be tried by jury, leaving them the option of being tried summarily before two magistrates, if they did not object to that method of trial. Then in the Act of 1877 to which the hon. gentleman alluded, I made that provision under the Act in the form which I have just read—that the clause which I have just read should apply so that when that was made—I will not say it was made a part of the criminal law, for it was a part of the criminal law at that time—but when the new provision was made and that particular class remained under the criminal law, while the breach of contract was taken out of the category of criminal offences, I gave expressly to the subjects charged with the first named offences the right of trial by jury. So the argument *ad hominem* of the hon. gentleman was altogether wrong. I am very sorry that the application of the Revised and Consolidated Statutes should be productive of such painful results on this occasion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I may be allowed to say, that while I applied my argument, as I did very distinctly, to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that was not the argument, but it was the application. The hon. gentleman has reiterated the statement in defiance of my denial. My statement was this: I said, were we the parties to be finding fault with Her Majesty's Government for passing a law of this kind when we passed the law to which I refer; and, I added, least of all did that come with good grace from the hon. member for West Durham. That was the way I put it.

Mr. GIGAULT. I know I am far from possessing the knowledge, the intelligence and eloquence of the right hon. leader of this House, and that many people will consider it as boldness on my part to rise to answer some of the assertions made by him in reply to what I said this afternoon. But however feebly I may do so, I will endeavor to defend my convictions as well as I am able. He said that I was wrong when I criticised the Act of Union, because it did not give to the inhabitants of Lower Canada fair representation. I did not attack the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on that account only. As illustrating the Tory proclivity of that hon. member, I quoted his speech at Barrie. I said also that he was the chief promoter of the Imperial Federation scheme, and these facts I produced as proof of his Tory proclivities. The right hon. leader says, and says rightly, that he defended

the French Canadians in bygone years, and that he opposed representation based upon population. I praise him for having done so; but when the Act of Union was proposed and adopted, I am of opinion it was proposed with a view of annihilating the French race in Quebec as a party. In a speech made by Mr. Hume on 3rd June, 1839, in the English House of Commons, when the Act of Union was discussed, he said:

"I have no objection to the resolution, but I do object to any principle of representation not founded upon the basis of population, and which was proposed with the view of giving the British population a preponderating influence. I cannot but regret to see a people so amiable as the French Canadians treated with so little justice or consideration."

So if I found the clauses of the Act of Union arbitrary with respect of the representation granted to the inhabitants of Lower Canada, I not only expressed my opinion but also that of Mr. Hume. There is another opinion similar to that expressed by Mr. Hume, and it is that of Mr. O'Connell, who, in the course of his speech in the English House of Commons, used the following language:—

"The avowed intention of the Act is nothing less than the annihilation of the French Canadians as a party, who have already been treated shamefully by the British Government. I enter my most solemn protest. There can be no real union of the Canadas unless the French Canadians are put upon a footing of exact equality with the other inhabitants. If we do not make the proposed union in that way, there are examples to show that the passing of a mere Act of Union is no corrective to long-existing evils."

If I understood rightly the right hon. leader of the Government, he said there was no difference between a Conservative and a Tory; that he was satisfied with the policy that was followed in 1841 and 1845, and that he approved it. In 1848, Sir George Cartier, Lafontaine and Baldwin were fighting the right hon. leader of the present House on account of his Tory proclivities, and because the policy pursued by the party of which he was one of the leading men was not friendly to Lower Canada. I am more inclined to think that Sir George E. Cartier, Lafontaine and Baldwin were right rather than the leader of the present Government. If I say so it is not because I think that the right hon. leader has not a brilliant past; but I believed that he had changed his principles after 1848 when he made an alliance with Sir George E. Cartier. Sir George E. Cartier and the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec never called themselves Tories. The position taken by the member for North Simcoe during the last two electoral campaigns, the crusade which the *Mail* undertook against the French race and its institutions, call for some explanations; and if I raise this question here, it is in order to ascertain if the leader of the present Conservative party approves of the position and principles which are advocated by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and by the *Mail* and its editors. I want to know if the present Conservatives of Ontario are going to adopt the same Tory policy which was followed in 1837, 1841, and 1848, and if that same Tory policy, inimical to minorities, is going to be followed to-day. It is time, I think, that we should know. If there is no difference between a Conservative and a Tory, is there any difference between the policy of the Premier and that of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)? He said that George Brown had tried to make Lower Canada English. He was right in saying so, but is not his declaration with respect to George Brown a condemnation of the attitude taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when he said in his speech at Barrie that the French Canadians were a danger to the confederacy as long as they remained French? This speech means that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) wishes to continue what George Brown wanted to do—that is, to make Lower Canada English, to make her renounce her institutions. What I want to know is if the principles of the present Conservatives of Ontario are the same as those

which guided the Tories of 1837. In the discussion on the Act of Union, the Earl of Gosford, who had been Governor of Canada in 1837, expressed the following opinion with respect to the Canadian Tory party:—

"I am aware, my Lords, of the existence of great alarm in Canada, which, indeed, does not surprise me, arising as it must do, so far as the French Canadians are concerned, from the apprehensions of a violent ultra-Tory British party, whose object is to monopolise as much as possible all the power and patronage of the colony, and to assume the ascendancy over all who do not participate in their arbitrary views. The whole conduct of this party, and the violence of the language made use of by many of those who belong to it, are quite enough to exasperate the French population and produce amongst them the alarm I have alluded to."

The Earl of Gosford says that the language used by the then Tory party was sufficient to create alarm among the French Canadians, and I think to-day that the attitude taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and by the *Mail* is sufficient to create alarm amongst us. We must know what are the principles of those men and whether the members of the present Cabinet condemn their attitude and the policy which they are following.

Mr. MILLS. Before the motion is put, I wish to say a word in reply to the observations made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He seemed to think that I did him an injustice in presuming that he was acquainted with the contents of the measure proposed by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I said you purposely charged me with misstating the law.

Mr. MILLS. I will read the precise words of the hon. gentleman, and he will see that he not only misstated the law, but that he also gave an erroneous reason for what he did at the time the law was proposed. After stating that the hon. member for West Durham was the author of this particular provision, the hon. gentleman says:

"But that is not the worst feature. Why, they were to be tried summarily—not by a court and jury. The great right of trial by jury was ignored by the hon. gentleman, and the trial was to take place before two magistrates who had power to send the accused to prison. That was the way we acted in circumstances of that kind."

The hon. gentleman then goes on:

"I voted against that measure, and I believe those associated on the Opposition side of the House with me almost unanimously voted against it. We did not so vote on the ground that we had not the power to pass legislation of that kind, but we denied that there was any occasion for so stringent amendment to the law."

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. He says this was part of the measure proposed by the hon. member for West Durham, and that he was so shocked at the time the measure was proposed that he opposed it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, so far from having opposed the measure on that ground, opposed it, notwithstanding the existence of any such ground. There is no such ground in the law; that could not have been the reason for his opposition, and the hon. gentleman, relying on his imagination in the one case, has relied on it in the other. What am I to suppose with regard to the position of the hon. gentleman? His explanation, I think, quite justifies me in the observations which I made. The hon. gentleman said I was not acquainted with the actual provisions of the law which my hon. friend proposed in 1877. He was misled in looking at the Revised Statutes. I accept his statement, for I do not think he would seek to mislead the House in the matter, but it shows that he should be more particular about ascertaining the facts before making so positive an assertion as the one he made a few evenings ago. I now wish to call the attention of the First Minister to what he did say in 1865, and I think he will find that I

did not misstate the views which he at that time entertained. He said :

"I have again and again stated in the House that, if practicable, I thought a legislative union would be preferable. I have always contended that if we could agree to have one Government and one Parliament, legislating for the whole of these peoples, it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous and the strongest system of government we could adopt."

So the hon. gentleman is of opinion that legislative union would be preferable to a federal union, that it is better that the community should be governed by a single Parliament controlled by a single Executive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this point up, because I have heard it stated before that, to use the language of the hon. gentleman, I hated and was opposed to a Federal Government and favored legislative union. I think the words were that I hated it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. The hon. gentleman read the first part of what I said, but he did not read the whole of it. I have the report of my remarks before me, and I will read from it :

"The third and only means of solution for our difficulties was the junction of the Provinces either in a federal or a legislative union. Now as regards the comparative advantages of a legislative and a federal union, I never hesitated to state my own opinions. I have again and again stated in the House that, if practicable, I thought a legislative union would be preferable. I have always contended that if we could agree to have one Government and one Parliament, legislating for the whole of these people it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous, and the strongest system of government we could adopt.

The hon. gentleman read that part.

"But on looking at the subject in the conference, and discussing the matter as we did, most unreservedly, and with a desire to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, we found that such a system was impracticable. In the first place—

And I would call the attention of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) to the reason why I gave up my opinion in favor of a legislative union and took up and adopted federal union heartily and unreservedly.

"In the first place it would not meet the assent of the people of Lower Canada, because they felt that in their peculiar position—being in a minority, with a different language, nationality and religion from the majority—in case of a junction with the other Provinces, their institutions and their laws might be assailed, and their ancestral associations, on which they prided themselves, attacked and prejudiced; it was found that any proposition which involved the absorption of the individuality of Lower Canada—if I may use the expression—would not be received with favor by her people. We found, too, that though their people speak the same language and enjoy the same system of law as the people of Upper Canada, a system founded on the common law of England, there was as great a disinclination on the part of the various Maritime Provinces to lose their individuality, as separate political organisations, as we observed in the case of Lower Canada herself. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, we were forced to the conclusion that we must either abandon the idea of union altogether, or devise a system of union in which the separate provincial organisations would be in some degree preserved. So that those who were, like myself, in favor of a legislative union, were obliged to modify their views and accept the project of a federal union as the only scheme practicable, even for the Maritime Provinces. Because, although the law of those Provinces is founded on the common-law of England, yet every one of them has a large amount of law of its own—colonial law framed by itself, and affecting every relation of life, such as the laws of property, municipal and assessment laws; laws relating to the liberty of the subject, and to all the great interests contemplated in legislation; we found, in short, that the statutory law of the different Provinces was so varied and diversified that it was almost impossible to weld them into a legislative union at once. Why, Sir, if you only consider the innumerable subjects of legislation peculiar to new countries, and that every one of those five colonies had particular laws of its own, to which its people have been accustomed and are attached, you will see the difficulty of effecting and working a legislative union, and bringing about an assimilation of the local as well as general laws of the whole of the Provinces. (Hear, hear.) We in Upper Canada understand from the nature and operation of our peculiar municipal laws, of which we know the value, the difficulty of framing a general system of legislation on local matters which would meet the wishes and fulfil the requirements of the several Provinces. Even the laws considered the least important, respecting private rights in timber, roads, fencing, and innumerable other matters, small in themselves, but in the aggregate of great interest to the agricultural class, who form the great body

Mr. MILLS.

of the people, are regarded as of great value by the portion of the community affected by them. And when we consider that every one of the colonies has a body of law of this kind, and that it will take years before those laws can be assimilated, it was felt that at first, at all events, any united legislation would be almost impossible. I am happy to state—and indeed it appears on the face of the resolutions themselves—that as regards the Lower Provinces, a great desire was evinced for the final assimilation of our laws."

So that the hon. gentleman ought to have read the whole of what I have read, instead of quoting the first part and not the latter part, in which I stated that I had unreservedly abandoned my opinion because it was impossible, if we were going to have any union at all, to have a legislative union, and we could only have a federal union.

Mr. CASEY. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the father of Confederation—the right hon. gentleman who has been exhibited throughout the Dominion from one end to the other as the originator and proposer of Confederation, out of whose brain sprung the whole scheme, to whom principally, if not alone, is owing the existence and success of Confederation, and to-night he quotes his own words, and says he is sorry that the member for Bothwell did not read them before.

Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. The remarks of the hon. gentleman have not the slightest reference to the debate in hand.

Mr. CASEY. I contend that my remarks have as much to do with it as the hon. gentleman's reply, and I say the question of whether the hon. gentleman was originally in favor of legislative or a federative union is as much in order when discussed by me as when discussed by himself. I have just been trying to show that he was in the conference, as he stated himself, in favor of legislative union, and was obliged to modify his views.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has failed to convince me that what he was arguing was really on the question. He might argue that some others have been out of order, but it seems to me that it was the general wish of the House to hear the explanations which have been given, so that I did not choose to interfere. But the moment the House complains that the discussion is away from the question I must interfere.

Mr. BURNS. As it appears it would not be in order for the hon. member for Montreal Centre to change the wording of the resolution, I beg now, at his request, to move as an amendment, what would be his resolution if changed in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Essex.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is not the slightest objection to accepting the resolution if it can be done without the necessity of the hon. gentleman moving the amendment. I understand that that cannot be done, and there is no objection to this being substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that the mover cannot amend his own motion, but, as I find it was often done at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker Brand, the original motion may be withdrawn, and then, with the unanimous consent of the House, it can be presented in a new form.

Mr. BLAKE. Let the hon. member for Montreal Centre withdraw the resolution and then present it in the new form. Then he will have his own motion in his own hands.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. CURRAN moved :

That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland; and

That in the year 1886, by Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that such a measure of Home Rule would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and

That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Bill enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and earnestly hopes that a measure so subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland may not become law.

That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland a substantial measure of Home Rule which, whilst satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.

That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this Her Jubilee year, and, if possible, render Her Majesty more dear to the hearts of Her already devoted and loyal subjects.

That the present Resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and Charles Stuart Parnell, M.P.

House divided on motion of Mr. Curran :

YEAS :

Massieurs

Amyot,	Eisenhauer,	Madill,
Armstrong,	Ellis	Mallory,
Audet,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Annapolis),
Bain (Soulanges),	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Freeman,	Moncreiff,
Béchar, d,	Gaudet,	Montague,
Bergeron,	Gauthier,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Essex),
Borden,	Girouard,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Perry,
Bowman,	Grandbois,	Plat,
Brien,	Guay,	Porter,
Bryson,	Guilbault,	Purcell,
Burdett,	Guillet,	Putnam,
Burns,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Cameron,	Holton,	Riopel,
Campbell (Digby),	Innes,	Robertson (Hastings),
Campbell (Kent),	Ives,	Robertson (King's, P E I)
Campbell (Renfrew),	Joncas,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jones,	Robillard,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Kenny,	Roome,
Casey,	Kirk,	Royal,
Casgrain,	Labelle,	Ste. Marie,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Scrifer,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Choquette,	Lang,	Skinner,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Ontario),
Cook,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Costigan,	Lavergne,	Stevenson,
Coughlin,	Lister,	Temple,
Coulombe,	Livingston,	Thérien,
Coursol,	Lovitt,	Thompson,
Couture,	Macdonald (Huron),	Trow,
Curran,	McCulla,	Turot,
Davin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Vanasse,
De St. Georges,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Waldie,
Desjardins,	McGreavy,	Watson,
Dessaint,	McIntyre,	Welsh,
Doyon,	McKeen,	Wilmot,
Duchesnay,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright, and
Edgar,	McMullen,	Yeo.—135.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Baker,	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Bowell,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Small,
Borle,	McCarthy,	Sproule,
Brown,	McDougald (Picou),	Taylor,
Cargill,	McKay,	Tisdale,
Carling,	McLelan,	Tupper (Picou),
Carpenter,	McNeill,	Tyrwhitt,
Cockburn,	Mara,	Wallace,
Daly,	Marshall,	Ward,
Davis,	Masson,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	O'Brien,	White (Renfrew),
Denison,	Reid,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Foster,	Ross,	Wilson (Lennox),
Haggart,	Rykert,	Wood (Brockville), and
Hesson,	Scarth,	Wood (Westmol'd).—47
Hickey,	Shakespeare,	

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TROW. I noticed the hon. member for Russell did not vote.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not vote for the reason I have already given, I have paired. Had I the opportunity I would have voted for the resolution.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to know when we will get those fishery papers. It is about time we had them.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot add anything to what I stated this afternoon. All despatch is being used, and they will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it possible the hon. gentleman has made no enquiry as to how long it will take to bring them down? On Friday it was promised they would be brought down yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman wishes me to set a definite time so as to have another opportunity of saying what he has already said, that I cannot keep a promise.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it possible the hon. gentleman has made no enquiry?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend has a perfect right, after the promise was made across the House by the Minister, that very important papers should be laid here yesterday, to know whether that Minister does or does not know, or has made any enquiries as to when they will be here. If he was in a position to promise them on Monday, the bulk of them at any rate might be in our hands to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I had promised that the papers would be brought down on Friday, or at the latest Monday, but, as the leader of the Opposition knows, permission was only obtained on Friday to bring down the second portion. Since then I have made no statement as to when the papers will be brought down. The leader of the Government told the House they would be brought down on Monday, but it was impossible to lay them on the Table on that day, except in manuscript, and in that case hon. gentlemen would have had 800 or 1,000 pages of manuscript before them for a few moments, of which no use could have been made, as they would have almost immediately to be sent to the printer. I thought it was better they should be printed before they were laid on the Table, when the whole House would have easy and instant access to them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have you any idea of the probable time when they will be ready.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not say definitely.

Mr. MITCHELL. Within a week?

Mr. FOSTER. I make enquiry every day, and the answer I get is that a certain number of folios are being printed each day, and they are going on with all possible despatch.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 31) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is the same Bill I had the honor to introduce last Session, which was referred to the Railway Commission to deal with. I do not know that it is necessary, as the Bill has been before the House, that I should take up time by further reference to it, but, if any hon. gentleman desire it, I will refer to the points. It has to do with the question of freight rates principally, and some other matters as well.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. AMYOT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act of 1874.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. member please to explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. AMYOT. The object of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to fix a uniform date for the contestation of Dominion elections, instead of having it reckoned from the day when the election is published in the *Official Gazette*. The delay shall be counted from the nomination day when the election is by acclamation and from the voting day when there is a poll. This delay must be uniform for everybody, and not be left to an arbitrary power.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PAYMENT OF MORTGAGES.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 33) to regulate proceedings in the collection of first and subsequent mortgages, and also to regulate the payment of the same. He said: The object of this Bill is to regulate the proceedings to be taken where there are more than one mortgage on property. Where there is a first and a second mortgage the intention of the Bill is to make certain provisions that the first mortgagee shall give the second mortgagee notice with regard to his intention to foreclose, and he has got to give thirty days' notice before he can incur any costs under the first mortgage; within thirty days the second mortgagee will be entitled to an assignment of the first mortgage on the payment of the principal and interest. It is to prevent properties from being squandered by the first mortgagee without giving the second mortgagee an opportunity of securing his rights. There are some other provisions in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SUBWAY.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to construct a subway from Prince Edward Island to the mainland?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The examination which was undertaken by the Government has not extended to a sufficient degree to enable them to arrive at any conclusion on that subject.

WHARVES AT LONGUEUIL.

Mr. BERNIER, in the absence of Mr. Prefontaine, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the Estimates a sum sufficient to cover the expenditure required in order to increase the length of the wharves at Longueuil, county of Chambly, the first part whereof is now under contract and about to be commenced?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work in question, as the hon gentleman knows, is now under contract. The work so given has been considered complete and sufficient by itself, and when it is completed we will have to see whether it will meet the requirements of trade or whether it must be lengthened. Therefore I am unable to give the hon. member another answer to-day.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA.

Mr. BERNIER, in the absence of Mr. Prefontaine, asked, Why the French edition of the Revised Statutes of Canada, which have been in force since the 1st March, have not, as yet, been distributed? Is it the intention of the Government to distribute the said Statutes for the use of Justices of the Peace and Magistrates in the several counties of the Dominion?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been very difficult, not to say impossible, for us to have both versions printed at the same time. The French edition is in the hands of the book-binder and will be ready within a few days. The distribution will take place in three or four days. The distribution of the English version is commenced. It is not the intention of the Government to distribute the Revised Statutes to the Justices of the Peace. A collection of all the criminal laws, making a very interesting and very useful volume, will be distributed to the Justices of the Peace of the Dominion.

WIDENING OF THE CHAMBLY CANAL

Mr. BERNIER, in the absence of Mr. Prefontaine, asked, Whether the Government intend to take the necessary steps to provide, at an early day, for the widening of the Chamby Canal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, I must say to the hon. member that it is not the intention of the Government.

BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Has the Government, since last Session of Parliament, renewed its then existing contract, or entered into a new contract, with the British American Bank Note Company? If so, for what length of time and upon what terms has such contract or renewal been entered into? Were tenders called for? Was the opportunity afforded others or sought by them of tendering for the work, and did any other company or firm tender for it? Were such other tenders, if received, at a lower price than that allowed the British American Bank Note Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government, since last Session, has renewed its contract with the British American Bank Note Company for a period of five years from the 22nd of October, 1886. The principal terms of the contract are that the work shall be executed in the city of Ottawa, twelve months being given to the company to move their place of business from Montreal to Ottawa. The rates mentioned in the schedule to be subject to revision once each year at the option of the Minister of Finance, according to the current rate then charged for similar work in the city of New York; the work to be done for the Inland Revenue and Post Office Departments, to be subject to revision once each year by the Minister of Inland Revenue and Postmaster General, respectively; and the rates are 15 per cent. below the prices of the previous contract for the

work performed for the Finance Department, about the same rate of reduction for the Inland Revenue Department, and about 30 per cent. below for the Post Office Department. Advertisements were not published calling for tenders. A tender was submitted by another company, but was not as favorable as that received by the British American Bank Note Company. It was considered that in consequence of the British American Bank Note Company having done the work for over twenty years, and on a whole in a satisfactory manner, the public interest would be best served by renewing the contract with them at the reduction of prices above mentioned.

HONORÉ ROY.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is true that Honoré Roy, of St. Valier, has been deprived of the situation which he held for several years on board the Government steam vessels? Has this been done after complaints made against his conduct or competency, and what were these complaints? By whom has he been replaced? By whom has his dismissal been required, and whether verbally or in writing?

Mr. FOSTER. One H. Roy—I suppose the same that is mentioned here—has been in the employ of the Government on the steamer *Napoleon* for some years. I find him on the pay-list up to January 26th. From January 1st to the present time his vessel has been laid up, and no sailors have been employed upon her.

MR. JEREMIAH TRAVIS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. Jeremiah Travis, formerly Stipendiary Magistrate, as one of the Judges of the new Court for the North-West Territories?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not the intention.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Government has yet obtained the consent of the Imperial Government to lay before this House, the papers or any of them, relating to commercial treaties, in which Canada is interested, which are covered by the terms of the Address passed by this House on 28th January, 1884? And (if such consent has been obtained) when will the papers be brought down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to allow that question to stand until to-morrow.

M. F. O'DONOGHUE.

Mr. BARRON asked. Has M. F. O'Donoghue, brother of the late W. B. O'Donoghue, been in the service of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and what was his position and salary? When was he first engaged? Is he still in the service of the Government; and if not, when did his employment cease?

Mr. COSTIGAN. M. F. O'Donoghue has been temporarily employed in the Inland Revenue Department—in June and July, and in October, November, December and January last. He was paid in accordance with the Civil Service Act, at the rate of \$400 per annum, for 153 days, making a total sum of \$168.11.

WHARVES AT ST. MARY'S BAY, STURGEON BAY AND GREEK RIVER.

Mr. ROBERTSON (King's) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair, during the present season, the wharves at St. Mary's Bay, Sturgeon Bay and Greek River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department is not aware that repairs are required during the present season on the wharves at St. Mary's Bay and Sturgeon Bay, as they were repaired last year. The wharf at Greek River has not been taken over from the Local Government.

EXPORT OF SPIRITS FROM IMPORTED CORN.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether distillers are permitted to import corn in bond for manufacturing purposes, and export spirits or high wines as the product thereof? If not, what allowance (if any) is made to exporters of spirits manufactured out of imported grain?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Distillers have not the permission to import corn in bond for manufacturing purposes. Under the Inland Revenue Act if they manufacture spirits from imported corn, and export the same, they may claim a refund equal to Customs duties paid on such corn after satisfactory proof that the corn, from which such spirits was manufactured, actually paid the Customs duties.

COUNTY COURT OF ELGIN.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Has the Government been asked to appoint a junior judge for the county of Elgin; if so, by whom and when? Is it the intention of the Government to make such appointment; if so, when, and who is to be appointed?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government has been asked to appoint a junior judge for the county of Elgin. The memorial came principally from a number of the members of the bar. It was received a few months ago. The matter is still under the consideration of the Government, and I am, therefore, unable to answer the question further.

EXAMINATION UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. CASEY asked, 1. Was any special examination under the Civil Service Act held in the year 1887? 2. If so; when and where, and who conducted it? Why was it held? What was the cost of it? Who applied to be examined? And who passed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A special Civil Service promotion examination was held on 1st March last at Ottawa and Halifax, conducted at Ottawa by Mr. LeSueur, one of the members of the Commission, and at Halifax by Mr. Parsons. It was held to fill vacancies in the Post Office Department at Ottawa and an office in the Customs Department at Halifax. The cost of the examination at Halifax was \$15, including the rent of room, and nothing at Ottawa. If the hon. gentleman requires further details, I am ready to bring down the papers, in response to an Order of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Who applied to be examined; and who passed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There were a number of applicants; but I am ready to bring down all the papers.

INSPECTION OF FLOUR.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a measure to amend the law respecting the inspection of flour, in accordance with the recommendation of the Montreal Board of Trade?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The subject is now being considered by the Government.

HARBOR OF REFUGE AT FATHER POINT.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sum of money for the purpose of commencing the harbour of refuge at Father Point, contemplated since 1870?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to put in the Estimates this year a sum for that purpose.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a despatch which he has received from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, enclosing copy of a communication from the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty showing the arrangements which have been adopted in order to meet the views of the Colonial Governments, in relation to the Imperial pay and pension and to the promotion in the Imperial service of Imperial naval and military officers employed by Colonial Governments.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, April, 1887.

PAINTING, &c., IN THE PARLIAMENTARY AND DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS.

Mr. HOLTON moved for :

Statement showing the various amounts paid to or claimed by William Howe and George Howe, or any other person on their behalf, for painting or other work in or about the Parliamentary or Departmental Buildings, Ottawa, since the 1st of January, 1884.

He said: Many of us who were familiar with the appearance of this building as it was at the close of the last Parliament, have been much astonished on our return here at the changes since then wrought in certain portions of its interior. We are, of course, all aware that the Minister of Public Works, who is primarily responsible for the so-called improvements, was not, when directing them, his usual æsthetic self. We have reason to know and believe that his mind was wandering, doubtless to certain localities in his native Province where coloring and gilding of another kind was so soon to require his serious attention and his artistic touch. But it is not to the style of decoration adopted, nor to the exquisite good taste displayed in painting and sanding handsome stone columns and carvings, to make them represent gingerbread or some other equally substantial material, that I desire specially to call attention. It has been broadly hinted to me that while these works were in progress, through all the odors of varnish and paint there was plainly discernible that of a job. It seems that no tenders were asked for this work, and that working under a *carte blanche*, these favored contractors laid on coat after coat of paint, merely to scrape them off again, at their own price and at the public expense. The suspicion, Mr. Speaker, is that this contract, which included similar work in other public buildings, was given to the parties whose names appear in my motion as a reward for services rendered or to be rendered in the trying times of election, to enable them to recoup themselves for their liberal subscriptions in aid of the grand old Conservative cause. The explanation of the Minister, however, and the production of the accounts, which I now ask for, will doubtless establish that I have been misinformed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has tried to be very sarcastic about this motion, and I do not complain of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is only facetious.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He says that no tenders were called for, for these works. Well, I am sure if he had Mr. COSTIGAN.

looked back to other times he would have seen that the same course has been followed under this Government as was followed under the preceding Government. These works were done in the same way under that *regime*, and that manner of doing the work was considered the best under the circumstances for the interests of the Government and for the interests of the public. The prices were fixed by the Chief Engineer; and with regard to the taste displayed and so on, that, of course, is not within my province, but it comes within that of the Chief Architect and his officers. Of course, if they have not proper taste for these things I am very sorry for it. The hon. gentleman spoke about painting carving, and columns, and so on; but perhaps, when the statement comes down, he will find that the paint had already been put on the carving of these columns, and that this was only following suit; that whilst they were dealing with the lobbies they had to deal with the capitals of the columns as well as other portions of the work in the same way that they had been dealt with previous to that. The hon. gentleman said it looked much like a job given to those mechanics as a reward for services rendered at elections past or prospective. Well, the hon. gentleman knows a great deal more about that than I do. I must say that all I know of the mechanics is that when they were employed they performed their duties perfectly well and showed themselves worthy of the encouragement of the Government as well as the other mechanics in the same line of business.

Motion agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved :

That the rule now in force requiring the withholding of blue-books and departmental reports till the assembling of Parliament—results in the suppression, often for periods of many months, of information relating to public affairs which the public interests require should be promptly made public. That the blue-books and departmental reports for each fiscal or calendar year should in future be made public as soon as practicable after the same are prepared, and that no unnecessary delay should be permitted to interfere with the issuing of the same. That monthly reports regarding the revenue, the expenditure, the public debt, and the exports and imports of the Dominion, should be issued respectively by the Departments of Finance and of Customs.

He said: It is hardly necessary to enter into any elaborate discussion as to the propriety of granting the request made by the resolution that I submit to the House—that is, that the blue-books and departmental reports be issued promptly and submitted to the public as soon as issued, and that monthly reports be given of the exports and imports, shipping, immigration, and also statements showing the gross and net public debt to the first of each month. It must have been assumed that this information could only be laid before the public by being first presented to Parliament while in Session. It strikes me that Parliament ought not to be treated in this respect as a privileged body or class. The information contained in these reports is information that belongs to the public; it is information relating to the public interests, information in which the public themselves are interested, and information which, in my humble opinion, ought to be given promptly to the public. We are sent here as representatives of our respective constituencies to look after their interests, to act in their behalf and in their interests, and I think the public have a right to know primarily, and at the earliest moment, what the state of public affairs is. The usual course has been to delay these reports for at least six months. Our reports are made to the end of the fiscal year, the 30th of June; Parliament usually meets in February, so that there is a lapse of seven months before the people are allowed to know what is contained in our Public Accounts, Auditor General's Report, Trade and Navigation Returns and the other reports issued by the

various Departments of the Government. The last report was some nine months in reaching the public. The reports were brought down to the 30th of June, Parliament met on the 13th of April, and the reports were not brought down till some days afterwards. In the meantime we had a general election—an election which was fought to a great extent in the dark. There were many subjects of interest to the people upon which they ought to have been fully informed, that they were in ignorance of. We were unable to say what the public debt was, or what the balance of trade was. Various questions which should have been thoroughly discussed and made known to all the electors were locked up in the blue-books, not to be presented till a new Parliament was elected and assembled. Now, with reference to the public debt, we had a statement made, in answer to a question I asked on the 30th of April, that the net public debt on that date was \$205,569,000. I asked the same question to be replied to on the 1st of June, but in the haste of the closing days of the Session the then Minister of Finance forgot to make reply; but afterwards, with great courtesy, he sent me the information and then I found that the net debt was about \$206,000,000. The public were not apprised of the fact that the debt had suddenly swollen by \$17,000,000 in thirty days, having stood at \$223,159,000 on the 30th June. Now, I hold that it was improper to withhold this information from the people. It left those who were discussing public questions without data to discuss them intelligently, and it left the people in ignorance of the condition of the country. Therefore I think it is a perfectly reasonable request that our system should be changed, and that the departmental reports should be issued at the end of the fiscal year, and given to the press and through the press to the country, instead of waiting for months until Parliament assembles.

On examination I find that that is the practice in various countries. In England there is a monthly statement of trade and navigation made. I hold in my hand one for January, 1887, which gives the exports and imports, shipping, &c. A Board of Trade Journal is also issued monthly by the Government, containing a great variety of information such as quarantine notices, post office notices, notices as to the changes in the Customs relations and Customs tariff of various countries, miscellaneous trade notices, statistical notices, &c. In the United States also, the trade and navigation returns are issued quarterly, and a monthly debt statement is issued showing the condition of the finances. Now, I think it is reasonable that we should have, either monthly or quarterly, a statement showing our exports and imports, shipping, immigration, &c., and a monthly statement showing the amount of the net and the gross public debt. The issue of such monthly statement would enable the Government to issue the reports with greater punctuality and celerity when the time came to issue them. In moving this motion, I desire, if the Government will consent, to substitute the following for the last paragraph, in order to make the practice more explicit:—

“That the Finance Department cause to be inserted in the *Canada Gazette* at the close of each month, a statement of the revenue and expenditure for the month, and also for the expired portion of the fiscal year, distinguishing between expenditure on capital account and expenditure on account of consolidated fund, and giving a statement of the gross debt and net debt; and that the Customs Department cause to be inserted in the *Canada Gazette* at the close of each month, statements of the expenditure, imports, immigration and navigation for the month, and also for the expired portion of the fiscal year.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see much objection to altering the practice that has hitherto obtained, for the reasons given by the hon. member. He knows that the reports made by the various Departments go to the Governor General, and the Governor General orders them to be sent down to Parliament. The Statutes providing for the

establishment of the different Departments, I think, enact that these reports must be sent down within a certain number of days after the meeting of Parliament, and I suppose that is the reason why they have always been kept until the time specified in the various Acts. I do not see why, however, they should not be published before. That is a matter for consideration, and I should like to see whether a short Act is not required for the purpose of altering the practice. The hon. gentleman has also moved some addition to the resolution, which I dare say is all right, but I should like it to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings before it is carried, and I should like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to see it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he proposes substantially to grant the request of my hon. friend. There is no doubt that in almost every country constituted like our own this information is given to the public at an earlier day. If I remember rightly, the present Minister of Finance deplored the lack of it from the place I occupy. Great contradictions arose on various points at the last election, as my hon. friend to my left knows, notably with regard to the amount of public debt. Now it appears my hon. friend, as is his custom, was several millions below the actual figure in his statement of the net amount of the public debt. However, as the hon. gentleman has kindly promised to take my hon. friend's request into consideration, I will not press the matter further.

Mr. BLAKE. It is of great consequence that this modification in our practice should take place. Now the accounts are submitted several months after the year is ended, and occasionally they are submitted at a much later date, and the continuance of this vicious practice of the accounts having relation to a period so very remote has, no doubt, resulted in the growth of the practice of public officers delaying the preparation of the accounts until the latest period. Public officials, as a rule, like other officials, are not anxious to anticipate the discharge of their duty, and, therefore, apart altogether from what the hon. gentleman proposes to enquire into and those modifications in the law, if there be any necessary, though, I think, there are none, because I think the mere requirement that the report shall be submitted does not prevent earlier submission—apart from anything of that kind, it is obvious the efficient discharge of the new practice may involve the very early, almost immediate, communication to the various Departments that the principal work of getting ready the public documents must anticipate the conclusion of the financial year, and the completion must follow as soon as possible the completion of the financial year. As to the statement the hon. gentleman proposes to be added to the monthly returns published in the *Gazette*, his suggestion is not merely unobjectionable, but of the very highest consequence, and has the sanction of the custom of other countries constitutionally governed. It is quite clear that any statement made with reference to the public expenditure which does not involve periodical announcement of expenditure on capital account, is not merely imperfect, but misleading, and such at present are the statements in some cases made. We are at a loss to know what the expense of capital account is as the year progresses. There is another point of importance in this connection. The practice of the Government in its capacity of manager of public enterprises should be assimilated to the practice pursued by managers of like public enterprises. I refer to the administration of Government railways. The great railways of the continent publish weekly returns of traffic, &c. It is quite absurd that the Intercolonial Railway, the traffic of which is not particularly lucrative nor very large, should be managed on such different terms, both with reference to our interests in that line, as a Government line, the property of the public, and to the

general condition of trade and commerce of the community and the continent, as evidenced by this gauge, the railway traffic. I hold it important we should obtain in the *Gazette* such weekly and monthly returns with regard to the Intercolonial Railway as we find published by managers of similar, only very much larger, corporations of the same character.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the Minister of Railways will consider the suggestions of the hon. gentleman.

Motion allowed to stand.

HARBOR OF PINETTE, P.E.I.

Mr. WELSH moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, departmental orders, reports and other papers relating to the dredging of the harbour of Pinette, P.E.I.

He said: I have been for the last forty years engaged doing business in Prince Edward Island, in almost every port, I may say in every navigable harbor or port there. We are peculiarly situated. We are surrounded with navigable waters, we have many more sea-ports, in proportion to our population, than either of the other Provinces; we are isolated for five months out of the year, and our time for shipping is very limited—in fact, in the fall of the year, our shipping is all done in the course of two months, and during those two months we want every facility we can obtain to export our produce. This harbor, respecting which I move for papers, is a very good harbor, with the exception of a bar of sand, which has only about ten feet of water over it at high water, and owing to that, it is very difficult for the farmers and merchants to get a vessel to charter in the fall for that port, it being then considered risky owing to the western wind, so that the ships want extra freight or refuse to go. In November last, the people wanted me to send a ship to take their grain to Great Britain or France. I could not completely load the vessel as there was not water enough in the bar, and the season was too late. The consequence was there was but one cargo of grain shipped from that port, where I have often shipped two or three in a year. The people had to store away their grain, and there it remains to this day. I should be very sorry to bring any matter connected with harbors, that would be the cause of public expenditure, before this House, unless I was certain it was absolutely necessary, and it was certain the expenditure would not be thrown away. I will never, while I have the honor of a seat in this House, move for any expenditure of public money on any harbor or other place that is not giving public service and will not be a benefit to the country. I have shipped, I suppose, thirty or forty cargoes out of this harbor of 400 or 500 tons each, and I know what I am talking about when I say it is necessary this place should be dredged. I can say further, that I was very doubtful whether I would undertake to speak in this House in favor of having a dredge sent there, and I decided that before doing so I would examine the harbor myself. About last March I wrote to get all the pilots and mariners—it is a great place for master mariners, and supplies more ship-masters, mates and seamen for the marine service of the Dominion than any other spot in the Dominion—there to meet me on this bar, and to cut holes in the ice every thirty yards. I went down and had forty holes cut in the ice. I put the bar of iron through, and found a bottom of hard sand, but after working the bar down a couple of feet, I found ten feet of mud beneath; and I am satisfied if the dredge was worked there three weeks or a month it would make an excellent harbor with fifteen or sixteen feet of water. Those people are far removed from a railway, and there is no other harbor handy; there is no other facility within I should say ten miles for getting their produce away in the

fall. If I might range a little, sailor-like to tack about and have a cruise, I would go to the next harbor and bring it in connection in some way or the other. It is the harbor of Wood Island. A great deal of money has been spent on that in building a breakwater. Money has been spent I should say for the last thirty years, by the Local Government, first, and recently, by the Dominion Government. That breakwater is a very good work, and, as far as it goes, it is a good job, but the harbor has never been dredged. The breakwater lies there, and it may be a little convenience for very small craft that can get in there, but until the harbor is dredged out, which it was always purposed to do, it is not much use, and I believe the Government intended to send a dredge there before this. In fact, they did send her there for a day or two, and they took her away without performing the work. If they would send the dredge to Pinette, it is only about twelve miles to Wood Island, and then they would economise by doing the two things about the same time. I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration. I have heard several replies from the Government to questions which have been asked, and the answer always was—it is under consideration. I hope this matter will go a little further than consideration, and that we will have action on it. It is true the dredge is employed for this summer at the further end of the island, not in a harbor, but at what is called Tignish Run. I trust it is doing good service there, but I hope the Government will be able to promise me that, as soon as the dredge performs that work, she will be able to proceed to the harbor of Pinette, and then to Wood Island. I can well understand that the Government, having had so much on hand these last few years, have not been able to pay so much attention to the harbors of Prince Edward Island as we might expect. British Columbia has received a great deal of their attention.

Mr. BAKER. What did they get?

Mr. WELSH. Well, I believe there are some ten or fifteen thousand white people there, and my hon. friend is a good specimen. I told him the other day that we were as good as any other people, that we were as good as the people of British Columbia, that we could drink as much whiskey as they did. He said they drank twice as much whiskey in British Columbia as we did. I did not believe it, but I looked up the statistics, and the gentleman is right. The Government has had its attention taken up by the Canadian Pacific Railway and by serving these ten thousand white people in British Columbia. Now, we have 100,000 white men in Prince Edward Island, and, if they will only give us five cents in the dollar of what they have given the British Columbians, we will be pretty well satisfied. I know there are six hon. gentlemen on that side of the House from British Columbia. Well, for half the money, we will send you twelve, if you only give us the chance. I hope the Government will turn their attention to Prince Edward Island and give us good consideration. We want it. We are isolated and we are frozen up five months out of the twelve, and we want, while the season is open, the use of our harbors and all the facilities that we can get to remove our produce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend said, a little while ago, that the Government were saying that they were taking everything into consideration, and he wanted action. Now, the hon. gentleman has thrown out for consideration the inducement that, if a certain thing is done for the Island, he will give us twelve supporters. I hope the hon. gentleman will not only take that into consideration, but that we will see some action.

Mr. WELSH. I put the other matter first. You perform your part, and we will do ours afterwards.

Motion agreed to.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES moved for :

Return of correspondence between the Department of Railways and the Chamber of Commerce, Halifax, respecting the rights of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, under their agreement with the Government dated September, 1872, to use of Intercolonial Railway extension into the city of Halifax.

He said : With the consent of the House, I will ask to amend that motion so as to embrace correspondence with the Windsor and Annapolis Company as well. The principle involved in this motion is one not only of considerable interest to the people of Halifax, but to the people of the western counties in Nova Scotia. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company had, as they thought, by an agreement with the Government, the right of using the Windsor branch, that is to say the branch from the Windsor junction into the city of Halifax, with its extensions. In 1879, under the administration of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, an agreement was made between the Windsor and Annapolis Company and the Government, and, in the first or the second clause of that arrangement, it is proposed :

" So much of the Nova Scotia Railway, with the branches, appurtenances, buildings and conveniences thereto belonging or attached, as lies between the terminus at Halifax and the Windsor Junction, both inclusive, together with any extension to Halifax hereafter to be made."

Now, that is under the head of the signification or meaning of the agreement between the company referred to and the Government. Under this, it will be seen that, wherever the trunk line is referred to, the Windsor and Annapolis Company have the right under this arrangement to the use of the road with all its extensions into the city of Halifax. Subsequently in 1882, we find the following :—

" The Government will permit the company, as soon as they are entitled to the Windsor branch under this agreement, to use the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway between the city of Halifax and the Windsor Junction, &c."

So the reference to this brings it under the parliamentary clause in the original agreement. In 1882, under the present Administration as well, action was taken between the company and the Government on this matter. During the time that intervened a question arose as to the ownership of that branch. The Government for a time resumed the possession of it, which was disputed on behalf of the Windsor and Annapolis Company, and that dispute was finally settled by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England in favor of this agreement of 1879, from which I have quoted :

" And whereas the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia at the time of the incorporation of the said company owned a branch line of railway extending from Windsor Junction to Windsor, hereinafter referred to as the Windsor Branch; and also a main line of railway (now part of the Intercolonial Railway) running past Windsor Junction into Halifax.

" And, whereas, one of the clauses of the said company's charter, in effect, provided that a traffic arrangement should be made between the said company and the said Government of Nova Scotia, for the mutual use and employment of their respective lines of railway between Halifax and Windsor, and Windsor and Annapolis, including running powers, for or the joint operation thereof on equitable terms."

Reciting again the understanding given them in the Act of incorporation, and given them in the arrangement of 1879, which has been confirmed by the Imperial Government; and again reciting that they had running powers over the trunk lines with an extension into the city of Halifax. Now, the Government have been asked by the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax—I am informed since I placed my motion on the paper, and it is what we might naturally expect—that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company and the Chamber of Commerce have asked that the Government should concede the right which the Windsor and Annapolis Company claim they have by this Act. There was some correspondence between the Chamber of Commerce and the Government, and I hold in my hand a reply

from the Department of Railways at Ottawa, dated 24th November, 1884, acknowledging the receipt from the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, and concluding with these words :

" The temporary agreement bearing date 20th November, 1879, makes no mention of a privilege of sharing with the Intercolonial the advantages of extension into the city."

Now, I can hardly see how the Department could interpret the Act in the manner which they appear to have done. The Act of 1879 was not a temporary agreement, because it was a permanent agreement for twenty-one years, and when that Act, as I say, was subsequently disputed by the Government who assumed possession of the branch for the Western Counties Railway, the Windsor and Annapolis Company maintained the validity of this agreement and obtained, as I have already stated, the decision of the Privy Council in favor of their view. Therefore, I think the Government will hardly be justified in saying it was a temporary Act in 1879, because, far from being that, it was a permanent Act for twenty-one years. Now, the only ground upon which I believe that they could or did dispute this, was that they had not room at the Richmond Station for the accommodation of the Windsor and Annapolis traffic. That may be true, but still it is a matter for themselves to consider; if they made an agreement with the Windsor and Annapolis Company involving the use of that road when they carried it into the city, they should have taken into consideration at that time that the Windsor and Annapolis Company would naturally look to the fulfilment of that contract. Moreover, if that was the difficulty it is one that could be easily obviated, because there is abundant land in that vicinity which the Government could acquire in the usual way, and by which they could give every accommodation to the Windsor and Annapolis Company. I may say that this is a question of so much importance that the people of Halifax have been agitating it from time to time. The distance from the city, I suppose, is about two miles and a half, perhaps more, and during certain seasons of the year when the roads are almost impassable, the hon. gentleman will perceive the expense attending the removal of freight from Halifax business centres to the Richmond junction where it meets the Windsor and Annapolis freight depot. There is almost as much expense at times in removing freight from Halifax business centres to the Richmond freight depot of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, as in bringing it from other places. There is also another very great difficulty regarding the removal of all the traffic, of all the produce, that goes over the Windsor and Annapolis line. Now, I will point out to the Minister of Railways the difficulties that we labor under there with reference to the shipment of western produce. There is a very large quantity of apples, say for one article, shipped from Halifax by the various steamers going to London and Liverpool. Those steamers loading for London or Liverpool usually take in their freight, and indeed they are obliged to take in their freight, as the hon. gentleman knows, at the deep-water terminus, and whenever it is necessary to ship grain or other freight, it is always shipped from what is called the deep-water terminus. We, ourselves, have been agents for various lines of steamers, and have frequently been in this position: we have had to take wheat from the elevator at the deep-water terminus, and while we were taking apples or other goods that came by the other line, we were obliged to pay \$2.50 a car to the Intercolonial for shunting that property that came by the Windsor and Annapolis road down to the deep-water terminus. The hon. gentleman will see that a steamer could not be moved for taking in a thousand or two thousand barrels of produce when she was taking in the bulk of her cargo from another wharf, and, therefore, it is simply a tax on the shipment of freight from Halifax which is a very considerable impediment in the way of business. The hon. gentleman will

also perceive that the only ground on which the Government could have taken exception to the fulfilment of what I hold to be their agreement with the Government, and ratified by the Government which succeeded them—the only ground on which they could refuse to carry out that arrangement, was on the ground of not having sufficient accommodation. That, as I have already said, they can remedy by securing more land. There is a proposal from the city of Halifax, now before the Department, which I hope most sincerely they will act upon. It is asked that they should acquire half of the block opposite the present railway terminus, so that the water street which has been obstructed, by having half of it taken possession of for reaching the deep water terminus, may be removed further up, and under the operation of such a purchase the Government would acquire about 250 feet of land all the way along the line of the water street, bordering on the present deep-water terminus property. If such should be the decision of the Government, as I hope and sincerely trust it may be, the company will be able to build warehouses on the property which they have acquired, and be able to run trains alongside those warehouses, and easily remove freight by carters. The great object we have in this matter is to save the people of Halifax the expense to which they are now put for all heavy freight, and this applies not only to produce coming from the west, but also to produce coming over the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway property at the deep-water terminus is so limited, they are not able to bring to that section all the heavy freight, such as brick, lumber, hay, straw, machinery, &c., which come for the use of the city, and which are of very great importance in the way of freight. These goods have to be hauled from Richmond, whether they come by the Intercolonial or by the Windsor and Annapolis road; and so, under the circumstances, I trust the hon. gentleman at the head of the Department will see that it is to the interest of the Intercolonial Railway, as well as of the Windsor and Annapolis road, that more accommodation should be provided, and provided at once. According to my humble judgment there can be no doubt as to the right of the Windsor and Annapolis Company to the use of the line. I may be wrong, and I will submit with all deference to the hon. gentleman, who, no doubt, has given the subject every attention. Still I venture to ask him to refer to the various Acts, to the charter of the company, to the two agreements for the use of the road and its extension into the city, and I sincerely trust that when the subject is looked into carefully the hon. gentleman will arrive at a different conclusion from that given the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, and will consider that an agreement formally made by a Government and ratified by a subsequent Government, and confirmed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, can hardly be regarded in the light of a temporary arrangement. I commend this matter, therefore, to the attention of the Government as one of very great importance, not only to the city of Halifax, but to all parties east and west who have traffic with the Intercolonial and with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway.

Mr. BORDEN. As I have the honor to represent a county which is affected by the regulations to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has alluded, I desire to add a few words to what has been said. In order to understand this matter it must be remembered that thirteen miles of the Intercolonial Railway entering Halifax are common to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, that all the freight from the eastern and western portions of Nova Scotia goes into that city over the Intercolonial from Windsor Junction, a distance of thirteen miles. Some years ago an agreement was made between the Dominion Government and the Windsor and Annapolis Company for the

Mr. JONES.

carrying of traffic from the west over those thirteen miles of road. The member for Halifax has read the agreement. I shall simply refer to one or two words of it. I have here the Statutes of Canada for 1852, which contain the latest legislation upon this subject, and find the third clause of the agreement between the Government and the Windsor and Annapolis states as follows:—

“The company shall also use, to the extent required for its traffic, the trunk line with sidings, accommodations, &c.”

The words “trunk line” are explained as follows:—

“Trunk line shall mean so much of the railway, with the branches, appurtenances, buildings and conveniences thereto belonging or attached, as lie between the terminus at Halifax and Windsor Junction, both inclusive, together with any extension into Halifax hereafter to be made.”

Those are the words to which I desire to call the Minister's special attention—“any extension into Halifax.” The Intercolonial Railway has recently been extended into the city, and now we find that cars coming over this new extension into the city from the east over the Intercolonial are charged the sum of \$1 per car, and Western Counties freight by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is charged \$2.50 per carload. We consider this an unfair discrimination against the Western Counties. I have here a letter from a constituent who is engaged in the business of brick-making. He writes me that on 1st March he had paid \$60 for this extra charge on his freight for two months. A man engaged in the same kind of business in the eastern portion of Nova Scotia would have had to pay \$24 for the same number of carloads, a direct discrimination as between the eastern and western man of \$36 in two months, or about \$18 a month, amounting to over \$200 in this one instance as against a man living in the western part of the Province. And so it is with everything else. The fruit-growing industry is affected. There is a direct charge on all the carloads of apples shipped to Halifax. So it is with shipments of hay—there is a direct discrimination in favor of eastern as against western Nova Scotia. A person shipping hay from my county, from which a large quantity is shipped, is taxed very much more than is a producer shipping from the eastern portion. In view of the fact of this agreement, and in view of the statements I have made, it appears to me very clear that some explanation is required from the Government. It is not enough to say that there is insufficient accommodation. If that is the case, why does not the company announce that they will not receive carloads of freight from the west. They do not do so, but they charge each carload \$2.50 and each car from the east \$1. If there is not sufficient accommodation they should not receive the cars at all. There is no justification for making a discriminating charge, amounting to \$1.50, for cars of the same kind of freight coming from the west and those coming from the east. I think, also, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Halifax, that this is a direct injury to the trade of Halifax. Goods going to the west have to be carted two or three miles out to a place called Richmond Station, from which they are shipped on board the Windsor and Annapolis for the west, and consumers in the west have to pay more freight, and the result is that they will not order goods from Halifax but go somewhere else for them; so that it affects not only the Western Counties but it directly affects the trade of the city of Halifax. I would suggest, with the permission of the hon. member for Halifax, that these words be inserted in the main motion after the word Halifax: “And between said Department and the manager of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway.” That, I think, would give all the correspondence that there is on this subject. In conclusion, I would again desire to call the attention of the Minister to this important question. I think, if he will look into it

carefully, he will see the injustice—no doubt, unintentional—which is being done to the western part of the Province of Nova Scotia in this matter.

Mr. KENNY. I am not familiar with the agreement which was entered into between the Western Counties Railway Company and the Government of Canada, and I will not, therefore, express an opinion on that subject. But I quite concur with my colleague in his statement that the distance of the present terminus of the Western Counties Railway Company from the city is exceedingly inconvenient to the citizens of Halifax. The distance from the city, over which goods transported by the railway have to be carted, is a great charge to the citizens, and must be very inconvenient to the shippers of produce over that road. I will also add—what I am sure my colleague would have mentioned, but it escaped his memory—that the accommodation in the North street freight sheds is quite insufficient for the large and increasing traffic of Halifax. I agree with the hon. gentleman who preceded me that it is in the public interest that, as early as possible, increased terminal facilities should be given not only to the Western Counties Railway, but to the Intercolonial, and that facilities should be granted for the transport to the port and city of Halifax of the heavy goods which are now only brought as far as Richmond.

Mr. POPE. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has brought this to the attention of the House; but I think that perhaps he has made a slight mistake about the date of the agreement. The agreement which I have is dated September, 1871, and that agreement I think is the only thing upon which the hon. gentleman based his argument. It is within the knowledge of the House and of everybody in the country that we have made very large expenditures already in the city of Halifax, as a terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. I may say that this matter is under the consideration of the Government, having been brought before to our attention on several occasions by the junior member for Halifax. I admit that it will perhaps be necessary in a short time to provide more accommodation; and I can only say that, if we had the means to accommodate the Windsor and Annapolis Railway at the deep-water terminus, I would be glad to do it. With respect to the warehouse, it is necessary that there should be a large warehouse, but up to this time they have largely used our stations and other auxiliaries as warehouses, and that has, perhaps, been one cause why we have not been able to give such accommodation as we should desire. However, the matter has been brought before the attention of the Government, not only by the able speech of my hon. friend opposite but also in conversation with his colleague, the junior member for Halifax, and we will give it early attention.

Mr. JONES. While my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, receives my motion in a very agreeable manner, he has hardly gone to the root of the matter. I took the ground that the Government were bound under their agreement to provide accommodation for the Windsor and Annapolis Railway; and I venture to point out that, if I was right in that contention, the Government were bound to take immediate steps, and if they had to go into further expense to secure the accommodation, that was part of the responsibility thrown upon them by the agreement. My hon. friend has hardly answered that branch of my question.

Mr. POPE. I hardly admit that.

Mr. JONES. That is the point I wish to bring him to. I wish to hear from the hon. gentleman whether he still regarded the question in the same position as that in which he placed it in answer to the Chamber of Commerce, or whether he had not, in the light of subsequent information, altered his judgment in that matter. If the Government dispute the right of the Windsor and Annapolis road to the use of the extension into Halifax, that would settle

the matter. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance—it is the germ of the whole matter—to know at once and emphatically whether the Government recognise that obligation or dispute it. Moreover, as was pointed out by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), they are charging now to the Windsor and Annapolis \$2.50 a car for taking goods from the Richmond Junction down to deep-water. Had they any right to do that? Have we any assurance from the hon. gentleman that, until proper accommodation is provided, that charge will cease? Have we any assurance from the hon. gentleman that, until he investigates the whole subject and ascertains whether it is necessary in the public interest to acquire more land there for the Intercolonial Railway and the Windsor and Annapolis, in fulfilment of their agreement—whether until that time arrives the people in the western part of Nova Scotia are to be placed in the same position with regard to inward and outward freight as the people in the eastern part of Nova Scotia? The hon. member for King's pointed out the great difference to people having heavy traffic relations with the company between freight coming from the east and that from the west; so the hon. gentleman must see that it is a question he can hardly lay aside in such a summary manner. I think it is worthy of more consideration than he seems inclined to give it now, and I again urge on him that he should arrive at some decision in the matter, and decide promptly. The whole trade of the city is disorganised for the want of such terminal facilities. It is a question with the people in the interior of the Province whether they will send their orders for goods to Halifax or to some other part of the Dominion. An important factor in their cost is the carting of them from the centre of business in Halifax to the Richmond Station, so that that trade is diverted somewhere else. The hon. gentleman must see that this is a matter of the greatest importance to the people of Halifax and the people of the western part of Nova Scotia as well, as far as Annapolis. Therefore, the hon. gentleman should not avoid a decision respecting it. He should either recognise the obligation at once to provide terminal facilities or dispute it, so that the company may know what course to take. It has been said that 300,000 barrels of fruit came mostly from Annapolis to Richmond last year, and the Intercolonial Railway charges \$2.50 a car for shunting that down to the steamer. The hon. gentleman must see that such a state of things cannot continue very long. People will not submit to it. His own friends there are feeling very strongly on the question, and I hope that, on reconsideration, he will before long be able to give us some more definite assurance that the matter will be attended to, and this grievance remedied.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA RAILWAY ACTS.

On the Order being called for:

Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on which to found an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be graciously pleased to effectuate the altered policy stated to the House of Commons on the 5th February, 1884, and in pursuance thereof to leave to their operation any Acts of the Local Legislature, not otherwise objectionable, which have been or may be passed for the construction of railway lines within the original Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Watson.)

Mr. SCARTH. I would ask the hon. member for Marquette to allow this matter to stand for a few days. From communications I have received from Winnipeg and from what has appeared in the Winnipeg papers, I understand that it is intended to send down a deputation from there to wait on the Government with reference to this question.

Mr. WATSON. I have no objection to let the motion stand, provided a day is fixed for the discussion. As the hon. member for Winnipeg states that he expects a deputation from there in the beginning of next week, I would

suggest that the First Minister make this the First Order for next Wednesday after Questions, and that, if undisposed of at six o'clock, when the discussion on Motions stops for that day, it should be the First Order for Thursday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think perhaps the best plan would be to make it the First Order of the Day for Wednesday without a change of matter after six o'clock, and sit it out on Wednesday and Thursday until the motion is disposed of.

Mr. WATSON. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg will move that it be made the First Order for Wednesday, as the hon. member for Marquette, being the mover of the motion, cannot do so.

Mr. SCARTH. I have much pleasure in moving that the consideration of the motion be postponed to Wednesday next, and that it be made the First Order for that day after Questions.

Motion to postpone agreed to.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

On the Order being called for :

Motion for return showing the amounts (in detail) expended under warrants from the Governor General in each of the years from 1873 to 1886, both inclusive.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not sure that it will suit the convenience of the Government or the House that I should proceed with this motion. The question I desire to call the attention of the House to is one of considerable importance, and by some unfortunate oversight on the part of the Printing Committee the papers have not yet been printed. However, I do not want to let it drop, and I put myself in the hands of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better leave it stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will, but I will call the attention of the gentlemen of the Printing Committee to the fact, because it may save trouble in the future, that matters like the Governor General's warrants ought necessarily to be printed as a matter of course. It is quite clear there is no annual return laid on the Table, which it is more important should be full and placed in the hands of the members, than the statement of the amounts which the Government have been compelled to expend without the authority of Parliament. However, I will not say anything more on the point. Both of these motions can stand.

Motions allowed to stand.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE IN LONDON.

Mr. CASEY moved for :

Copy of the Commission or other document appointing Sir Alexander Campbell as representative of Canada at the Colonial Conference in London, and of any instructions given to him in such capacity.

He said: I find that in drawing the motion of which I have given notice, I omitted the name of one of the delegates appointed to attend the Colonial Conference in London, Mr. Sanford Fleming, C.M.G. If the House will allow me, I will add his name to the motion. I suppose it makes very little difference, for the commission and instructions issued to one of the delegates will, in all probability, be the same as those issued to the other. I do not propose in making this motion to discuss the general question of Imperial Federation. The subject is too large a one to discuss on a motion of this kind, but I wish to call attention to the fact that the Colonial Conference, which has been sitting in London, has been looked upon by the public at large as a sort of preliminary to the discussion, at all events, if not to

Mr. WATSON.

the institution of some scheme of Imperial Federation. It is, therefore, very important that we should know what instructions were given to our representatives at that conference. I have always been one of those who believe that some sort of *entente cordiale*, if nothing more, between the different members of the British Empire, would be advantageous, not only to the colonies, but to the Empire itself. The precise form of the understanding among the different communities which form the Empire is a very important question, and one which should not be discussed without deliberation. It is one which no delegate should be authorised to discuss without full authority, not only from the Government of the day, but also from the people of the Dominion. I hope it will appear when the documents for which I move are brought down, that the Government have not assumed to speak for the people of Canada in regard to the question of Imperial Federation, without submitting that question to the people at the general elections. It is quite possible that such a conference as that which has been sitting in London should suggest ideas very useful to what we call the old country, the nucleus of the British Empire, as well as to the colonies in general. It is quite possible also, that such a conference should "put its foot in it," if I may use the phrase, by going beyond the powers delegated to the different representatives by the Governments which have accredited them to that conference. I wish, therefore, to ask for the commission or documents appointing Sir Alexander Campbell, and, if I may be allowed to make the correction, Mr. Fleming also, as representatives of Canada to the Colonial Conference at London, and of any instructions given to them in that capacity. When we have the documents before us, and can compare them with the discussions at the Colonial Conference, we will be able to see what scope the Government gave in their instructions to our representatives, and how fully the latter carried out those instructions. It would be interesting to know, in regard to the fisheries, what instructions, if any, were given; also in regard to the mail service between Vancouver and Australia; and until we have the papers before us and know exactly what we are talking about, I must postpone further discussion on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Add to that, "all the papers respecting the said conference."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Return showing the time at which the steamer *Northern Light* commenced running between Prince Edward and Pictou, in the fall of 1886, how many trips were made by the said steamer, the date of each trip up to 15th April, instant, with number of passengers.

He said: This motion is for the purpose of ascertaining how long the people of Prince Edward Island have been without communication with the mainland. When I had the honor of occupying a seat here some years ago, I brought this question, year after year, before Parliament without any effect whatever in the direction of securing the carrying out of the terms entered into between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion. In 1873, when the Province entered Confederation, it was stipulated, and, I may say, that stipulation was the only reason why the people were induced to enter Confederation, that they should have continuous steam communication with the mainland in the carrying of mails and passengers. This agreement has never been carried out. Under the present Administration no improvement whatever has been made. Whatever improvement in communication we have had, was given us by the Mackenzie Administration. It was under that Administration the *Northern Light* was built, and she did very good work while the Mackenzie Government were in office, although during that time she was pronounced by the then Opposi-

tion as a failure and an imposition on the public. The moment, however, they came into office, she ceased performing the same amount of work, and let me say that the present Government have made no improvement upon the *Northern Light* in the nine or ten years they have been in power. True, they built a branch railway to Cape Traverse, a distance of ten or eleven miles, but when the passengers get to Cape Traverse they have to be strapped themselves to boats and get across in that way nine or ten miles over very rough ice, and at times through the water. A few days ago I had to cross, and it took me six hours to reach the other side. That is no small amount of labor. I would like to see some hon. gentlemen, some of those knights of the order, cross there in that way, and see how they would like it. It is also true that we were promised a subway, perhaps not very directly, but indirectly, and, if I understood aright, though I had not the honor of a seat here last Session, a Bill passed both Houses of this Legislature incorporating a company to construct that subway. So far, the operation of that Act is a failure, it is a dead letter. It is true that on the eve of the election, I think five or six days before the election, a gentleman who is well known in this community, Senator Howland, attended several meetings and read a letter which he said was written by the First Minister. At all events it bore the signature "John A. Macdonald," and that letter stated that, if the engineers showed that the work would not cost more than \$5,000,000, the First Minister was prepared to ask Parliament to place in the estimates a sum of \$5,000,000 to build that work. Whether that was intended to catch votes or not I do not know. At all events, it had not the effect of catching the votes. We talk about Ireland being dissatisfied, but I tell the Government and this House that the people of Prince Edward Island are dissatisfied, and the result of the election shows it. They have not been dealt with fairly, and until that subway is built or until the terms of Confederation are carried out, the people of Prince Edward Island are not to be considered in the Confederation; we are not united to Canada; we are disunited. The proper means of crossing over the ten miles of water which separates Prince Edward Island from the mainland are not provided for in the winter. It is well known that the people of the Island have complied with all the terms of Confederation as far as they are concerned, and, perhaps, a little more, in this way that, when we came into Confederation, we were told that the tariff would not exceed 15 per cent., and it exceeds that 15 per cent. by 50 per cent., and perhaps a little more. In that way we have probably paid over 100 per cent. to the Dominion of Canada more than Prince Edward Island is actually getting. The neglect to carry out the terms of Confederation by keeping up this continuous communication is a great drawback to the people of Prince Edward Island, because during the winter our speculating men are not able to take advantage of the outside market. We may have pork, or fresh fish in the article of smelts, to sell in the market, but we cannot do it. It was plainly shown by the papers which were laid before the Imperial Parliament, last winter, by the delegates from Prince Edward Island, that the year before sixty days elapsed without our having steam communication between the Island and the mainland. Is not that a great drawback? And then there are perhaps two months of communication only by small open boats which cross at the capes, and, therefore, it is impossible for our speculating men to get any article of produce to the market, while our merchants have to import very largely in the fall and pay a large amount of interest on the goods they import, and they must put an additional price on those goods which the consumer has to pay. That is one great reason why Prince Edward Island is dissatisfied. I hope and trust that the Government will take up this question

fairly and properly, and will have another survey made. There was a survey last year, and I do not know whether there was any report made as to the result, whether it was said to be practicable or not, but I hope that the Government will during this summer have another survey, and that before long the Government will be able to pronounce whether it is practicable, and whether they are prepared or not to build this subway. If they are not prepared to carry out the terms of Confederation, the people of Prince Edward Island will consider themselves clear of Confederation, they will consider that they are not united with the mainland, and that the Government of the Dominion have failed to carry out their contract. When one party to a contract fails to carry out its terms, the contract is broken. I do not wish to be understood in the sense that there is any feeling of secession in Prince Edward Island, but there is a great feeling of discontent. The people of Prince Edward Island think the Government have not honestly and sincerely tried to carry out the terms of Confederation, although we have been made to pay a large part of the revenue. If we are one-fortieth part of the population, I suppose we should be considered as paying one-fortieth part of the revenue, and in that case we pay \$800,000 a year. We do not receive \$450,000, so that shows a balance due to the Island of something like \$350,000 a year since the present tariff came into force. The people of Prince Edward Island know that, and they know that every dollar they have to make costs about 50 per cent. more than it does in the Province of Ontario or in the western part of Quebec. That is why our people are so much dissatisfied. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length on this question, because it will come up again, and I hope that, when the people of the Island ask the Government to have a commission appointed to take up the whole question between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island, they will consent to it. Last winter, when the joint resolution of both branches of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island came up here, I remember that the Government appointed a sub-committee to enquire into this matter, and that sub-committee, I think, was composed of Sir Alexander Campbell, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Their report was very meagre; it was very unfavorable, it was very inconsiderate; and, more than that, the Government of Canada endorsed their report, and I am sorry to say they have acted upon that report, and I believe they are acting upon it. It appears to me as if they were taking no step whatever towards carrying out the terms of Confederation. Will I be told that, after nine or ten years of experience of the working of the *Northern Light*, they were not able to get any steamer built to do better work, or even, if necessary, were not able to put two steamers on in order to carry out the terms of Confederation with that portion of the Dominion which is called Prince Edward Island?

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for:

Copies of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., in relation to the building of a post office in the town of Montmagny, in the county of Montmagny.

He said: (Translation) Mr. Speaker. I make the demand for the papers mentioned in this motion in order to find out whether any promise has been made by the Government in relation to the building of a post office in the town of Montmagny. The hon. Minister of Public Works, the other day, answered a question put by me in this House, by saying that it was not the intention of the Government to put a sum of money in the Estimates for the building of a post office at Montmagny. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was previously put before the House,

and my predecessor here even presented, on behalf of the town of Montmagny and of the municipal council of the town of Montmagny, a petition praying that the Government should be pleased to grant a sum of money sufficient for the building of a post office. In answer to a question put by the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) last year, the hon. Minister of Public Works answered that the Government had not yet decided to build a post office. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the reason given was that, before the Government came to a decision, the town of Montmagny should furnish the land for the building of the post office. Consequently, in order to get the post office, the municipal council met and adopted a resolution which must have been transmitted to the Government by the then hon. member for Montmagny, Mr. Landry. I was then one of the town councillors, and I seconded the motion made by Mr. Oliva, a good Conservative, to the effect that the council consented to give the necessary land for the building of the post office. During the last elections, Mr. Speaker, this question came before the public and my opponent declared that it was the intention of the Government to build the post office, and this promise—either false or true—was used as having been made by the Government. At all events the name of the Government was used to promise the post office, and of course it had some effect in the county. The population is quite considerable, the laboring class is numerous, and the promise of ten or twelve thousand dollars of public works during the election, when people remembered what had been said during the previous year, to the effect that the Government had not yet come to a decision, and when it was known that the town council of Montmagny had promised to give the required land, they came naturally to the conclusion that the Government, who were only waiting for that promise, would very shortly build the post office which was so necessary to the town of Montmagny. Well, Mr. Speaker at that time the post office was promised, and a few days ago when I enquired whether it was the intention of the Government to fulfil their promise, the answer was simply and solely that it was not the intention of the Government. Now, I ask this: if the town of Montmagny had a right to have a post office—and that right has been implicitly recognised by the Government, who required of us that we should take steps in order to aid them by giving them the necessary land, and we did so—I do not see why the same right should not exist to-day, and I do not see why the Government should refuse the county of Montmagny the building of a post office which was promised, to a certain extent, and which we have a right to have. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if some of the Ministers should pass through the town of Montmagny, and should see for themselves the post office which we have—an office doing a large business and which is the only office for a population of about five thousand souls, both in the town and in the parish, I believe that these gentlemen would at once consent to grant the necessary amount, because the post office which we have to-day is neither more nor less than a disgrace to the town of Montmagny. I am sure the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), who is like me a resident of the town of Montmagny, would corroborate what I have just said if he were here. The size of the post office is about twenty feet by twenty-five. It is utterly impossible for the transaction of business that we should remain longer in this position, and I hope the Government will not be so cruel as to not fulfil their promise in order to punish the county of Montmagny for not having deemed it expedient to re-elect the old member or to elect a member who would have given his support to the Government. If, last year the county of Montmagny had a right to have the post office, and if the town of Montmagny saw fit to give the required land to build this office, I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the position should have changed, nor how we could to-day

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

transact our business, in a post office which is almost useless and which is a disgrace to the town of Montmagny. Consequently, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that, should it appear by the papers now moved for, that the promise has been made, I hope that the Government will do us justice, and will fulfil their promise by granting the amount required for the building of the post office. As regards the town of Montmagny, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that it is still ready to give the necessary land, and I believe that if other concessions were required to secure this post office, without venturing to speak for the council of Montmagny, I think I may say that we would be ready to make other sacrifices in order to aid the Government if they are too poor to undertake it themselves,—in giving to the town of Montmagny a post office worthy of that town and adequate to the amount of business transacted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to bring down the papers moved for, and the hon. member will then see what has been done with regard to this intended construction. If the hon. member will refer to the answer I gave the other day he will see that it was not absolutely negative. I said that it was not the intention of the Government to put in the Estimates of this year an amount for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY CROSSING IN ST. CHARLES DE BELLE-CHASSE.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of the correspondence between the Government, or the Department of Railways, and the parish or the ratepayers of St. Charles de Bellechasse, respecting the appointment of a watchman at the place where the Intercolonial Railway crosses the public highway, between the snow sheds built there; and also respecting the change of position of the crossing; and the petitions forwarded in the matter.

He said: A snow shed has been built in the parish of St. Charles for a considerable length. It crosses the public highway and has made the place very dangerous. Already horses have been killed there, and people have narrowly escaped being killed. Since 1885 numerous petitions have been sent to the Department, in consequence of which an official was sent down there to examine the place and look at a plan prepared by order of the municipal council. He offered to change the highway providing the municipal council would buy the right of way, which, however, the municipal council declined to do. They say that it is not their fault that the snow shed has been built by the Railway Department, and they do not see why they should be bound to pay for another right of way. In the meantime nothing has been done to make the place less dangerous. At any moment an accident may occur; some person may be killed, as horses have already been killed there. But it is easier and quicker to cause a fatal accident at that place than it will be to secure compensation from the Department. I do not say that the Minister is not well disposed to the people of that parish, but I do say that when these accidents occur it is very hard to reach the Minister in order to obtain justice, and if people are killed there will be no way of obtaining redress at the hands of the Government. I hope the Minister will look into this matter at once, for human life is in danger at that spot, and if a fatal accident occurs through the negligence of the officials, the Government will regret that they did not sooner take steps to have a watchman appointed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Government has no objection at all to bringing down the correspondence, but my hon. friend will see that there is no need of correspondence on this subject. The Government is thankful to my hon. friend for having brought this matter to our notice, and drawn our attention to the fact that this crossing is a dangerous place. I may state that the authorities of the Department of Rail-

ways have sent an officer to enquire into the facts. A watchman has been asked for, as my hon. friend states, but as the locality where the watchman was asked for was in the country, where the traffic is very small, it was not considered necessary to have a watchman appointed. The municipal council has also asked that the highway should be removed, and the Government replied that they had no objections at all to have the highway removed. It is within the power of the municipal council to do so. The Government offered, if the municipal council would give the right of way, to make the road, and I do not think that condition was a severe one. I hope my hon. friend, having drawn the attention of the Government to the matter, will not insist upon having any correspondence, because there is no other correspondence than what has been mentioned.

Mr. AMYOT. I will not insist further upon the motion; but I wish to say that the parish of St. Charles is a very large one, and this is a main road which leads into many other parishes, and as more than twenty trains sometimes pass this crossing during the twenty-four hours, it has become a very dangerous spot. It would cost \$300 or \$400 for the parish to buy the right of way, and I do not see why, in law or in justice, the Government should impose that expense upon the parish. The highway actually exists there now, and it suffices for the wants of the parish, and if the Government is under obligation to cause the danger to cease, they must be under obligation to incur the necessary expense. If the Government do not want the railway there, let them take it away and the parish will not ask for anything more; but the Government built the railway and the snow shed across the highway, thus creating a danger to the public, and I think it is their duty to cause the danger to cease at their own expense.

Motion withdrawn.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Ontario Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate "The St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company."—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 12) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate "The Collingwood General and Marine Hospital."—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the "Imperial Trusts Company of Canada."—(Mr. Denison.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:—

I acknowledge with thanks the Address you have loyally adopted in answer to the speech with which I opened the Session, and I rely with confidence on the assurance that the important measures submitted to you, will receive your careful and full consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 27th April, 1887.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing all seizures effected in Canada for illegal sale of tobacco for each year since 1878 up to 1st March, 1887, inclusive; the names of the persons on whose premises the seizures were made, the

amounts realised on such seizures by sale or otherwise, and the expense of making the seizures.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

Statement setting forth the number of stills seized by the Department of Inland Revenue for the years 1878-79-80-81-82-83-84-85-86, respectively, and the first three months of the year 1887; the names of the persons on whose premises the stills were seized; the names of the informers and the sums paid to each; also statement of the cost of effecting such seizures, and the receipts accruing from all sales of such stills.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

Copies of all complaints, letters and papers of any kind respecting the dismissal of Mr. George Olivier as postmaster of the parish of St. Esprit, and the appointment of Mr. Jules Piquet to the position of postmaster of St. Esprit, in the county of Lotbinière.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

Return showing how many trips were made by the steamer *Neptune* last winter from Prince Edward Island to the mainland, the date of each trip, and the amount paid for said service, also the number of passengers.—(Mr. Perry.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation be authorised to employ a shorthand reporter to take down such evidence as the committee may deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the quorum of the Select Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation consist of fifteen members instead of nine members, as contained in the order of reference of the 19th April.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain for what reason he proposes to alter the Order of the House made at the instance of the First Minister a few days ago, and how it is that the motion is made without notice.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The motion made is in accordance with a resolution of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation. Of course, I presume it cannot be made without notice, unless with the consent of the House. The committee came to the conclusion that the quorum should be fifteen instead of nine members.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would submit to the hon. gentleman that, unless the committee is very large, this may tend very frequently to prevent their meeting or going on with business.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have no special opinion in regard to the matter myself. I think it may be just as well to leave the committee at nine members. But it seemed to be the general feeling of the whole committee that the quorum should be increased from nine to fifteen. Of course it is for the House to say whether that opinion shall prevail.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) seconded the resolution in the committee. There were a great many members present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps it had better stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. HESSON. The committee is a very large one, and nine is too small a number, I think, to form a quorum. Usually there is a large attendance, and the committee should not be permitted to meet with a quorum of nine members, all the other members being held responsible for the action taken. The committee were unanimous in respect to the recommendation.

Mr. SPEAKER. This must stand as a notice of motion, because a notice is necessary in this case.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I will allow it to stand as a notice of motion.

Motion withdrawn.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Messrs. Joncas and Campbell (Kent) be added to the Committee on Immigration.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Government has yet obtained the consent of the Imperial Government to lay before this House, the papers or any of them, relating to commercial treaties, in which Canada is interested, which are covered by the terms of the Address passed by this House on 28th January, 1884? And (if such consent has been obtained) when will the papers be brought down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The consent of the Imperial Government has not been received, nor is it likely to be received, as they object to correspondence being submitted on a matter not brought to a conclusion; and I may add, I hope to be able at an early day to make a communication to the House upon the subject which I hope will be satisfactory.

PUBLIC BUILDING FOR LUNENBURG.

Mr. EISENHAEUER asked, Whether the Government have secured a site for a Public Building in the town of Lunenburg for which \$4,000 was voted last Session; also whether it is the intention of the Government, this Session, to place in the Estimates a sum sufficient to put up and complete the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To the first part of the question I answer yes, that a site has been secured; to the second portion I may say the matter is under the consideration of the Government.

CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION.

Mr. BARRON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compensate J. C. Gilchrist, Esquire, of Woodville, father and legal representative of the late William Campbell Gilchrist, in his lifetime of Frog Lake, N.W.T., where he was killed by Indians on the 2nd April, 1885, during the rebellion, for the personal property of the deceased which was lost and destroyed as a result of the insurrection?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is not the intention of the Government to compensate persons whose relatives were lost during the troubles in the North-West. So far as Mr. Gilchrist is concerned, I have had some correspondence with him and have secured at the public expense proper sepulture for the deceased. As to the latter part of the question, I presume a claim has been laid before the North-West

Commission, and whatever amount may be found to have been lost will be paid.

INSPECTION OF BUTTER.

Mr. HICKEY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the duty on butter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not competent for the Government to make any communication touching the tariff until the Budget is brought down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope there will be no duties added to the food of the people.

Mr. HICKEY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have all butter imported for home consumption subject to scientific inspection?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government, upon having any evidence furnished that butter imported is of an unwholesome or impure character, would take the necessary steps to have it subjected to scientific inspection.

RESIDENCE FOR THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. ROBILLARD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a new residence for the Governor General? If so, where?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. It having appeared in the newspapers that I did not vote on the amendment of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and as I find on referring to the Votes and Proceedings of the House that my name is not recorded, I bring the matter before the House. I mentioned it to the Clerk, who said it was an omission and he would see it was corrected; but I deem it right to make this personal explanation, as it has appeared in the press that I shirked that vote. I did vote on the question, and I voted in favor of the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the Clerk states that there was really a mistake, a correction will be made by an erratum.

QUEEN'S, N. B., ELECTION.

Mr. SKINNER. I will first read the resolution which I propose to move:

That it be Resolved, That it appears by the poll-books and other papers transmitted by John R. Dunn, the returning officer appointed to conduct the last election of the electoral district of the county of Queen's, N. B., and laid upon the Table of this House by Richard Pope, Esq., Clerk of the Crown in Chancery;

That two candidates, George F. Baird, Esq., and George G. King, Esq., were nominated, that a poll was granted, and the names of the said George F. Baird and George G. King were posted as candidates in accordance with the provisions of the Election Act.

That on the twenty-second day of February last a poll was held and taken in the said electoral district and the returns made to the said returning officer by the deputy returning officers of the said several polling districts.

That the said John R. Dunn as such returning officer made a return certifying that the member elect for the said electoral district was Geo. F. Baird, of the city of Saint John, in the city and county of Saint John, barrister-at-law, no other candidate having been properly nominated, and also made a report of the proceedings, which is as follows:—

"REPORT of proceedings in the matter of the Election in the Electoral District of Queen's County, Province of New Brunswick.

"To the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery:

"The writ commanding me to hold an election was received by me January 28th, 1887. I took the oath required by law and appointed my election clerk. Proclamations were duly posted throughout the county within the time prescribed by the Act.

"On February 12th, Lemuel Currey deposited with me the nomination paper of George F. Baird, of the city of St. John, in the city and county of St. John, barrister-at-law, with the required deposit and his appointment as Mr. Baird's election agent.

"On February 15th, at 12 o'clock, I opened court for nomination of candidates for the House of Commons of Canada. T. Medley Wetmore handed me the nomination papers of George G. King, of Chipman, Queen's county, N.B., merchant, accompanied by the sum of \$200. On my calling the attention of Mr. Wetmore to the fact that no election agent had been appointed by Mr. King, I was handed the appointment of John McLean McLean as election agent for Mr. King. At two o'clock I granted a poll and announced the names of the candidates, notices of poll being granted, and the names of candidates were then posted throughout the county.

"On Saturday, February 26th, the day appointed by notice for declaration, I opened court, but on account of the boxes for several parishes being delayed by snow-storm, I adjourned until March 5th. On Saturday, March 5th, I opened court for declaration, and summed up the votes given for each candidate.

"Lemuel A. Currey, barrister-at-law, on behalf of Mr. Baird, asked that all the ballots cast for Mr. King be rejected, since Mr. King's nomination paper was invalid on two grounds: 1st, That the names of the nominees had not been recited in the affidavit to nomination paper; 2nd, That the deposit made with Mr. King's nomination paper had not been legally made, since it was not made by his election agent. After hearing the arguments made on behalf of Mr. Baird by L. A. Currey, and on behalf of Mr. King by George F. Gregory, barrister-at-law, I overruled the first objection to the nomination paper, on the ground that it was covered by Section 80 of the Dominion Elections Act. I sustained the second objection, and declared the nomination paper of George G. King invalid, and that all votes cast for him were void and null.

"I then declared George F. Baird, of the city of St. John, in the city and county of St. John, barrister-at-law, elected to represent the electoral district of Queen's in the House of Commons of Canada, and adjourned the court *sine die*.

"JOHN R. DUNN,

"Returning Officer for the Electoral District of Queen's.

"GAGETOWN, QUEEN'S COUNTY,

"March 24th, 1887."

That by the said poll-book and returns of the said deputy returning officers, and the summing up of the votes, it appears that the said George G. King had 1,191 votes, and the said George F. Baird had 1,130 votes, the said George G. King having therefore a majority of the votes cast should have been declared by the said returning officer as member elect for the said electoral district, and that the return of the said returning officer should be amended.

That the said George G. King having a majority upon the summing up of the votes, should have been declared as the member elected to represent the said electoral district, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend the House with the writ of election and return, and amend the said return by erasing the name of George F. Baird and substituting the name of George G. King as the member elected to represent the said electoral district of Queen's in this present Parliament; saving, however, to the said George F. Baird the right of contesting the said election if he thinks proper, in such manner as may appertain to law and justice, and according to the usage of Parliament and the laws of Canada.

Now, at the outset, it will be admitted that this is a very important question, and one that should receive full attention, because the rights of the people of that county are in question, and the decision of the case will serve as a precedent; and if their rights and privileges should not be protected by this Parliament, then the rights and privileges of other constituencies in Canada would also be brought into danger and hazard. To me it appears to be very plain what the duty of the returning officer is. He is simply to return the person having most votes. It will appear clear from the proceedings that Mr. King had the majority of the votes. In the report which the returning officer has sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery he states that he summed up the votes, but he does not declare the number that each candidate had, and he goes on then and gives his reasons for rejecting the majority which was given for Mr. King. But when we come to the returns which were sent in and were laid before the House on the 25th of April, we find that the returns of all the deputy returning officers in the election are contained therein, and they show that Mr. King and Mr. Baird had respectively the number of votes stated in the resolution, and that Mr. King's majority was, I think, sixty-one over the number of votes obtained by Mr. Baird. Now, section 69 of the Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes, is the one immediately governing this case, and I will read it to the House:

"The returning officer at the place, day and hour appointed by his proclamation, and after having received all the ballot boxes, shall proceed to open them in the presence of the election clerk, the candidates or their representatives, if present, or at least two electors, if the candidates or their representatives are not present, and to add together the number of votes given for each candidate from the statements contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officers of the ballot papers counted by them. The candidate who, on the summing up of the votes, is found to have a majority of votes, shall be then declared elected."

From this it is contended that the returning officer has no other duty to perform when the returns have been made to him than to sum up the votes, and return the candidate having the majority of votes polled. The returning officer in this case has seen fit to violate that plain duty, and has returned the minority candidate. That would be a violation of his duty, as a matter of justice, even if he were not acting under a Statute; but when he is acting under a Statute which is directory in its terms as to what he is to do, he should follow the directions of the Statute, and should not undertake to depart from them. It will be found on examining the authorities that they amply sustain the position I take. In the English Act, 35 and 36 Vic., called the Imperial Ballot Act, section 27, are the following words:—

"After the close of the poll the ballot boxes shall be sealed up so as to prevent the introduction of additional ballot papers, and shall be taken charge of by the returning officer; and that officer shall, in the presence of such agents of any of the candidates as may be in attendance, open the ballot boxes and ascertain the result of the poll by counting the votes given to each candidate, and shall forthwith declare to be elected the candidates or candidate to whom the majority of votes has been given, and return the names to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

The wording of this section may in some particulars differ from the wording of section 60 in our Act, but on the whole there is no difference. The duty of the returning officer under both of these sections is precisely the same, to sum up the votes and return the man receiving the majority of the votes cast. Under this section of the English Act, the case of the Queen *vs.* the Mayor of Bangor was decided. That case was cited before this House when my hon. colleague from St. John (Mr. Weldon) moved in this case the other day, and I mention it here lest it might be thought that as that case had reference to a municipal election, the rule might be different from what it is in the case of a parliamentary election. With these explanatory remarks, I shall proceed to read a few extracts from the judgments of the judges in that case. On page 359 of 18 Queen's Bench Division Law Reports, the Master of the Rolls uses these words:

"Whether he rejected any of them does not appear, but having counted those that were passed, he found that a majority of votes had been given for Roberts. The returning officer stated that fact at the time, but an objection having been taken that Roberts being an Alderman was not eligible for election, he stated the number of votes given to each candidate, and said that he should consider the question as to whom he should declare to be elected."

In the judgment of Lord Justice Lindley, on page 366, is the following language:—

"Looking at the terms of section 2 of the Ballot Act of 1872, it is, I think, clear that the returning officer has no power to declare a person elect who has not obtained a majority of votes. It is the majority of votes which determines the election, and the returning officer is to declare that person to be elected to whom the majority of votes has been given. That declaration is to be made forthwith, and it is entirely distinct from the public notice to be given under rules 45 and 46, which provide that the returning officer shall give notice 'of the names of the candidates elected, not the names of the candidates declared to be elected. In the present case the returning officer gave public notice that a person was elected who had not been elected. He departed from the language of the Act instead of following it. He did not 'forthwith' declare any one to be elected, as the Act requires. I therefore come to the conclusion that Pritchard was not duly elected. It is said at any rate he filled the office *de facto*, and therefore is entitled to a mandamus to compel the council to respect him in that office until he is turned out by an election petition."

On page 368 it is said:

"It is admitted that he had a majority of votes. The material part of that section is the second part, which defines the duties and powers of the returning officer when the ballot boxes have been taken charge of by him after the close of the poll. After he has opened the ballot boxes and counted the votes, 'he shall forthwith declare to be elected the candidate to whom the majority of votes has been given.'"

I wish to emphasise that portion of the judgment :

"He has no power to enquire to whom the majority of legal votes has been given. I think that directly he has ascertained by counting to whom the majority of votes has been given, his simple duty is clearly and indisputably to declare that person elected. It cannot be that he has any power to declare with respect to the eligibility or ineligibility of any candidate. That would be a highly dangerous power to entrust to a returning officer. I am, therefore, of opinion that Roberts was duly elected."

The digest of the case, which will be shorter to read than any other portion of it, is as follows:—

(1) That the person returned was not by reason of his being an Alderman disqualified for election to the office of Councillor, and that by accepting the latter office he vacated the former; (2) That the returning officer had no power to decide whether R. was disqualified or not; (3) That by stating at the close of the poll the number of votes given to each candidate the returning officer had made a sufficient declaration under section 2 of the Ballot Act, 1872, that R. was elected, and that the effect of that declaration was not altered by reason of the public notice issued on the following day under R.R. 45 and 46 of the rules in the first schedule of that Act; and (4) That the office of councillor was not *de facto* filled by R. so as to entitle him to hold under it until dispossessed by an election petition or by *quo warranto*.

This case goes on further to decide that the duties of the returning officer are purely of a mathematical character: that is to say, to sum up the number of votes received. On page 363, it is said :

"No power is given to him were that candidate elected for whom the majority of votes has been legally given."

That covers that other branch :

"That is to say, he is not to consider the question of the legality of the matter at all, after he has exercised his power and performed his duties with regard to accepting the nomination papers, but is here simply to sum up the votes and return the candidate who received the majority."

Going back from that case, it will be found, not only in the election cases before the courts, but also in those before Parliament, that there is abundance of authority to sustain the position I am now taking. The first case that has come under my notice of the return of a minority candidate by a returning officer occurred in 1630, at the Leicestershire election and will be found in the 1 Commons Journals, page 511, more particularly referred to on page 515 :

"The Act Henry 8th, chap. 7, required that the members to be elected for counties should be 'dwelling and resident within the same counties.' At the election a resident and non-resident were nominated, but the non-resident obtained a majority of votes; the sheriff, however, returned the minority candidate on the ground that he was advised by counsel that the majority candidate was not eligible. The House immediately sent for the sheriff and under-sheriff 'as delinquents,' and caused them to kneel at the bar and make their confession. Mr Speaker then reprimanded them as great offenders. During the debate on the question Mr. Holt, a member, said the sheriff was a judge of the number of votes but not of the ability or disability of the candidates. Sir Edwin Coke seemed to hold similar views, and the House unanimously concurred."

"In the Liverpool case, 11 Com. J., page 202, the returning officer decided that a coroner was ineligible for election, and returned the minority candidate as duly elected. For so doing he was declared to have violated the rights of the Commons of England and broken the privileges of the House, and was committed to custody, where he remained until the dissolution of Parliament."

"In the Denbigh case, 24 Com. J., the returning officer returned the member 'contrary to the majority of votes received at the poll. The House then decided that the officer had acted partially, arbitrarily and illegally, in defiance of the laws, in manifest violation of the rights of the freeholders of the county and in breach of the privileges of the House."

Let me refer to another case, in the 9 Commons Journals, called the Monmouth Case :

"The Clerk of the Crown being called in amended the return of the Borough of Monmouth by erasing out the name of Charles Lord Hubert and inserting the name of John Arnold, Esquire, thereof."

I quote that case to establish the point that it is quite within the power of Parliament to summon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to appear with the return, and amend

Mr. SKINNER.

it according to this motion. As to the difference between judicial and ministerial duties of the returning officer, there is another case called the Cumberland Case, 32 C. J. 367. There the returning officer was committed to custody for returning a member "contrary to the majority of votes named by him upon the poll." Another case will be found in 33 C. J. 69 and 457, called the New Stoneham Case, in which a similar commitment was made of the returning officer for having at the last election returned as duly elected the candidate having a minority of votes. In Dalton on Sheriff, page 332, it is laid down that :

"Persons attainted of treason or felony being chosen to be Knights or Burgesses for the Parliament, it seemeth the Sheriff ought to return them, neither ought any man that is in execution for debt be chosen a Knight or Burgess for the Parliament; and yet such persons being chosen it seemeth the Sheriff ought to return their names"

That is to say, that although the persons were disqualified to be elected to Parliament, it was the duty of the sheriff to return them after they had been properly nominated; or rather, after the poll had been taken. By some it is contended that the duties of the returning officer are of a judicial character; by others that they are wholly of a ministerial character. Upon examination of precedents and authorities, it will be found that to some extent the returning officer has a judicial character or capacity when the nomination papers are brought to him and they are manifestly contrary to law, or some person is to be nominated who manifestly could not be a candidate. He may then have judicial powers to settle the question, but having then settled the question he cannot review his decision afterwards. On referring to these papers, it will be found this returning officer, by the acceptance of Mr. King's money, by the acceptance of Mr. King's nomination papers, by the sending of Mr. King's name out in the proclamation, by every step he took, he declared and decided that Mr. King was a legally qualified candidate at that election. Having once decided that, he cannot take the question up again and decide the contrary, after the result of the ballots has been ascertained, and after Mr. King has received a majority of the votes. Of course that argument is altogether outside of the Statute, which takes from the returning officer the judicial power in that respect. Though he may have a judicial power in the first instance in reference to the reception of the papers and the nomination of the candidate, if he even have the judicial power there, the Statute has taken it from him after the votes have been cast, by section 60 of our Act. That clearly declares his duty, which is to sum up the votes and return the candidate who has received the majority. Therefore, without further dwelling upon the case, it seems to me that the authorities, precedents, and principles amply sustain the course I have taken, and warrant me in moving this resolution, and the House in passing it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am sure that no hon. member of this House will disagree to any extent with the view which the mover of this resolution has expressed as to the importance of the question which it involves, inasmuch as it deals not only with the powers of returning officers and the rights of a constituency, but likewise with the conflicting claims of two gentlemen who assert their rights to a seat in this House. In a matter of so much importance, and which we are required by our duties as members of this House to approach in a spirit entirely free from political bias, I am sure the House will feel gratified at the presentation of the case which was made this afternoon by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), which was entirely free from the slightest bias as to his statement of the facts, and was fair as to his statement of the authorities which he thought should govern the action of this House. I regret to say, however, that, while I appreciate the way in which the case was presented by the hon. gentleman, I do not quite agree with him as to the action which should be taken by this House.

The hon. gentleman has referred to a series of decisions which were made in the House of Commons in England—some five or six decisions—tending to confirm the view which he urged on the House, that the duty of a returning officer in a parliamentary election was not judicial but purely ministerial, and tending to confirm his contention that it was the right and duty of the House—when the returning officer usurped any other than ministerial functions—to correct his return and to seat the member having the majority of votes. It is quite true that a long course of decisions has established that line of procedure, not only in the Imperial Parliament, but also in the Parliament of Canada. But the hon. gentleman who made the motion and who cited those precedents to the House, requires to go back, to search for those precedents, to a period in respect of which the precedents have not by any means the force and weight, either in the Imperial Parliament or the Colonial Parliaments, which decisions of a subsequent period would have. Twenty years ago, in the Imperial Parliament, the gravity of questions connected with parliamentary elections, the necessity of having them adjudicated upon by an entirely impartial tribunal, led the Parliament in Great Britain to adopt an Act which relegated to the judiciary of the country the disposal of all questions connected with controverted elections. Upwards of ten years ago in the Dominion of Canada a similar Statute was not only adopted by the Parliament of Canada, but adopted by a number of the Provincial Legislatures. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has not cited to this House any precedents whatever subsequent to the adoption of that radical change in the law regulating the trial of controverted elections, which would sustain in the slightest degree the action which he proposes this House should take this afternoon. I desire, in the first place, to emphasise the point that the precedents which he has suggested to this House are precedents which were adopted at a time when the procedure in connection with controverted elections was regulated by a law entirely different from that which now prevails. The House will see the force of that position when I remind the hon. member that at that time, and under that procedure, there was no other course for the House to adopt. The House of Commons of Great Britain was the only tribunal by which the rights of its members to seats in that House could be adjudicated upon. But subsequently to that time, as I said before, by the change which transferred that litigation to the judiciary of the country, an entire alteration was made in the system of dealing with this question, and the very absence of any precedents subsequent to that change, is a strong argument against the action of the House which the hon. member proposes to be taken this afternoon, and by which the hon. gentleman asks this House to take back once more the power which it has transferred to the judiciary of the country, and to be seized again of the right to dispose of the controverted elections of its members. Now, I am sure that the hon. gentleman will find—doubtless he remembers without any research as to the question at all—that the questions which have arisen since that change in the law have been precisely analogous to those which have been presented to this House. It is not the first time that the House of Commons of Great Britain, or the House of Commons of Canada has been asked to deal with questions, or that the courts have dealt with the election of members of that House, in which it was claimed that the returning officers had usurped functions that did not properly belong to them, or that they had returned persons to the House who had not received the majority of the votes. But, as I reminded the hon. member at the outset, he will have to look from the change in 1867 down to the present time, in the records of the judiciary of the country, and not in the records of the House of Commons, for precedents to find where redress was given in such cases. Since the change which I

have referred to, and by which Parliament has renounced its rights to deal with the matter of controverted elections, there has been fully recognised in the various discussions that have taken place in the Imperial House of Commons, this principle, that everything has been transferred to the judiciary in connection with controverted elections, excepting the one question of the disqualification of persons who have been returned to Parliament. As was said by Sir Henry James, in 1882, in the case of Michael Davitt, the only question which Parliament has reserved to itself to deal with is the question whether a proper person has been returned in obedience to the writ. As was explained by Lord Coleridge and Lord Selborne in a previous debate in 1870, that reservation is not in conflict with the Statute which says that the election shall only be contested by an election petition, because the House has to consider whether the writ has been obeyed which commanded the electors of the shire, or the county, to return a suitable person (one of the *magis idoneos et discretos*) to sit in that House. The House, therefore, is still seized of the right to decide whether the writ has been obeyed by the election of a person who is fit and proper to sit in that House. But as soon as the question has been decided as to the qualification of the person so returned, the conduct of the returning officer, or the number of votes which were received, the conduct of the candidates, and every other question connected with the election, or with the conduct of the returning officer, has been relegated to the judiciary, and the House has always declined to exercise its functions and its power to interfere. In 1870 there was, in the Imperial House of Commons, a practical illustration of the exercise of the power which the House of Commons still reserves to itself; that was, as I said before, the one question of whether a qualified person had been elected or not. On account of O'Donovan Rossa, a convicted felon, having been elected in the House in 1870, the House of Commons resolved that the election was void, and ordered a new writ to issue, thereby exercising the right to decide whether a fit and proper person had been returned to Parliament. But you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in that case, although they declared the election void and ordered a new writ to issue, there was no attempt to do what the hon. member asks the House to do this afternoon, namely, to seat the opposing candidate. Well, Sir, in 1875 the same right of supervision as to the obedience given to the writ was exercised in the House in the case of John Mitchell, and the same action was taken. The House of Commons resolved that inasmuch as the person returned under the writ was a convicted felon, the writ had not been obeyed. A person had, in point of fact, been returned by the sheriff to sit in Parliament who was civilly dead in the eyes of the law, and therefore incapable of sitting, and again a new writ was ordered to be issued. At the election, which came on in the same year, Mr. Mitchell's name was again presented to the constituency, and again he was returned to Parliament, and although in that year that person, who had already been adjudged incapable of sitting in Parliament, and incapable of being returned to Parliament, was re-elected, the action which the House, at the instance of Mr. Gladstone, took, was not to do what the hon. member proposes this afternoon, that is, to declare the person who had been returned, not lawfully returned, and seat the other person, but the House simply reiterated its determination that a fit and proper person had not been elected; it then stayed its hand, and the opposing candidate to Mr. John Mitchell in 1875 had to resort to the courts by election petition in order to get the seat, which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) moved that this House shall give Mr. King by vote this afternoon. In 1882 in the case of Michael Davitt, precisely the same procedure was followed, and hon. gentlemen will find, with

the exception of two or three unimportant cases, in which the rights of the other party were not pressed either to discussion or to division in the House, the House of Commons of Great Britain exercised no powers in relation to any controverted election except that simple power of ascertaining whether the person who had been returned to Parliament was qualified or not. In the Parliament of Canada we had, in 1882, a question something like this presented to the House, in which it may be contended that the House undertook to declare the return of one person void and the return of another person good. Let me remind the House, however, that in 1882 the state of things in King's county, Prince Edward Island, was this: That the House was required to decide, upon that return, whether a fit and proper person had been returned to Parliament or not. It was alleged against the return of Mr. Robertson that he was a disqualified person, and, therefore, in 1882, while this House did take up this question and did decide who was entitled to the seat, the House was only acting as possessor of the power which, as I have said, the House of Commons of Great Britain reserved to itself, the right of saying whether a qualified person had been returned in obedience to its writ, or not. But let it not be supposed by anyone who has not a distinct recollection of that case, that the House on that occasion transgressed the rule which, as I have said, has been recognised in both Parliaments since the change of the election law, by ordering not only that the disqualified person should be unseated, but that the opposing candidate should be seated in his place. It is true that was the result of the action of the House, but it is not correct that the House, in taking that step, in any way reversed the return which had been made to it by the returning officer. The circumstances in that case were exceedingly peculiar, because both parties had been returned to Parliament, and, therefore, the House had only to say who was the disqualified person, and to leave the other not seated by the action of the House, but seated by the return of the returning officer, which the House did not require to touch or to amend. I have already shown the House that in the case of Mitchell, and in the case of Robertson in this House in 1882, while the House exercised the power to decide on the question of disqualification, it did not exercise the power of seating a person who claimed the seat. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) has referred this afternoon to a recent English authority on the question of the powers and rights of returning officers. I do not wish at all to be understood as minimising in any degree the weight of the authority in that case, or the force of the reasoning by which it is sustained. I do not pretend, this afternoon, to express any opinion whatever as to whether the conduct of the returning officer, Mr. Dunn, in this case was similar to the conduct of the returning officer as in the case of the Queen vs. the Mayor of Bangor, or whether he did right or wrong. But the hon. gentleman, I think, pressed that case a little beyond its legitimate length when he insisted that it was an authority for unseating the person returned and seating the person claiming the seat. The hon. gentleman will remember that that was a case of a municipal election, in regard to which the returning officer had no return to make. The returning officer had simply to sum up the vote; and it is mentioned by the Master of the Rolls that the returning officer had no return to make as a parliamentary returning officer would have, and for that reason it was that the court decided that it was unnecessary to proceed by election petition. The returning officer in that case had summed up the vote, he had declared who was entitled to the office, and his functions had entirely ceased; and having declared who had a majority of the votes, he had no other return to make. The Master of the Rolls, in discussing that objection, that the candidate not seated ought to have resorted to an election petition, made this statement:

Mr. THOMPSON.

"It is said that the returning officer having declared Pritchard duly elected and Pritchard having qualified and taken his place in the council, the office was filled by him *de facto*, and he could not be ousted, except upon petition. I have already said that the returning officer had no power to make that declaration and that it was void; if so, it is equally clear that what the town clerk, acting upon that declaration, did, was of no effect whatever; nor, if Pritchard was never properly elected either in form or substance can the fact that he assumed to qualify for the office make that which had gone before any less void."

I perfectly agree with the argument the hon. gentleman made, not only as to the importance of this case, but as to the right of the majority of the electors to have their candidate returned. In this case, however, whichever way the majority of votes was cast, the rights of other parties are concerned, and let not this House, in its zeal and haste to do justice to the majority, violate the rights of any other persons whomsoever. I am not going to propose that this resolution ought to be voted down; I am not going to urge the House to vote this afternoon that the argument I have endeavored to present as regards the propriety of leaving this case to the courts is one that this House ought to affirm. I have presented that view, first of all, because it is the view I honestly entertain; and, secondly, because I believe I have only to present to the House sufficient grounds for the House to conclude that at least it is an arguable case in order to induce the House to stay its hand from the measure which the hon. gentleman proposes, and by which he proposes to seat one of the candidates, and to enquire whether, without any hearing whatever, without any regard to his rights whatever, without ascertaining whether he has any rights whatever, it should unseat the gentleman who rightly or wrongly has acquired rights which cannot be taken from him without due and proper authority. Let us see for a moment whether it would not be more fair and more proper, in view of all the circumstances surrounding this case, and in view of its novelty, that the House should at least make some enquiry into the subject before taking this action. The House has a committee for the purpose of dealing with privileges and elections. It is a committee composed, to a large extent, of members having legal attainments, and it is a committee like that committee to which the case of King's county was referred in 1882. It is a committee which I am sure will command the confidence of the House, not only because its members have more opportunity of giving careful consideration to the matters connected with law and with parliamentary precedents than the House has, upon the spur of the moment, but because it is always recognised that this committee acts in relation to those elections with the same sense of responsibility as judges would do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand from the expressions of dissent which have come from the other side of the House, that that remark does not meet with the approval of some of my hon. friends.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear," but I may be able to convince him that I am not altogether mistaken in that matter, by reading to hon. members what an eminent member of this House said on that subject in 1882. The hon. member for West Durham then said:

"It has been my fortune when sitting among the majority in this House to have been concerned with the other hon. members in the settlement of two cases which affected the seats of the members of this House—one in which a member of their minority was concerned, the hon. member for Two Mountains, whose seat was attacked, and the other in which the right to sit here of an hon. gentleman, who at that time filled the chair, Mr. Speaker, you now occupy, was disputed. On those two occasions the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in both cases we were able to arrive at a unanimous deliverance, and to deal with them in a spirit which reflected, I think, no discredit on Parliament as a judiciary on those occasions."

I hope that those hon. gentlemen who express dissent from my remark will accept the authority of a gentleman for whose statements on that subject I, for one, entertain a very great respect. Now, Sir, on a former occasion, when a question like this was before the House, a good deal of use was made of the only authority that could be found in the debates of the Imperial House of Commons against a reference of this kind to a committee. In 1870 the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone was urged by an independent member of the House to refer the subject of the election of O'Donovan Rossa to a parliamentary committee, instead of dealing with it by resolution, and Mr. Gladstone's statement in reply to that view, in which he refused the proposition, is one which was repeatedly used on a former occasion to convince this House that it was undignified to take the step of referring questions of that kind to a parliamentary committee. It may possibly be that at a subsequent stage of this debate the same language of Mr. Gladstone will be used to convince the House that, on this occasion, it would be undignified to refer this matter to a committee; and I may be permitted, then, to express my humble opinion upon the reasons why the resistance of Mr. Gladstone should not induce this House to resist the motion which I intend to make on this occasion. The statement which I refer to, and which, as I said before, is the only authority to be found in the debates of the Imperial House of Commons for refusing a reference to a committee, is this:

"If this were a case in which, after the best investigation we can make, we thought that any good, fair, or reasonable doubt attached to the facts or the arguments of the case, or as to the course which the House ought to pursue, then I admit it might be the subject of a reference to a committee, especially if the question were one which involved the examination of a long and complicated series of precedents, such as it would be difficult to bring under the view of the House in debate. But Sir, in our view it is neither the one nor the other. The facts of the case are the fewest possible, and the principles applicable as clear as can be brought to bear on any question of parliamentary discussion, and I would submit that if that be the case, a proposal to enquire instead of a proposal to act, would not be becoming the dignity of this House."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. I see by this assent to Mr. Gladstone's view that I do not unduly anticipate the use they will make of this extract, but I hope hon. gentlemen will not submit that statement to the House as an authority against the resolution I propose to move, without calling the attention of the House fairly to the surrounding circumstances. In that case Mr. Gladstone could fairly challenge any member of the House to say that there were any facts or precedents at all requiring examination. The only fact as respects which there could have been even an investigation, was the identity of the person returned with the person convicted; and the hon. member of the House of Commons who was urging that the matter should be referred to a committee, so far from disputing the identity of the person convicted with the person returned, urged that it would be unjust and uncivilised to reject the person convicted, because he was regarded by his constituents as a patriot whose presence would not disgrace the House of Commons. In the arguments presented to the House the single fact about which there could be any dispute was admitted by the gentleman urging the reference to a committee. All the precedents were on one side. In this case, as I have shown the House already, since the change in the system by which election petitions have to be tried, the hon. gentleman who presented the case so well this afternoon on behalf of the candidate not returned, has been unable to mention a single instance in which any such power was exercised, either by the Imperial or by the Canadian House of Commons. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of the House for a few moments to the difference likewise between the modes proposed for dealing with the two cases—the case in which Mr. Gladstone declared that a reference to a committee would be undignified and that the proposal should

be to act and not to enquire, and the case we are dealing with this afternoon. Mr. Gladstone was proposing that nobody should be seated; he was asking the House simply to affirm that which the common law of England—as it was admitted on both sides of the House—distinctly declared, namely, that a felon, who had not finished his term of punishment, was not entitled to take his seat in the House of Commons, or be returned as a member of the House of Commons; and he might properly say that, inasmuch as it was merely inviting the House to affirm a general principle of law which was recognised all over the realm, it was undignified to refer so plain and simple a question to a committee—that it was undignified to hesitate to act in making that affirmation. The action which the House is asked to take this afternoon is very different. The House is asked to pronounce judgment on the rights, duties, and powers of returning officers, and not only that, but to do execution likewise, and say that one of the persons occupying a seat in this House is not entitled to this seat, and that without any enquiry whatever, without even the enquiry he is entitled to have in a court of law, if his seat should be attacked there, as to the right of the other gentleman to take his place in this House. Now, Sir, coming back to the point which I mentioned a few moments ago, that persons have acquired rights here other than the electors even, let me ask the attention of the House to the effect on those rights of the resolution which the hon. gentleman has proposed. Let us ask ourselves if, in this haste to do justice to the right of the majority of the electors in Queen's county, we are not taking away the rights of others. Let me ask the House if the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) is not moving that we should put the sitting member in a far worse position than he would have been if he had been petitioned against in the courts, and the election law, which we adopted ten years ago and upwards, carried out. Why, Sir, if that hon. gentleman were petitioned against in the courts, what would be his rights? He would have the right to retort against the gentleman whom the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) proposes at once to put in his place, and say: "If I am not entitled to the seat, you are not entitled to it either. You have been disqualified by corrupt practices; the election has been void in consequence of the corrupt practices of your agents. The election has been void in consequence of irregularities in connection with the conduct of the election; the election has been void in consequence of undue revision of the electoral lists, the want of jurisdiction, perhaps, of the reviser who revised them, and the want of the certification of the proper lists to the deputy returning officers." It would be his right, before his opponent should be put into the seat he occupies, to raise every one of these questions; and the hon. member for St. John proposes that we shall take away from him that right and put him in a far worse position than he would be in if Mr. King resorted to the procedure which the law of Canada lays down for a person who claims the seat. I mention that especially for the ears of the hon. gentlemen who cheered me ironically when I said that the rights of other parties than the majority of electors had to be considered. More than that, we have to consider this fact, that the hon. gentleman proposes that we should take away the right which any person has to petition against the sitting member. It may be that some elector of the county proposes to petition against him, and to disqualify him; and if this course of procedure can be followed—I am arguing the subject in an abstract way—the result will be that a member who is liable to disqualification can invite a friend in the House to move to unseat him and to seat his opponent, and thereby escape disqualification altogether. It may be thought that this is a very fanciful case, and yet in the Imperial House of Commons something like it was done only ten years ago. A member who was

afraid that he was incurring penalties which it would not be very convenient for him to pay, got himself unseated; but in that case the House was not asked to go the length we are asked to go this afternoon, of seating his opponent. Therefore I say we may be taking away the right of some one who desires to petition. More than that, we may be infringing the right of some person who has already petitioned. I understand that in the case of the hon. member for Queen's the time has not yet expired for presenting a petition, and it may be that the court to which we have given jurisdiction, by the Statute of 1574, for the trial of controverted elections, is already exercising that jurisdiction. If the matter goes before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, this is a question that can be enquired into. But it is proposed by the motion not to enquire into a matter of that kind at all, but to deal with the case summarily and let the court go on and exercise that jurisdiction or not, just as it pleases. If it be the case that a petition has already been entered, we shall have the anomaly of two jurisdictions—the jurisdiction of this House unseating the sitting member, and that of the court under the petition, seating or unseating him as it may please; and the singular result may be that, after we have decided, in our zeal to do what we thought was right without any enquiry at all, that Mr. King was entitled to the seat, the tribunal, which proceeded more leisurely, thinking it consistent with justice to hear both parties, might decide that he was not entitled to the seat after all. For these reasons I move in amendment to the resolution the hon. gentleman has moved:

That all the words after the word "That" where it first appears, be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: The return transmitted by John R. Dunn, the returning officer for Queen's county, in the Province of New Brunswick, at last election for said electoral district, together with all papers laid before the House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and relating to said election, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, with power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to report thereon with all convenient speed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me, Sir, that the motion made by the hon. Minister of Justice is altogether at variance with the line of argument he has addressed to the House. He has given us an elaborate argument in which he has undertaken to show that this House has no jurisdiction in the matter, that it divested itself of any authority it had by the creation of courts for the trial of controverted elections, and that it could not properly deal with this matter. That was the hon. gentleman's proposition; and notwithstanding the fact that he has elaborately defended it, he has concluded his speech with a motion to refer this case to a committee of the House to enquire into the propriety of taking any proceedings in a matter with reference to which he has declared that it would be improper for the House to take action. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement which it seems to me is not borne out by the precedents. He has said that because the House has referred the trial of controverted elections to the courts, it ought not to deal with a matter of this kind. We must bear in mind that the jurisdiction which the ordinary tribunals of the country possess under our Controverted Elections Act is precisely the same as the jurisdiction which was formerly vested in special committees of the House. We formerly appointed committees for the trial of controverted elections, which committees sat and dealt with those cases. We did not divest ourselves of any of the extraordinary jurisdiction committees did not exercise; and we have to look to what was the practice of the House before the House established the courts for the trial of controverted elections, to see whether we have retained to ourselves such power as is proposed to be exercised on this occasion. We know well that long after the trial of controverted elections by committees existed, the House took direct action in all cases such as this—where the returning officer had acted in a way grossly irregular, where, instead of complying

Mr. THOMPSON.

with the law, he had departed from it, and violated the principles which the law had laid down for his guidance in the conduct of the elections. The House of Commons, in such cases, did not refer the question to the committee with the view of contesting the election, but took action directly. Where there were no disputed facts, the House dealt directly with the matter. The first case in the history of this country was the case of the Beauharnois election, in which the member declared elected was excluded, and it was proposed to bring the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before the bar of the House, and to order the return to be amended accordingly. That was done in the case of the Kent election. The sheriff took exception to the qualification of the Hon. Malcolm Cameron, and made no return. The sheriff was brought to the bar of the House. The seat was given by the House to Mr. Cameron, and the officer who had acted irregularly was dismissed. In the Oxford case the returning officer returned, not the party having the majority of votes, but the candidate who had the minority of votes. The returning officer refused to return Sir Francis Hincks, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was brought to the bar of the House and ordered to amend the return so as to give to Sir Francis Hincks the seat. I need not go over the list of cases. In not one of them was there any attempt to deal with the question on the line laid down by the hon. the Minister of Justice. There were committees for the trial of controverted elections, these committees had the jurisdiction the courts have now, and no one seriously argued that the cases I have referred to were proper cases to bring before the committee for the trial of controverted elections. On the contrary, they were held to be gross and improper violations of the rights and privileges of Parliament, and the House corrected the returns accordingly. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Bangor case quoted by my hon. friend, and he says that in this case the returning officer was not required to make any declaration, and that his declaration was therefore *ultra vires*. He quoted the words of Lord Esher, the Master of the Rolls: "I have already said the returning officer had no power to make that declaration, and that it was void." But the hon. gentleman argued he had no power to make any declaration. Does the Master of the Rolls say so? Does he maintain any such proposition? On the contrary, he says that he had no power to make the declaration he did make, which returned the candidate in the minority, and the Master of the Rolls quotes the Statute to say it was his duty to make the return—

Mr. THOMPSON. Does not the Master of the Rolls say he had no return to make? He has no return to make to anybody as in the case of a parliamentary election.

Mr. MILLS. The Master of the Rolls quotes the words of the Statute:

"It is not, as in sec. 2 of the Ballot Act, 1872, that the returning officer shall forthwith declare 'to be elected' the candidate to whom the majority of votes has been given, but that he shall give public notice of the name of the candidate 'elected,' showing that the rule was intended to apply to an election which had been before completed."

These are the words, and the hon. gentleman's statements, if not calculated to mislead, nevertheless would have the effect of misleading the House. Now, the Master of the Rolls goes on to say, referring to the declaration, that the returning officer had a declaration to make, and that was to state the number of votes given, and declare the person who had the majority elected:

"I therefore say that the returning officer had no power whatever to declare Pritchard elected, and the declaration to that effect which he made in the placard issued the day after the election was *ultra vires* and void."

Why? Not because he had no declaration to make, but because he had no power to make the declaration stating the candidate of the minority should be returned, when the law

expressly orders him to return the candidate of the majority. The same view was put forward by Mr. Justice Lindley. These eminent judges do not say that the returning officer has not judicial power, but they say if he had such power, the time to exercise it was when the candidates were before him for nomination. Having accepted the nomination, he already had passed judicially, if he had judicial power, upon the subject. Having accepted the nomination, he has no duty, says the Master of Rolls, other than the arithmetical one of summing up the number of votes and returning the candidate who had the majority. That is the position laid down in this judgment, a position wholly different to that taken by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, has not carefully looked at the judgments given in this case. If we examine the judgment of the Master of Rolls and of Mr. Justice Lindley, we will see that they assumed that, after the election has taken place, the act of the returning officer is a ministerial act, and that if he has a judicial power, the time has gone by when that power might have been fairly exercised. What did this returning officer, Mr. Dunn, do in this case? He accepted the nomination and the deposit. He gave a receipt for the deposit; he issued the proclamation; he named the polling places; he had the ballots printed upon which were printed the names of the candidates. The electors took these ballots and marked them for one candidate or the other. Now, what duty had the returning officer to discharge. Had he to go back and do what the eminent judges in this case say that the returning officer cannot do, namely, review his own act and set it aside? He had no other duty than to return the candidate who had the majority of votes. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who has any doubt on that question? and is he prepared to interfere with the liberties of Parliament and the rights of the people by keeping in his place a man whom the evidence shows conclusively was notoriously in the minority? The hon. gentleman has referred to the case of Mr. John Mitchel. Mr. Gladstone, if he had acted according to the hon. gentleman's view, ought to have allowed the courts to pass judgment on that case, and if there had been no provision, the House would have been helpless. But, the hon. gentleman says, although Mr. Gladstone excluded a man who was notoriously disqualified, he did not seat his opponent. No, because Mr. Gladstone did not propose to do that which is illegal, because he did not propose to give the seat to the man who was in the minority, against whom the majority of the legal votes of the constituency had been recorded. Why, what is the rule? It is well stated, in many judgments of the courts, that the candidate of the minority is not entitled to the seat unless the people voted perversely, unless it was brought clearly before them that the candidate for whom they proposed to vote was disqualified and that they would throw away their votes if they voted for him. The facts and the law must be clearly and specifically stated and brought home to the electors before the candidate of the minority is entitled to the seat. That is clearly shown, and upon that ground the hon. gentleman, who is returned to this House, was not entitled to the seat and was not entitled to be returned. The highest qualification is the receipt of a majority of the qualified votes that are cast in the election. Now, he does not possess that qualification. And the hon. gentleman, in the face of the law, which says that the returning officer shall return the candidate having the majority of votes, and when he knows that the returning officer did not return such candidate, but, on the contrary, disregarded the law and returned the candidate having the minority of votes, nevertheless asks this House to maintain that man in his position.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg your pardon, I did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does anyone doubt that fact when the hon. gentleman proposes to refer this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when the time is nearly expired for petitioning? The hon. gentleman has suggested a petition. Who has said that there is a petition against this man? We petition against a party who has apparently a right to the seat, but there is before this House evidence to show, as clearly as day itself, that the hon. gentleman who is returned from Queen's is not entitled to sit in this House, that the returning officer, to use the words of Mr. Justice Lopes in this case, instead of complying with the law, departed from the law, and that his return is no return at all. That is what the judge said in that case. Where is the difference? I think that the hon. gentleman has made out no ground. I have called the attention of the House to the fact that all cases of this class were referred not to the Committee on Controverted Elections, and are therefore not proper to be referred to the courts which took their place, but were regarded as proper cases to be dealt with by the House, and the rule is as valid to-day, and in this case, as it was in regard to any of the cases on which the House acted in former years. I again say that the highest qualification, the best right a man can have to sit in Parliament is the fact that he has obtained a majority of votes. That is a necessary qualification, paramount to all others, and of more consequence than all others. It is that by which the party is entitled to take the seat in the first instance. If Mr. King has been guilty of bribery, if he has acted in an improper manner, then it will be open to Mr. Baird or to any other party in the constituency to contest Mr. King's election. He will be exactly in the same position that he would have been in if the returning officer had done his duty. It is the interest of this House to see that the returning officers who act improperly have no countenance given to their misconduct, and that we shall not hesitate for a moment to do what is right and proper in the matter by giving the seat to the candidate having the majority of votes, leaving the other party to rely on the remedy which the law may give him.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). The importance of this subject which is now engaging the attention of the House has been alluded to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), who addressed the House this afternoon, and I think, from the remarks he made, he fully appreciated the novelty of the proposition he has introduced into the House and brought before its consideration to-day. I cannot say so much for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I do not think he has shown any great desire to regard this matter solely from a judicial point of view, and entirely devoid of any political feeling or partisanship. I hope that in the debate which will be carried on, I have no doubt, for some time, all hon. gentlemen will approach this question as one purely of law, because no speaker in the debate has hitherto, and I venture to say no speaker yet will, deny that the proposition now before the House of Commons is purely a legal question. The resolution, as it stands, I venture to say, cannot possibly meet with the approval of either side of the House. As it reads it would stultify the House of Commons, and I have no doubt that, when I point out to the House the curious form in which it stands at present, very few hon. gentlemen will be as ready as the hon. member for Bothwell to agree to vote for it. The resolution, if carried, would say and would enact that Mr. King was the duly returned member for this House, no other candidate having been properly nominated. That would be untrue in fact and contradicted by the return itself and by the recitals of the resolution in which the return is set out. I might also say, that another important point comes up in consideration of the form of the resolution and of the proposition before the House in connection with

the fifth section of chapter 9 of the Acts of 1886, because, in reference to the petition which could be presented by the person aggrieved or by the person considering that he was entitled to be returned, that petition must complain of an undue return or undue election of a member, and, as the House will see at once, if this resolution passed, we would be depriving Mr. Baird, the present member of this House, of the right to petition against the return of Mr. King. I venture to say that this resolution, in those two points, will require very careful and mature consideration before those gentlemen who, on the merits of the case, are disposed to decide in favor of Mr. King and against Mr. Baird, will support it. I think the House, having listened to the very able and very thorough argument of the Minister of Justice touching the practice of Parliament in the past, and touching the legislation of 1868 in the English House of Commons, and the legislation of 1874 in this House, must have been struck with the reply of the hon. member for Bothwell. He dwelt very considerably on the old cases, which, I think, most members will agree cannot affect the very important question touched upon by the Minister of Justice, since they were all parliamentary cases referred to by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution this afternoon. I think the whole question hinges upon the clause in the Controverted Elections Act, introduced, I may add, by the Reform party, by the party opposite, in the year 1874, in the Bill they brought down to the House dealing with controverted elections at that time. I think that that clause of the Act is the one to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in his argument paid the least attention, and I do not consider that the position taken by the Minister of Justice, upon the interpretation of that clause and its effect, has been considered by him. The Minister of Justice was twitted somewhat by the hon. member for Bothwell with having taken an inconsistent position on this question. I deny that entirely. I say the member for Bothwell could not have listened to the speech delivered to the House this afternoon and come to that conclusion, because, while the Minister of Justice mentioned the very important matters which were to be considered in connection with this important step which the House was asked to take, he pointed out that there was no authority for the course the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) wishes the House to pursue, while, on the other hand, there were many cases which pointed to the House not having the right to consider the case at all. And under all these circumstances, and as it is a case of great importance, bringing the question here for the first time for our consideration, the Minister of Justice was willing that this matter should be carefully considered and carefully threshed out in the regular way before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The two positions were not inconsistent. The Privileges and Elections Committee, if they agree with the views of the Minister of Justice, may very properly report to this House that, having investigated these cases, having looked into the legislation, having compared, for instance, the sections of the Ballot Act, on which so much stress is laid, with the sections of our Controverted Election Act, they have come to the conclusion that the matter should not be entertained, nor be dealt with in the House of Commons. Therefore, if that be so, it was not only consistent, but, from many points of view, highly proper, that this course should be taken. I, myself, having looked into this subject, with, I hope, a judicial spirit, have come to the conclusion that perhaps, if the Minister of Justice had taken the course which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) desires, that the position of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) should be directly challenged and the matter discussed here—I, myself, should have thought that course a proper one, because I believe that the matter is not properly before this House, and I propose to show that before I sit down. I wish now to

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

refer to the allusion made by the hon. member for Bothwell, to the Mitchel case, and his claim that if the contention of the Minister of Justice was sound, that would have been sent to the courts. That case was sent to the courts and dealt with by them, and Mr. Gladstone took no such course, and no such course was taken as is proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell to be followed to-day. Now, the senior member for St. John, in introducing this matter, appealed to us to consider the question calmly and judicially, but I do not think that he showed much of the spirit of the judge in his discussion of that portion of the subject. I have great respect for the opinions of the senior member for St. John as a commercial lawyer; I believe his standing as a brilliant commercial lawyer is acknowledged by both sides of this House, but I do not think much of his judicial opinion in reference to an election petition while he is a member for St. John. I have no doubt that when he reaches the position, to which he will undoubtedly some day be entitled, we will all place the greatest confidence in the opinions which he may give concerning an election; but as member for St. John I think his utterances will have to be watched carefully and weighed well. For instance, before he sat down he adverted to the conduct of the returning officer, who certainly has some rights, who is to conduct his functions in the face of a Statute imposing tremendous pains and penalties upon him for disobedience in any one of his duties; and I think the member for St. John alluded to his conduct in a spirit that was hardly judicial—in fact, I believe that before he sat down he had worked himself up into such a feeling that he would have supported a resolution to draw and quarter the returning officer in this case, when he charged him with “gross dereliction of duty, and hoped the House would not tolerate such conduct on the part of a returning officer when his duty was so clearly pointed out by the Statute.” Another position taken by the member for St. John I challenge. He stated to the House that with the nomination, or what was done at the nomination for Queen’s, we had nothing to do; that was not material; that we had only to skip the sections, virtually, in the Controverted Elections Act regarding what was to be done at the nomination, and to skip all the sections regarding the duties of the returning officer, and to come down to the counting of the votes. I say, that properly to treat this subject, we must, of necessity, begin at the beginning, and ascertain what the duties of the returning officer were at the nomination, and whether, having done anything at the time of the nomination improper and contrary to the imperative language of the Statute, he had power to rectify that mistake before he made his return. Whether my opinions on that point are right or wrong, certainly I think that the hon. member for St. John erred in thinking that to be all the question before us. There was one thing, one sentence that dropped from the hon. member, to which I call particular attention. He stated that “if any of the proceedings were irregular, there is a tribunal provided in the Controverted Elections Act by which the returns can be rectified.” That was the only portion of his speech with which I heartily concur. We have that tribunal. The Minister of Justice has pointed out that this matter is one for that tribunal. I do not understand that the hon. member for Bothwell has challenged that position, and I think that no member of the legal profession in this House will say that this matter could not have been brought before the legal tribunal pointed out by the Controverted Elections Act, and dealt with satisfactorily there. Now, much has been said in reference to the Ballot Act of 1872. That was the Act before the judges in the case to which so much attention has been paid to-day, the case of the Queen and the Mayor of Bangor. It was with the provisions of that Act that the judges of the court were then dealing. The Minister of Justice has directed the attention of the House to the fact that that case, as it stands,

and admitting the position taken by the hon. gentleman, does not bear them out as they believe it does. I wish to draw the attention of the House to another aspect of that case, in which I shall differ with the hon. member for St. John, when he says that the Ballot Act of 1872 and our Elections Act are virtually one and the same Act, so far as their provisions are concerned. Now, I will point out to this House that there is a marked difference. In the first place the clauses which are enactments in the Act before us, in the Controverted Elections Act, are merely rules appended to the Ballot Act of 1872, and I do not think the members of the profession in the House will challenge the statement that the rules appended to a Statute are, as a general thing, directory, whereas in an enactment they are imperative. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the provisions regarding the duties of a returning officer in the Ballot Act of 1872, are found in the rules, while in the Act before us they are positive enactments—so that there at once you see a great difference between the Ballot Act and the Controverted Elections Act. Now, there is another great difference between these two Acts. The Ballot Act of 1872 specially provides a time for and a time when the returning officer is bound to consider the validity of the nomination papers placed before him. There is a time specially marked out for him to exercise his judicial functions; there is a time marked out in these rules at which all objections to a nomination paper must be presented; and the rules go on to say that after that any question regarding the returning officer's decision as to the nomination paper must be raised after the election, and by petition, and that there is no time in which the returning officer can change his opinion or disallow objections allowed, or allow objections disallowed to these papers. And the House will see at once that the difference renders the case and renders the decision so much commented on, entirely inapplicable to the case before us. What are those rules—and they are not in the Acts, as I have said, regulating elections in the Dominion of Canada? Rule 6 in this Ballot Act of 1872, after mentioning the manner in which candidates have to be nominated, goes on to say:

"No objection to a nomination paper on the ground of the description of the candidate therein being insufficient, or not being in compliance with this rule, shall be allowed or deemed valid, unless such objection is made by the returning officer, or by some other person, at or immediately after the time of the delivery of the nomination paper."

And rule 12 says:

"A person shall not be entitled to have his name inserted in any ballot paper as a candidate unless he has been nominated in manner provided by this Act; and every person whose nomination paper has been delivered to the returning officer during the time appointed for the election, shall be deemed to have been nominated in manner provided by this Act, unless objection be made to his nomination paper by the returning officer, or some other person, before the expiration of the time appointed for the election, or within one hour afterwards."

With those two rules, is it to be wondered at that the courts in England, when this question was brought before them by petition, should have said that after that decision is given, after the returning officer has exercised those judicial functions, it is a mere matter of count, he proceeds to follow out the duties appointed by the Act. Why, hon. gentlemen will not question the correctness of such a decision there, when I mention to the House that these clauses are not in our Act, and that, moreover, we have entirely different clauses in regard to the nominations and what is to be then done than they have in the English Act; and that difference is at the very bottom of this case, as it is in regard to the proceedings with respect to the nomination paper. The hon. gentleman will see that the case of the Queen vs. the Mayor of Bangor can be relied upon in no degree whatever in the discussion now before the House. The Canadian Act, chapter 8, section 22, contains a provision that will not be found in the Ballot Act, nor in the existing Act of 1863, of England:

"No nomination paper shall be valid and acted upon by the returning officer unless it is accompanied by the consent in writing of the person therein nominated, except when such person is absent from the Province in which the election is to be held, in which case such absence shall be stated in the nomination paper; and unless a sum of \$200 is deposited in the hands of the returning officer at the time the nomination paper is filed with him; and the receipt of the returning officer shall, in any case, be sufficient evidence of the production of the nomination paper, of the consent of the candidate and of the payment herein mentioned."

Taking that section of the Act, together with the section towards the end of the Act in regard to the payment of any deposit before or after the election, and to which section I shall allude later on, the House will see at once that we have to face a position of affairs that cannot be found in any election case, parliamentary or otherwise, in England, nor in any Act that obtains there. In the view I take of this question I do not think it is necessary for the House to thresh out that question of law. I may mention to the House that the very question which is considered by some hon. gentlemen so easy to dispose of and decide, is now before the election courts in Nova Scotia, that it is a point relied upon by one of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and in maintaining that position in opposition to the one taken to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, that gentleman hopes yet to become a member of the House of Commons of Canada. So, the House will see that the question involved in this election is not merely a legal one, but it is a question in regard to which more authority than the case of the Queen vs. the Mayor of Bangor will be required and much more argument addressed to the House before it will follow the decision given in that case. I may say to hon. gentlemen who do not belong to the legal profession, or say for them, that it is worth our while considering how this clause 68, Chap. 9 of the Canadian Act, came to be the law in Canada. In 1868 that legislation was first introduced. In the case of England it was introduced after a tremendous agitation had been made for such an enactment; and although that clause was much discussed in the Imperial Parliament and much discussed before it was brought to the notice of Parliament, I am surprised to find that in Canada, in 1874, that clause received very little attention when the Election Act was introduced in the House by the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Fournier. The reason was that for over four hundred years the House of Commons of England had been contending with the legal tribunals for the jurisdiction over election cases, and those parliamentary courts whose decisions had been appealed to had so offended by their decisions the sense of independent minds in England, that dissatisfaction arose and it became so strong that this change was deemed necessary. Over four hundred years ago, before the Election Act of 1868, legislation had been passed authorising the judges of assizes to enquire into the elections of members of Parliament; but this particular clause was not introduced into any of the Acts till 1868, and it became necessary then because Parliament assumed jurisdiction in every case of question as to the election and return of one of its members, and the conduct of its committees from time to time gave rise to scandals, and it was considered improper that members of Parliament should be judges of their own cases. What are we asked to do to-day? We are asked to decide, not only the question of Queen's county, but questions involved in a petition against the return of an hon. member in Nova Scotia. We are virtually deciding what may prove at some time to be our own case, and that of other hon. members. Is it proper that we should deliberately sit in judgment on a case with which we are connected? Surely no one but a hypocrite would say that we can enter into this case utterly devoid of partisan feeling and political bias? If that is the case, is it not wise to follow the letter, or, at all events, the spirit of the Act which relegated all these political or quasi-political questions to the legal tribunals? I think such a reference

would be a result which everyone should strive to reach, a result that would take from us the responsibility of dealing with what I have pointed out to be a question in which we are all personally interested. In order to lead the House to understand the importance of this question, I trust hon. members will bear with me while I read one or two extracts from a very eminent member of the bar, written before the present Election Act was introduced into England, for his remarks embody opinions which I might imperfectly express. Sergeant Palling, in 1866, said :

"The claim of the House of Commons to alone adjudicate on the validity of its own members is a principle very objectionable. It is, in fact, neither more nor less than the claim of a body of individuals to act as judges in their own case."

Again, he said, in 1869, after the Act of 1863 :

"It has come to be at last recognised in the case of the House of Commons, as in that of other elective bodies, that all questions affecting the due return of the individual members who constitute it must not only be regulated by the general law of the land, but be disposed of by tribunals emanating and wholly governed by such law. There can now be no retrograde movement; nothing can upset the concession thus solemnly made to the nation, that all questions affecting the election of its representatives in Parliament must henceforth be disposed of by an established system of judicial enquiry, wholly free from the bias, the defects and the inevitable evils of the election committee."

Then Rogers, who is an authority on the law regarding elections, says :

"The House of Commons from the earliest time claimed and exercised the exclusive right of deciding upon the validity of all elections to its own body; its exercise was first regulated by Statute in 1707, by the Grenville Act, which provided for the decision of such questions by select committees of the House. The decisions of many of these committees have been reported and are still of authority where there is no statutory direction for the Court to follow.

"The right of deciding such questions has now, by the Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, (31 and 32 Vict. chap. 125) been transferred to the tribunal (consisting originally of one judge, but since 1879 of two, under 42 and 43 Vict. chap. 75) created by that Act, so far as elections are concerned; but the House retains the right of deciding upon the qualifications of its members.

"The last-mentioned right has been exercised in several instances since the transfer of the jurisdiction over petitions to the judges; e.g. in the case of Sir S. Waterlow, who was declared disqualified under 22 Geo. III, chap. 45 (relating to contractors) by a select committee in 1869, and in the cases of O'Donovan Rossa, whose election was declared void by the House in 1870, and John Mitchel, an escaped convict, whose first election in 1875 was disregarded by the House; also in the more recent cases of Sir Bryan O'Loughlin, in 1879, who had accepted an office of profit under the Crown; of Michael Davitt a convicted felon in 1882; and of Mr. Bradlaugh, who was expelled in the same year."

And while mentioning the name of Mr. Davitt, and recollecting the allusion made by the Minister of Justice to that case, I would point out to the House that, as far as the proposition for which I am contending is concerned, legal gentlemen of high standing in the debate on that occasion challenged the position taken by the Attorney General of that day, Sir Henry James. It will be found that in that discussion these legal gentlemen contended that even as regards the question of disqualification or the eligibility of the members of the House, the House of Commons by this clause to which I have directed attention, had relegated the whole matter to the tribunals of the land. And in the Tipperary case that position was taken by counsel at the bar, and the argument was addressed to the court that even in those cases the House of Commons had by that Act deprived itself of its authority. They, of course, admitted that the House of Commons could pass another Act and so arrange to bring the matter within their jurisdiction, but that while the Act stood unrepealed they had no right to deal with a case touching the election of members, no right to deal with the eligibility of members to sit in the House of Commons; but in the Tipperary case the court gave a decision neither one way nor the other, as they were able to arrive at a decision without dealing with that point. This only shows to what a length this provision in the Act will carry us in cases of this kind. Now, every authority that the hon. gentlemen can find in the library, all the leading authorities of the day regarding election petitions, go to

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

show that the position taken by the Minister of Justice is sound, and that this House has nothing to do with the consideration of the due return or election of a member to the House, because in those cases which have been pointed out the only causes affecting the eligibility of a candidate or his disqualification in which this House can act are when the candidate is a felon, a minor, a convict or a woman.

An hon. MEMBER. Why refer it then?

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friend asks, why then refer it? I have already stated that from the search I have made on this occasion, I think that if the Minister of Justice took the strict position he is entitled to take, in virtue of these cases, he would not refer it for a moment, but would call on the House at once and summarily to dispose of it and refer it to the tribunal appointed by the country. But the minister's position is very strong, and should commend itself to my brother judges in this matter. So anxious is he that a judicial spirit should prevail, so ready to admit that this is a case of the kind that should engage the attention of the House that he is willing that all those cases with which individual members have made themselves acquainted should be carefully examined and calmly discussed in the committee, and then that the committee may take such a course as to it may seem proper. I think his position is an extremely strong one; he is not technical, but I consider that he has shown a desire to-day to be eminently just. Now Leigh and Marchant, in their "Law of Elections," quote this section, and our Act is just the same as the English :

"From and after the next dissolution of Parliament no election or return to Parliament shall be questioned except in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

The words are not exactly the same as in our Act, but any one, I think, will see that there is no substantial difference between that clause and the clause of our Act. The text writer goes on to say :

"Questioned means questioned by election petition, by persons having an interest in raising the question and wishing to vindicate their own rights, and does not take away from the House of Commons their authority to decide on the eligibility of a candidate, in the event of a felon, a minor, or a woman being returned. So in the case of O'Donovan Rossa, convicted of treason-felony under the 'Crown and Government Security Act, 1848,' who was returned for the county of Tipperary, the House of Commons agreed almost unanimously, on 10th February, 1870, 'That he, Rossa, having been adjudged guilty of felony and sentenced to penal servitude for life, and being now imprisoned under such sentence, has become and continues incapable of being elected or returned a member of the House.' A similar resolution was passed on the election of John Mitchel, a convicted felon, and an alien, as member for the same county; and it is to be noticed that this power of declaring ineligible by resolution, a person who has been elected, does not involve as a consequence that the resolution of the House of Commons can, *per se*, affix a disability not previously existing. If the House of Commons had not this power, it would make the rejection of a disqualified member contingent on a petition being presented. By the exercise of this power the House of Commons might refer to the consideration of a committee the seat of a member called in question by any member of the House; for instance, when a member accepts an old office of profit from the Crown, and has not sought re-election, and no writ has been issued for a new election; or, as in Sir S. Waterlow's case; or when a member already holding one office of profit received another to hold with the first, and does not vacate his seat. In the two latter cases it would seem that no other mode of raising the question would be left, as these cases would not fall within the provisions of the Parliamentary Elections Act of 1868."

Because, as you will see, the time for petitioning and the procedure would not at all apply to these cases, which might arise long after a general election. Well, to come nearer home, we have the decision in the Bagot case, in 1879, after the Act of 1874 became law. We have that decision, Mr. Speaker, given by one of your predecessors which, while it was not on all fours with this, throws some light on the point to which I address myself, and with the permission of the House I will read an extract from that decision, because on that occasion the opinion of the House was unanimous. As stated by the Speaker of this House, the matter was not within the jurisdiction of the House since the legislation to which I have referred was introduced.

The Speaker in the Bagot case, after a petition had been presented to a court of law, simply because charges had been made that collusion had occurred or that for some other reasons the election had been carried on improperly or corruptly, ruled the petition out of order, and went on to deal with the case in the way I have been stating :

" Now, the only question that this House has to consider is whether this petition is not in effect a petition questioning the return of a member, which, as it has been admitted on both sides, cannot be properly received by the House, in view of the fact that it has divested itself of its right of trying such matters by referring them to the jurisdiction of an independent judicial tribunal. In handing over this power to the Courts, the House still reserve to itself the right of taking notice of any legal disabilities affecting its members, and issuing writs in the room of members judged to be incapable of sitting ; but the petition now under consideration, both in its terms and scope, is a petition questioning the return of a member, and not within the purview of this House."

And what does the resolution propose that this House should do but question the return of an hon. member of this House just as much as a petition could ?

" By the Act 57 Vic., chap. 10, the House of Commons divested itself of its original jurisdiction for the trial of all matters growing out of the election and return of members having the right to sit therein, including the withdrawal and abatement of any election petition in consequence of alleged corrupt agreement between the parties concerned. That power now belongs to the courts of justice, which try all election cases in conformity with the Statutes in that behalf provided.

" The 63rd section of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, expressly provides that all elections held after the passing of the said Act shall be subject to the provisions thereof, and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance therewith, showing clearly that the determination of the judicial body, to whom that power has been delegated, is final to all intents and purposes.

" Now, the petition in question declares, in express terms, that the city member has no right to the position he occupies, —"

I will ask hon. gentlemen to substitute the word " resolution " for " petition."

—" and were the prayer of the petitioners granted, the logical result would be the virtual resumption by the House of the jurisdiction which it has in its wisdom handed to the courts."

" To grant the prayer of the petition would be to violate the general principle which lies at the basis of all the legislation adopted by the English Parliament since 1868, and by the Canadian Parliament since 1873, that the court should alone adjudicate on matters of controverted elections. When the law has been proved to be inadequate to provide a sufficient remedy in any case, then Parliament has always come forward, as the various statutes in amendment of the Act of 1874 proved, and passed the legislation necessary in the premises. In view, then, of the fact that the petition is in conflict with the letter and spirit of the law which governs the House in such cases, and does in effect question the right of an hon. member to his seat, I have to decide that the objection raised by the hon. member for Bagot is well taken, and that the petition cannot be received."

I think that decision bears upon the case before the House. Hon. members may say that while it is true that the question of a member's seat is the concern here, the returning officer is under the authority of this House, that he has acted contrary to his express duty, and that his conduct is properly before Parliament. I deny that position as equally unsound with the position taken in this case, because the Act has expressly provided that the conduct of the returning officer may be reviewed. In cases where he has not properly performed his duties, he may be and is sometimes a respondent to an election petition, and the Act expressly provides how and when the conduct of that returning officer may come before this House. It is not until the judge has investigated it, before whom the returning officer is entitled, as he is not here, to have counsel to defend him, and then the judge is bound to report his conduct to the House. When that report is made, the conduct of the returning officer can properly be dealt with here, as was done in days of old. They used to bring some of those officers before the House and make them kneel and go through gymnastics not at all in accordance with the spirit of to-day ; and it is to those musty old precedents the honorable gentleman has mostly referred. In support of the contention that the returning officer's conduct is not properly before us to-day, any more than the petition should be, I will read to the House the opinion of a text-writer in

reference to the provision of our statute, which is contained in the English Act. Rogers says :

" The jurisdiction of the House of Commons over returning officers does not seem to be taken away by the Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, although the judges, and not a committee, would hear and adjudicate on any complaint against them. The judge, it seems, would make a special report to the House under section 11, if necessary, upon which the House would act as they thought fit."

Then the discretion of the returning officer has been spoken of, and my learned friends have stated what he ought to have done. Now, suppose this matter is before the House, and suppose it is differently considered by the judge of the election court from what it is by the House. Suppose the judges come to the conclusion that this return was a proper one, and that the return in the Nova Scotia case I have alluded to was an improper one. In the latter case the judgment will be in answer to the prayer that the returning officer ought to have done in the Nova Scotia case exactly what he did in the case before us, because, as everybody knows, the prayer in the Nova Scotia case, which is the converse of this, is that the returning officer ought to have returned the other candidate, and this question of the minority of votes would come up. In reference to the discretion of returning officers, Rogers says :

" It would seem that the returning officer is not subject to any liability as far as Parliament is concerned if he returned a disqualified person, nor on the other hand could he well be censured for exercising his judgment as to eligibility of a candidate and returning the person whom the judge ultimately decides to be entitled to the seat ; for in most of the cases in which a disqualified person has been returned, the form of the resolution of the Election Committee has been that the petitioner ought to have been returned."

So that, in the view I take of the matter, the returning officer, while he could have taken one of two courses, was at perfect liberty, and cannot be properly censured by this House for having adopted the course he did. Having exercised the discretion which I believe was given to him by the provisions of the Act, whether he exercised it rightly or wrongly, he would not in fairness be subject to the rebuke or censure of this House. Now, if the House will bear in mind certain sections in our Act, and not confine themselves to that section which states what the returning officer must do in counting up the votes, they will find that it is impossible to maintain the position that the returning officer has no discretion. His discretionary powers are many and of great importance. Under chap. 8, section 28, he has to report as to the non-compliance with any of the provisions of the Act. I have suggested with reference to the nomination that it is imperative, in order to be a candidate at all, a man must not only be nominated by so many electors, but must make a deposit in a certain way. The officer has no discretion. He has no final authority, but is bound to follow out the Act to the best of his ability, and a heavy penalty can be inflicted upon him if he does not. Chap. 8, section " I " invests him with discretionary powers also in reference to being bound to return the person who ought to be returned. I can say there is strong authority to show that the member for Queen's has been properly returned. There is authority in Ontario, that of Judge Wilson, who, in a case there, pointed out that in many respects our returning officers have judicial discretion, or powers not purely ministerial. In the Ballot Act, moreover, there is a definition of a candidate. In our Election Act there is no such clause, and I say that makes a vast difference. In the Ballot Act it is something to the effect that the " person who has been nominated " and so forth, whereas in our Act the candidate cannot be considered in the eyes of the law entitled to be returned unless the section " I " referred to is complied with, and the deposit made by the proper party.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER. Before six o'clock I was dwelling upon the 68th clause, chap. 9 of the Act of 1836, which says:

"All elections shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance herewith."

I do not remember having read that section before this evening. I read the section in the English Act from which it is taken, and claim that substantially the two clauses are the same, and that therefore the authorities to which I drew the attention of the House in connection with the interpretation were perfect. I would like to read the two clauses of chap. 8, which must be taken together, in order that the point upon which the decision of the returning officer was given, or in reference to which the returning officer took the action he did in the case of the selection for Queen's, may be appreciated, and the House will understand, from the position I took, that it does not to me matter much whether he was right or wrong in the interpretation of his duty under this clause, because the election courts alone have to do with that. These two sections read as follows: Section 22, of chap. 8, after stating how the nomination should be drawn up in writing, makes it imperative that the \$200 shall be deposited in the hands of the returning officer when the nomination paper is filed, and goes on to say:

"The amount so deposited shall be returned in a certain event. Section 118 says that no payment (except in respect of the personal expenses of a candidate), and no advance, loan or deposit shall be made by or on behalf of any candidate at any election, before or during or after such election, on account of such election, otherwise than through an agent or agents whose name or names, address or addresses, have been declared in writing to the returning officer, on or before the nomination day, or through an agent or agents to be appointed in his or their place, as herein provided."

I referred to authorities in England, which went to show that the language in that clause of the Act, though the precise language is not in the Election Act, as they have no clause similar to this requiring a deposit, but still the language in the body of the Act is imperative, and I pointed out too that there was no particular time for the returning officer to take the responsibility of directing what course should be pursued in regard to the rejection or acceptance of these papers. In the case of the Canadian Act, the returning officer has up to the time of making the return the right to treat the nomination paper as valid or otherwise. The responsibility lies with him. I point this out to show the arguable point, and the question involved in it, and I claim that these reasons require that this House should not touch a matter involving that peculiarly legal point. Now, reference has been made to the conduct of the returning officer, and to this case as an extraordinary one and particularly unfair to Mr. King. Naturally, at first blush one would say that the candidate or person receiving the majority of votes was entitled to the seat, and undoubtedly that is the fact. The candidate duly nominated, under the provisions of the Election Act, and having the majority of votes, is entitled to the seat, and the candidate duly nominated, if he did obtain the majority of votes under this act would get his seat, and this House cannot unless by Act of Parliament prevent him taking his seat here, but he must go through a certain preliminary stage before taking that seat. What hardship is there, supposing Mr. King to have the right to sit in the House, after he has proceeded in due course to law, in his case more than in the case of the other gentlemen who are claiming the same right, not by virtue of any mistake or misdeed of the returning officer, but on account of gross bribery on the part of the gentlemen who have been returned, and whom they hope to unseat? Then, if we come to what is fair, if we are to leave aside the legal aspect of this question and put it to ourselves as men, I think there is something to be said on the other side. I do not think that all the fairness or all the justice, according to

Mr. TUPPER (Picton).

the popular idea, is with Mr. King in this dispute. As the parties stand now, without the action of the House, which is desired by my hon. friend opposite, being taken, the law will give Mr. King all that he is entitled to. No one has challenged the proposition I have laid down that Mr. King can assert the rights which his friends claim for him in a court of law, and can obtain the position he claims, if his contention is sound. So the parties are upon an equal footing and the courts are equally open to them. But, if the House takes the step my hon. friend proposes, what will be the effect in regard to Mr. Baird? I ask the consideration of hon. gentlemen who will follow me in this debate to this point. You are depriving Mr. Baird in that way of all the rights which the returning officer believes he possesses, which he believes he possesses, and which a great many of the legal profession believe he possesses, at once and forever, because in that case he cannot get his case examined by a legal tribunal, he cannot go into an election court and have his case investigated as against Mr. King. That is a position we ought to hesitate before taking, because in that way we will do an incalculable injustice to Mr. Baird, and Mr. Baird cannot get rid of our action in any tribunal in this country. Even if we err in our decision as regards this point to which I have alluded, and if I am wrong and the returning officer is wrong in his view of the law, that can all be rectified, not by political partisans or on political considerations, but in due course of law and in the tribunal which we all must think the best fitted to deal with a question of this kind. Reference has been made to the terrible outrage perpetrated by a returning officer in returning a candidate who had the minority of votes. I alluded a little while ago to the fact that a candidate who was legally nominated according to the Act, and obtained a majority of votes under the law, was entitled to his return; but the proposition of my hon. friends is not equally true that any person who obtains a majority is entitled to the seat and ought to be returned by the returning officer. In the Tipperary case, to which I alluded, in the Mitchel case, to which, I think, the Minister of Justice alluded, Mr. Mitchel, also after being unseated, at the next election—I think it was, but that does not matter—obtained 3,114 votes, and his opponent obtained 716 votes. That came before the courts of law, and, instead of this opinion which has been expressed in this House to-day being sustained by the courts, strange to say the court declared the gentleman who had that minority of votes the duly elected member for that seat, and gave him the seat, and held that he was entitled to be returned. More than that, the court held that the returning officer should have returned this gentleman, Mr. Moore, who obtained only 716 votes, although the other candidate obtained 3,114 votes. The prayer of the petition, as is usual in these cases, claims that the returning officer should have returned the party whom the petitioner alleges should be elected, and the court in the decree granting that says the returning officer should have returned that party. I have already pointed out the extraordinary position in which we would be if it were possible that a case of this kind should be dealt with in the courts of law, and they should decide that the gentleman obtaining under these circumstances a minority of votes should have been returned by the returning officer, when this House would have taken the opposite course. I think we shall agree that in matters of this kind the legal tribunals would be more fitted to express a legal opinion than the majority of this House, which is made up of laymen as well as of those who have studied these questions professionally. In the Tipperary case, the petition declared that the returning officer should have declared Moore, the petitioner, duly elected, although he obtained the minority vote. The matter came up, I think, on a stated case, and the question was asked as to whether the returning officer

should have returned this candidate who obtained the minority of votes. The question is on page 42 of O'Malley & Hardcastle's Election Reports, Vol. 3. The question is:

"Were the votes given for the said John Mitchel at the said election, under the aforesaid circumstances, thrown away, and was the said Stephen Moore, who was the only other candidate, and was duly qualified, and for whom were recorded the number of votes stated in the sheriff's return, entitled to be declared duly elected for said county?"

The answer on page 48 is:

"We now answer the two questions, submitted to us by the learned judge, in the affirmative."

And so in all these cases no one will question that the order is that the successful party should have been declared elected. Well, there is another case in which this minority question came up, and the returning officer was not considered to have acted so outrageously in the exercise of his discretion, as my hon. friends seem to think the returning officer acted in this case. We find this case in 10 Law Reports Common Pleas, Northcote and Pulsford; and I would like the hon. gentlemen who are interested in this matter to observe the state of the poll on that occasion, the action of the returning officer, and the action of the court, because in England, as here, where the action of the returning officer is involved, he is made a party to the suit, and is made responsible in costs if the court considers his action unjustifiable. Well, now, I think that so far as that election case is concerned the case to which I have alluded is in point. There were four candidates—Mr. Northcote, Mr. Harris, Mr. May and Mr. Pulsford. Mr. Northcote put in a nomination paper which was not duly prepared, and he put in another which was duly prepared, and complied with the provisions of the Act; and the returning officer, taking the view of my hon. friend opposite, that he was a purely ministerial officer, did not exercise any discretion whatever in reference to these papers, but posted both papers of the one candidate, Mr. Northcote, making two sets of ballot papers and two names for the one candidate, and each voter gave separate ballots for each of the names of the same man. As the returning officer had so many papers before him, and acting in that machine way, did not look at each paper but went ahead. There were 301 votes on one set of ballot papers for Mr. Northcote and 71 on another; and 508 for Mr. Harris, 372 for Mr. May, and 339 for Mr. Pulsford. But instead of giving Mr. Northcote the seat, to which he was entitled, having obtained 372 votes altogether, he gave the three seats to Mr. Harris, Mr. May and Mr. Pulsford, by separating the votes for Mr. Northcote according to the ballots on which they were given, and those ballots given in connection with the irregular ballot paper amounted to 71. Mr. Northcote presented his petition to the court and claimed to be elected instead of Mr. Pulsford. In that case the court declared that Mr. Northcote was duly elected and should have been returned, and notwithstanding the conduct of the returning officer in that case the court did not compel him to pay the costs and did not reprimand him in any way. So that, as I pointed out, the mere fact that a man obtains a certain number of votes is not the main question, when these questions are dealt with from a purely legal point of view. As I mentioned to-day, a case in one respect precisely similar to this is already present before the election court. I hope that this matter will be sent to the committee, and after the committee has reported I trust that this House will not consider this matter properly before us. Now, I mentioned to-day, that while I individually would have been prepared to vote directly against the resolution, and while I did not see why this matter should go to the committee at all, still I am prepared, under the circumstances, looking into all these cases, recognising the fact there are many of them to be examined, that my view of them may be incorrect, that a further examination may show that the opinion I have formed now is wrong, looking also at the practice

in our own House, I think, after all that, it will be better that the matter should go to the committee, not as an admission that we have jurisdiction over it, but as a matter for them to investigate first on the point as to whether we have anything to do with it at all. Now, I noticed that in Mr. Bourinot's work on Parliamentary Procedure, after all his research he has not been able to find any case similar to this. Still there have been many questions affecting the members previous to the Act of 1874 and the Parliamentary Act of 1885. I find that on page 155, after dealing with the different cases, he says:

"A reference to the committee is no doubt a proper procedure in all cases in which there are reasonable doubts as to the facts, or the course that should be pursued, especially when it is necessary to examine precedents."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that he will be a bold man who, on perusing the different text-books to which I have referred on the election law of the Mother Country, which in many respects is the same as our own, and after remembering those changes and appreciating the difficulties of the returning officer in this case—I think he would be a bold man who would say, no matter how he felt personally, that there was nothing for us to examine, that there was nothing for us to look into. You have it stated, and to some extent the members who have spoken on this subject have verified that statement, that this is not a question for political parties, that it is a question for us to approach, divested of all political feeling. Well, we see the Minister of Justice taking strong ground on this point, and you see the hon. member for Bothwell taking strong grounds in the opposition direction, and each hon. gentleman claims that he has authors covering the point, and that they are final. Now, in this case, I think it will not be out of the way for lawyers as well as laymen in this House to admit that there is something to look into, something to investigate. My hon. friends opposite claim that when this matter is investigated, it will appear that the only matter to look into is the Election Act, and to treat it on its merits, and either to confirm my hon. friend from Queen's in his seat, or to amend the return and elect this other gentleman. Now, I hope and believe that an enquiry will lead to a totally different result, and I am willing to leave the matter to the committee, believing that the committee will endorse the position I have taken to-day.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot help thinking that the two distinguished lawyers who have addressed the House against the original motion must have felt that they were addressing a very unsympathetic audience when they advocated so strenuously the cause of the minority candidate. I do not know that they could expect that all the hon. members in this House would sympathise with the rights of the gentlemen who represent the minority in their respective constituencies. The speeches these two hon. gentlemen made did not strike me as being entirely consistent with themselves or with one another, and are still less consistent with the amendment which the Minister of Justice moved. Now, almost the whole of their arguments were addressed to convince the House that we had nothing whatever to do in dealing with this case, that we had no more right to do anything in the way of favoring the claim of the minority candidate or the majority candidate in this case, than we had in any other matter that might be imagined not even remotely connected with this affair. Surely, if this House cannot properly deal with this case there is only one straightforward thing for us to do, and that is to vote that we cannot do so. If we propose to take up much more time of this House and of an important committee in dealing with this case it is surely an acknowledgment that we have a right to take action. Why not come in a straightforward manner to the House, if hon. gentlemen are sincere in their convictions? Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite have the courage of their convictions and vote against the original motion?

Surely it is not fair to the member-elect, if he has a right to his seat, to keep him dangling in the galleries of the House and hanging about the precincts of the building, not only while this debate is going on but while the enquiry is going on before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Last Session we had some experience respecting enquiries before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. They are not decided promptly; they sometimes drag along a whole Session, and even towards the end of the Session, when the report of the committee is brought before us, the leaders of the House think it better not to take action upon it. That is a nice position in which to place the member-elect if he has a right to his seat! If our contention be right, that the majority candidate should be placed in his seat, surely it is also unfair to keep the county out of its proper representation in Parliament. We want this matter settled, we ask the House to decide whether the facts are as we state them or not. We are told by the Minister of Justice, and by the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), that we are going to do a serious wrong to the member-elect if we take this action, that the law is such that if Mr. King is seated now there is no provision under which Mr. Baird or any elector could file a petition against him and test the merits of the case. The resolution introduced by the member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), makes special provision that all rights of that kind shall be saved and preserved. But, supposing the language of the resolution amounts to nothing; supposing it does not override the statute law which says that an election petition must be filed within thirty days after the gazetting of the return, I would like to know whether this Parliament could not pass a law to put that matter right. If Mr. King is elected and allowed to take his seat and any elector wishes to petition against him, Parliament could pass an Act enabling that to be done. Any wrong that has resulted has been due to the acts of the returning officer, and not due to those of Mr. King or his friends. Therefore there is nothing in that argument. But have no other people rights? What about the rights of Mr. King, the majority candidate? Is there no sympathy for him on the other side of the House? I thought this question was to be approached in a non-partisan spirit. Surely some of the overwhelming sympathy of hon. gentlemen opposite will be felt for Mr. King and those electors who might desire to see the matter properly adjudicated. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) very frankly said a little while ago that to his mind it made very little difference whether the returning officer was right or wrong. I do not think the House will agree with that opinion. The Minister of Justice has not been able to deny that there is an unbroken series of decisions and precedents in the old Parliament of Canada, at any rate up to the time of the passing of the Controverted Elections Act of 1874, which showed that that Parliament never hesitated to take direct action in the line proposed to-day, to seat the majority candidate, and let the minority candidate claim his seat according to law. Hon. members are aware that this was invariably done—in the Oxford, Kent, Beauharnois, and Bagot cases, in the Lennox and Addington case before 1872, and then in the Muskoka case in 1873. How does the Minister of Justice get over those precedents? He is a lawyer and would naturally follow precedents unless he could give some reason why they should not be followed. And what was his reason? It was simply this: that in 1874 Parliament passed the Act for the trial of controverted elections by the courts. That is true, and the hon. gentleman claimed that such being the case Parliament had no jurisdiction any longer even on a question of this kind. Hon. gentlemen who are lawyers from other Provinces are naturally not familiar with the state of the law in the old Province of Canada before 1874. But, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out, there was a court from 1852 for the trial of election petitions.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask whether that Act contained clause 68 of the Act of 1874?

Mr. EDGAR. I will point out to the hon. gentleman some of the provisions of that Act. In the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, chap. 7, it is there provided—it is an Act respecting Controverted Parliamentary Elections—that

“Every petition presented to the Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly of this Province within the time hereinbefore limited for that purpose with respect to such provisions and complaining of an undue election or return of a member to this House, or complaining that no return has been made, or complaining of special matters contained in any such return”——

Thus covering all the ground the other Act covers,—

—“shall be deemed an election petition.”

Then by section 53 of that Act it is provided that

“All election petitions received by either House shall be referred by the House to the general committee on elections for the purpose of choosing select committees as hereinbefore provided for the trial of such petitions.”

We see, therefore, that in the old Parliament of Canada there was a court with all its machinery provided for the trial of controverted elections just as is the case now, and that fact did not prevent Parliament, when a case was brought before it, as a matter of privilege, from exercising its inherent prerogative to control its officers—and the returning officers are officers of Parliament—and make them do their duty, as we are asking that this returning officer shall be made to do his duty. The precedents all go to show that Parliament did this while at the same time there was an election court, just as formal and just as regularly constituted, and even more formally in many respects, than the present courts for the trial of controverted elections. So that the Minister of Justice will have to revise the whole of his argument on that point, because the precedents which he has tried to set aside must be brought in and held to apply to this case. But let us look at the case itself. What happened? What have we before us? The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) said he did not care much whether the returning officer was right or wrong. I do not think this House will take that view of the case. Let us try and have a little common sense, and look at the simple facts of the case that are before us. There is no single fact required for the decision of this case that is not on the Table of this House, and printed in our Votes and Proceedings. There is not a single point of law that is required to be looked into to decide what we shall do. Even the two hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken to night do not say that there is any point of law necessary to decide what we shall do, because they say we should have nothing to do with it at all. Well, if they have sufficient information to enable them to come to that conclusion, let us see if the House has not sufficient information to enable it to decide upon the case. The papers show, in the report of the returning officer, on page 16 of our Votes and Proceedings, that a nomination was held. We find, also, in the same report that a poll was held and that voting took place, and then we find that he held a meeting for the summing up of the votes, and that he declared the minority candidate elected. There is no doubt about that. Then we go farther, and in the later return brought down last Monday, and printed at page 77, we find the actual result of this summing up in figures. We find that Mr. King polled 1,191 votes, that Mr. Baird polled 1,130 votes, and that Mr. King had a majority of 61 votes. That is all before us; we do not want a Committee on Privileges and Elections to tell us that. Let us apply common sense to the Act of Parliament. Section 59 of the Act of 1874, which has already been quoted, simply says that on summing up the candidate having the majority of the votes shall then be declared elected. How can we get over that? How can the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if they sat for ten years, make anything clearer than that? There was no possible

alternative for the returning officer; there was nothing else he could do, after the polling and summing up of the votes, than declare the majority candidate elected, without an absolute and complete breach of his simplest and plainest duty. And if an officer of this House commits a breach of a simple and plain duty, more especially when it is connected with the privileges of members of this House, surely it cannot at this time of day be said that we ought not to interfere. From the argument which the last speaker addressed to the House, I think I can see how it was that the returning officer erroneously—to use a mild term—thought he had to make a report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. He should not have done so. Section 59 says that he should have returned the candidate elected, and that is all. But I see by the Act that section 23 does refer to a report, and no doubt the simple returning officer thought, or was advised, that he would be complying with the Act if he made a report. Section 23 says that he shall “accompany his own return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, with a report of his proceedings, or of any nomination proposed and rejected for non-compliance with the Act.” He no doubt acted under that section, but that only relates to acclamation returns. Section 23 is among the sections of the Act which refer to the nominations of candidates, and up to that time the word poll or voting is not mentioned. It is not until the 24th section, the one which comes after that, that any reference, directly or indirectly, is made to having a poll; and he has gone to that section, which he would have had to act under, if at the time of nomination he had declared the result of that nomination in the shape of an election by acclamation. In that case only was he required to give these particulars. That is why we have happened to get that report. It was incomprehensible to me at first, but it is evident that, instead of the return he was commanded to make after the poll, he has made this report. Now, the case is in a nutshell; that is really the whole of it; it is all before us; there is no law, no facts, in dispute one way or the other. The case is infinitely clearer than the Muskoka case, the last case of the kind that was decided in this Parliament; and in that case the hon. leader of the Government himself admitted, apparently with some hesitation from the report of the debate, that it was a case which should properly be dealt with by this House, without referring it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it was so dealt with. In that case the returns showed that there were poll-books lost; that there were people acting as poll clerks who were not sworn, and that there were a number of irregularities shown on the face of the return. And yet the House unanimously decided to put Mr. Cockburn in his seat in this House because, and only because, it was apparent from the papers on the Table of the House that he had the majority of votes, and it was not suggested in that case that it should be referred to any Committee on Privileges and Elections. Now, what are the returning officers' duties on nomination day? The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has rather elaborately gone into that question. I will look into it as briefly as possible and see what I understand by the directions of that statute, and I think all the hon. members of this House who have had occasion in their own cases to consider the proceedings with regard to nominations and electors will follow me and understand it. He is to decide, simply I suppose in a judicial capacity, whether more candidates than are required to be elected are nominated. That is all he has to decide on nomination day. Then he either returns by acclamation under section 22 or he grants a poll under section 24. If he returns by acclamation under section 22 then he makes the report which this returning officer has thought proper to make here. But if he once acts under section 24 he has made a step; he grants a poll, and having made that step there is no power in the Act

which enables him to retrace that step. He has taken a proceeding which he cannot retrace. He might as well make another return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; he might as well indeed keep on making returns for a year. It is true there is no provision in the law which says that he shall not make more than one return—no provision which says that after going to the poll he shall not go back and declare a man elected by acclamation. Such a case is so absurd that the law does not deal with such a possibility. Having granted the poll, as was done in this case, and moreover, having actually held the election and polled the votes, his entire duties and functions as to nomination proceedings were discharged. He was absolutely *functus officio*. When granting a poll it is for the returning officer to decide what candidates are nominated, and he puts their names on the ballot papers. The Act then says that any votes given at the election for any other candidate than those so nominated shall be null and void. That is to provide for cases where the returning officer finds votes on the ballot papers for persons other than those put there by him as properly nominated. Now, I am afraid that this returning officer has had it running in his mind that that provision gives him some sort of discretionary power, when summing up the votes, to go into the whole question of the nomination again, and decide judicially whether a certain nomination has been proper or not. In order to show how little discretion is allowed to a returning officer to interfere, I will call the attention of the House to the South Renfrew case, which has been referred to by the hon. member for Pictou. It is reported in Hodgkin's Election Cases, page 705. In that case it was held by Chief Justice Wilson that the returning officer at the nomination has so little discretionary power that he cannot refuse a nomination paper which is signed by only 24 qualified electors instead of 25. The returning officer in that case did so, and he returned by acclamation the other candidate, Mr. McDougall, whose nomination paper appeared unobjectionable. A petition was filed by Mr. Bannerman, the unsuccessful candidate, whose nomination paper had been refused. The Chief Justice said the returning officer should have gone on and held his poll, and cited section 80 of the Act, which provides that no technicality shall affect the result of the election. And it was held by the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, that even such a glaring mistake in the nomination paper did not justify the returning officer in interfering with the ordinary course of the election. If he had any right to interfere, it was, as in the Renfrew case, before he granted the poll. But in the case before the House to-day, for a mere technicality, the returning officer, after he had granted the poll, chose to reverse the decision of the whole majority of the electors of the county. Now, I do not want to argue, more than I can help, the merits of the wretched technicality which the returning officer clings to as his excuse for violating the simple words of the statute, but as the hon. gentleman who has preceded me has gone into that matter a little, I will follow him. What were the merits of the returning officer's decision? He says in his report, which he wrongfully sent in:

“T. Medley Wetmore handed me the nomination papers of George G. King, of Chipman, Queen's Co., N.B., merchant, accompanied by the sum of \$200. On my calling the attention of Mr. Wetmore to the fact that no election agent had been appointed by Mr. King, I was handed the appointment of John McLeas McLean as election agent for Mr. King. At two o'clock I granted a poll and announced the names of the candidates, notices of poll being granted and the names of candidates were then posted throughout the county.”

That was on the 15th of February. The election was held on the 22nd of February. On the 5th of March, the returning officer in his report says:

“I summed up the votes given for each candidate.”

That should have ended the matter, but it did not. Well, what was the objection taken? It was this:

"That the deposit made with Mr. King's nomination paper had not been legally made, since it was not made by his election agent."

The returning officer sustained that objection, declared all Mr. King's votes void and null, and returned Mr. Baird elected, stating in his report that no other candidate had been properly nominated. The nomination papers were admittedly all right. The consent of the candidate was put in, the money was paid to the returning officer accompanying the nomination paper, the returning officer accepted this deposit and acted upon it on the very day it was paid by granting a poll, and no objection was raised until the 5th of March, long after the polling had taken place. The law of course says the deposit should be paid to the returning officer; it does not say by whom in any of the provisions relating to the nomination proceedings. The words "agent" or "election agent" are not mentioned in any one of the sections relating to the nomination of candidates. Those sections are from the 19th to the 22nd section of the Act of 1874. Election agents are not referred to until section 121, at the end of the Act. I contend that the law is literally and fully complied with when, in the words of the Act, the sum of \$200 is deposited in the hands of the returning officer at the time the nomination paper shall be filed. As a matter of fact, when we come to read anything in the Act about the agent or the election agent, we find that the law does not require him to be appointed until nomination day, and he need not even be appointed on nomination day. The law provides that the nomination paper and the deposit with it may be filed at any time after the proclamation. Is it reasonable for the returning officer to claim that the agent should make that deposit with him when the agent need not be appointed for days after the deposit may have been made? Again, the nomination, we know, may, under the provisions of the Act, proceed legally and validly, if the candidate is away from the Dominion altogether. He need not be here when the nomination is made, and need not give his consent in writing; and if the nomination is made during his absence, it is so stated in the nomination paper. It would be impossible for a candidate, under the provisions of the Act, who was absent—as, for instance, in the case of the opponent of the First Minister in Kingston—to be nominated, if on nomination day, when the deposit had to be made, it had to be made by his election agent. That election agent may not then be appointed. No absent candidate should be made ineligible through such a strained and forced interpretation of the law. I can see now from the argument of the hon. member for Picton what I had before supposed, that this returning officer had got into his head that among the provisions as to election expenses in the Act, he could find some excuse for the requirement that this deposit must be made with him by the agent. Section 121 of the Act, under the heading of election expenses, provides: "No payment (except in respect of the personal expenses of a candidate), and no advance, loan or deposit, shall be made, except through the election agent." That appears to be the ground upon which the returning officer undertakes to give a decision he has no authority to give. But surely this deposit must be some loan, deposit or advance in connection with election expenditure. Can any one contend that the deposit of \$200 handed in with the nomination paper on nomination day can be held to be part of election expenses covered by this section? Why, it is paid back. Every hon. member in the House, and most of the candidates out of the House, have received their \$200 back, and how can that amount therefore be included in election expenses? Later on we are told that these agents must include all their election expenses in certain particulars filed with the public officer. I would like to ask how many members of this House have included the \$200 deposit made with the returning officer on nomination day in their election expenses? Not one. That has

Mr. EDGAR.

nothing to do with the election expenses. It has been useful to them to get it back to meet election expenses, but it was not election expenses, and therefore the idea that the provisions in this Act with reference to agents paying election expenses should have any connection with the deposit made on nomination day, under the nomination section in the beginning of the Act, seems perfectly frivolous and absurd. What are election agents appointed for? Do we not know why they were appointed in England? They are appointed to guard against corrupt practices, as far as the law can. If we are required to know what election agents are appointed for, we have it laid down in a recent case by an English judge. Referring to the English Act, the Act of 1883, in which these very words, with reference to election agents, were used, for we find it there provided that no payments, advances or deposit shall be made except through election agents, Mr. Justice Field, in the *Barrow-in-Furness* case, 4 *O'Malley and Harcastle*, page 82, says:

"If I understand the Act rightly, the object is that a person shall be the election agent who shall be responsible for all the acts done in directing the election. No contract is to be made but by him, because he is a known responsible man who can be dealt with afterwards and looked to afterwards for an explanation of his conduct in the management of the election."

Can any explanation be ever asked from the candidate as to any corrupt or illegal design he may have in depositing the \$200 with the returning officer? Can any such explanation be asked of an election agent? It is absurd. Therefore, the election agents, neither by the terms of the Act nor by the whole scope of the Act, can have anything to do with making this deposit to the returning officer. They may, as they very often do, make it for the sake of convenience, but they may not, and, as hon. gentlemen know very well, they have not done so in many of their own cases, and a large proportion of the members of this House have the same defect as Mr. King in this respect. The returning officer, I contend, has violated the Act in the first place, in assuming these judicial functions. His duty was otherwise than to have interfered in this matter at all. The evidence is now before the House that he committed this breach of duty, and I hope this House will, as the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me have said, try and look at it in a judicial spirit; because it is creating an important precedent, and I am sure that the majority of the members of this House and the majority of the electors of this country do not want these election matters conducted in a spirit of hair-splitting and under the direction of a committee of lawyers, whose tendency—and I am a lawyer myself—is to be more technical than laymen, and I do think that this House should not be anxious, when a simple matter that they can all understand just as well as any lawyer, comes before them as this has been done for their consideration, to delay justice and to continue wrong any longer by sending it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, because, if Mr. Baird is right, it will be continuing a wrong against him to delay a settlement of the question, and if Mr. King is right, it will be continuing a still greater wrong against him, and against the electors, by delaying the settlement of the question as it is proposed to do by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LANDRY. In speaking upon this question, one cannot forget that perhaps the popular side of the question would be that of speaking on behalf of the candidate who received the larger number of votes. In speaking of the popular side, I do not mean to apply that expression in regard to members of this House, but I mean it in regard to the people in the country generally. But, while that may be admitted, yet upon this question the very people with whom it might be popular, just on the broad proposition as to who should be returned, the one receiving the majority or the one receiving the minority of votes, to sympathise with the one who had the majority of votes,

yet, when they come to understand the situation as it is, a great deal of the popularity must be taken away from that side of the question. In the observations I shall make to you, I do not pretend to say that I myself have arrived at a positive or definite conclusion in my opinions as to whether the returning officer was right or wrong in his decision, but I will endeavor to show, and I hope to be able to show, that there is stronger ground for the decision that he gave than seems to be admitted by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. This I will undertake to assert, that the returning officer, in deciding in the way in which he did, in making the return he did make, did it *bond fide* and believing that he was discharging his duty to the best of his knowledge and ability, under the laws of the country and under the election laws as they existed. I believe that sincerely. I believe that he did it after thorough consideration of the subject himself, after receiving such advice as he had confidence in, and that he then decided to the best of his judgment and ability and not through any partisan spirit. If that be the case, it seems to me that it is entirely unjust to pass upon the returning officer the condemnation that I have heard passed upon him outside of this House, and I think also inside of this House when the matter was first broached, although I must admit that this evening the discussion has been quite free from anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me has endeavored to show that the argument of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) was entirely void of foundation, when he spoke of the law requiring the deposit to be made by the agent appointed by the candidate; and he cited the statutes to that end, and seemed to have convinced himself, whether he convinced the rest of the House or not, that what he had affirmed as to the argument of the hon. member for Pictou was correct. I say there is a great deal to justify the conclusion that this deposit was intended to have been made by the agent of the candidate, and that it was intended, in order that the nomination might be valid, that it should be so made by him. Before going any further, I will refer to the law as I interpret it, not that I have made up my mind whether it is right or wrong, but to show in regard to this question that there is a great deal of foundation for strong argument on the side to which the returning officer has inclined and on which he has given his decision. The hon. gentleman has told us that in the law referring directly to the nomination of candidates there is no reference whatever to the person by whom the deposit shall be made, that the agent himself is not mentioned, and that he is mentioned only in some subsequent sections of the law, and has no connection with this. The hon. gentleman may be correct as to the sections of the law in which the agent is named, but, while that may be true, I do not think he can lose sight of section 121 of chapter 9 of 37 Vic, which I think was in existence at the time the elections were had, because I think it was before the Revised Statutes were in force, and I think the sections are the same, though they are not numbered the same. It reads:

"No payment (except in respect of the personal expenses of a candidate), and no advance, loan or deposit shall be made by or on behalf of any candidate at any election."

I ask hon. gentlemen who wish to consider this subject and the law which bears upon it, to ask themselves what was meant by the word "deposit." To what did that refer? I do not think my hon. friend, with all his legal knowledge and ability, attempted to show what the word "deposit" meant. I think he left the House in the dark as to what he thought it meant. We find the word "deposit" in the Act before, and we find that it has but one meaning, the deposit which is to accompany the papers when the candidate is nominated. It refers to that and to that only. So, when we find the same word in the same Act, it is a natural deduction that it refers to the same deposit, unless it refers

to something else so clearly that we cannot be mistaken. I ask the hon. gentleman and those who agree with him to tell the House what that word "deposit" is really there for, that no one shall make this deposit except it be the authorised agent of the candidate. If they can convince me that it is not that deposit required with the nomination papers, then I admit that one of the grounds on which the returning officer made his decision would be taken away from him. But are there any other grounds to show that what was meant was the same deposit which is made with the papers? I say there are, and I think I can point to them to show that these reasons apply to this section as well as to the preceding one. The hon. gentleman told us that this referred particularly to election expenses, that it must have some particular meaning in relation to election expenses, and that it never meant anything else. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the Act of 1874, because we have to refer to this Act to see the meaning of the word "deposit," and I will read section 19 of that Act, in which the hon. gentleman will find this language. After it refers to the deposit, which then was only \$50 and has been since changed to \$200, it uses this language:

"The sum so paid shall be applied by the returning officer towards the payment of election expenses."

So we find that precisely the same language "election expenses" is used, as is used in section 121 of the same Act. Therefore if it be used there as election expenses it is not, it seems to me, straining the meaning of it when we read the two sections together and say that they have, or may have, the same meaning. It is true that that part of that section was repealed in 1882.

Mr. EDGAR. Did my hon. friend ever know of any body putting that \$200 in his election expenses under the Act?

Mr. LANDRY. I do not know that I ever heard of anybody doing that, but I think that somebody may reasonably put it in his expenses. Under the Statute of 1874, before that portion was repealed in 1882; and those to-day who do not get half of the number of votes polled by their opponent, I think could reasonably put it in as election expenses. Of course they get it back again under the law as it exists to-day; if they poll more than half the votes of successful candidates they get back the \$200, in which case it does not go towards the election expenses; but in case they do not poll more than half the votes they forfeit the \$200 which then goes towards election expenses, just the same as from 1874 to 1882 the \$50 went towards the election expenses, no matter what number of votes the candidate received. Therefore when my hon. friend seemed to treat as trivial the argument used by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) on this question of the deposits, it appears to me that he did not grasp the idea that the hon. member for Pictou put forward so clearly and so well. Now, Sir, as to the duty of the returning officer. My hon. friend would wish to say that if he had made any decision at all, a decision that should have had any weight, he should have made it on nomination day. Well, to some extent, I agree with the hon. gentleman. I think for all parties concerned, it would appear more reasonable and it would have been less subject to objections and to attack if, on nomination day, the objection had been taken, and then and there the returning officer, when two o'clock had arrived, had decided there was but one candidate, that the other had not been nominated properly, in consequence of this defect, and had declared the only one nominated to be elected by acclamation. I think that course would, no doubt, have obviated very many of the difficulties that have arisen since. But we are not called upon to question that, I do not think we are called upon to discuss that now, because the returning officer not having done so, left the matter go to the polls. Now, Sir, I would like to ask the

hon. gentleman whether, if he could have done so on nomination day, if it had been legal and had given a proper interpretation of the statute, to have decided that Mr. King was not properly in nomination before him because the deposit had not been made by the proper agent, would his failure to do so, because the question did not arise then, make Mr. King a legally nominated candidate? If Mr. King on nomination day at two o'clock was not properly in nomination, was not legally a candidate under the law, would the fact of no question being asked, no decision having been asked for, or arrived at by the returning officer, make Mr. King's nomination valid one day or two days or a week afterwards. I am very doubtful about it. There is no doubt irregularities can be cured by no objections being taken and new proceedings being had. But these might be simple irregularities or technical objections that would not be as strong as what actually occurred. Here is a statutory provision that must be followed to the letter in order to make the nomination valid, and if this was not followed, if one important particular is left out and the nomination is not legal on nomination day, no action on the part of the returning officer on that day or subsequently can make that nomination legal. The fact of the question not having been raised on nomination day, goes to show the *bonâ fide* of his decision, the sincerity of his decision. The irregularity was not brought to his attention, and not having been brought to his attention, he might not have had the law at his fingers' ends, and therefore this may not have occurred to him at all, and he granted the ballot in the usual way. If, on nomination day, however, the question had arisen, and he had given his decision differently to what he gave it on declaration day, then his motives might have been questioned but the question was not raised on nomination at all; he was not asked to decide.

Mr. AMYOT. He raised it himself.

Mr. LANDRY. Not as to the deposit.

Mr. AMYOT. There was no agent appointed.

Mr. LANDRY. I must have misinterpreted the returns, if my hon. friend is right. He says that he raised the question himself. What interest had the returning officer to raise the question on that day, that there was no agent appointed, beyond his desire to see regularity in the proceedings? But he did not raise the question of deposit. He said there was no agent, and I did not understand the returning officer to say that he told Mr. King that in consequence the deposit was not valid. Therefore I say that the point as to whether the deposit was valid, not having been raised, he having given no decision upon it—unless the fact of his holding the deposit be taken as a decision—it shows that he acted in *bonâ fides*.

Mr. MILLS. He gave a receipt.

Mr. LANDRY. He gave a receipt for the deposit, it is true, but no question was asked him, and he was not there as a judge. If he were the proper tribunal to decide it, he was not, as a judge, called upon to give that decision. The parties were represented there. One was represented by an attorney and the other by an agent; the parties were there themselves, and that question was not raised, and he was not called upon to give a decision himself, he was not called upon to look after the technicalities that might arise and give a judicial decision on that point, with the question being raised for his decision. But it came before him on declaration day, and for the first time—at that time, I think, as a judge, as an officer on whom the duty devolved to give a decision. I think that was the time for him to have given a decision, and it may have been much more convenient for him to have done so on nomination day had he been asked to do so. I think he was prepared to give his decision on declaration day, when the question was put

Mr. LANDRY,

as to whether the gentleman was properly nominated, and he gave it to the best of his judgment under the law, and he considered that Mr. King was not properly nominated, and consequently there was only one candidate in the field, and he returned him by acclamation. Well, it appears to me that the difficulties are all in a nutshell as the case stands. He did not give his decision on nomination day, because he was not asked to do so; because the point was not raised; because no party interested had taken the point before him, and therefore the matter went on until declaration, and then he gave his decision and gave it according to his interpretation of the law, and according to the way it is interpreted by very many people who have looked into it. For I do not say myself, I am not prepared to say what course I would have taken upon that question; I am not prepared to say whether he was wrong, but I do say that there was a great deal to contend for on the side he has taken. Well, if that be the case, where is the proper tribunal to decide this as it now stands? If there be a point in this case, if there be something to argue upon at all, where is the proper tribunal to decide this point to-day, and to say whether he was right or wrong? I do not think we are. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me has laid great stress upon the fact that many cases had been decided by Parliament and by legislators almost similar to this. He laid great stress upon the fact that under an Act, I think he said, not of this Parliament, but of the Parliament of Canada as it existed before Confederation, there was a tribunal to try these election petitions, and that the House had taken cognisance of cases similar to this, notwithstanding this tribunal. But, Sir, it appears to me that the hon. gentleman had forgotten, or I am much mistaken in what that law contains; no doubt he is much more familiar with it than I would be, because I have not studied closely the Acts of the Parliament of Canada previous to Confederation—but I think he will search a long time before he will find in that Act a provision similar to the one in our statute concerning controverted elections, and it is this: section 63 of chap. 10, Controverted Elections Act, reads thus:

"All elections held after the passing of this Act shall be subject to the provisions thereof and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance therewith."

Now, if there were no such section in the law, then I could easily see why, although the law pointed out and authorised such a tribunal to hear such petitions, that did not deprive Parliament of the authority it possessed to consider those matters and decide them. But when we have a provision in the law so explicit as exists in this provision, it should make us pause at any rate before we take the case into our own hands instead of sending it to the proper tribunal; that is, the tribunal in accordance with the Controverted Elections Act. We have that Act to-day. The election for the local district of Queen's county is controverted. If this Act means anything, the election ought to be questioned and controverted under and subject to the provisions of this Act; that is before the proper tribunal and not before this Parliament. And it seems to me there are very strong grounds, when we have a competent tribunal with proper authority and jurisdiction before which to try these cases, for holding the opinion, that they should not come before Parliament for trial and for decision by a vote. There was much reason before the passing of the Act why Parliament should do so. It was the only tribunal to try such cases, except the tribunal referred to by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, but that tribunal consisted of a committee of the House, and therefore was not so competent to deal with cases as are the election courts as now constituted. At all events, it was evidently thought so by the passing of the Act of 1874, by which we provided for election courts. So we have a legal tribunal which

would arrive at a just conclusion between the parties, and it is open to parties who feel aggrieved, to either Mr. King or the gentleman returned to this House, to go before that tribunal in order to have it decided as to which of those two gentlemen is right in this contention, as to whether the returning officer is right or wrong in the return he made. The last paragraph of the motion before the House would go to show that the hon. mover, and the friends who are with him in this matter, must have felt their case to be weak indeed when they inserted these words: "Saving, however, to George F. Baird the right of contesting such election, as provided according to the usage of Parliament and the laws of Canada." Why was this inserted in the resolution moved by the hon. gentleman? It was because he felt that some injustice would be done that gentleman by the action of the House, if by the vote of the House his opponent were given the seat; in fact that an injustice would be done to Mr. Baird unless his rights were guarded by the wording of the resolution itself. But those words would have no effect whatever, for even if they were adopted by the House they could not override the statute law. My opinion is that these words could have no effect whatever either to place Mr. Baird in a better position or in a worse position, and they might as well have been omitted from the motion. If the House was to decide by a vote to seat Mr. King, the rights of Mr. Baird would not be altered by those words, and they might as well have been omitted. The hon. gentleman who preceded me went further to show how strongly he felt that the action he asked the House to take would prejudice the rights of Mr. Baird, by saying that if injury was done an Act could be passed to remedy it. Is it not going too far that we should be invited to commit a grave injury which we may not be able to remedy except by an Act of Parliament? And yet this House is asked to place itself in that false position. The hon. gentleman gave his case away when he mentioned that injury would be done and rights swept away, and that we could pass an Act for the purpose of having those rights restored according to law. But we have the proper tribunal for a trial of these cases, possessing jurisdiction and machinery, and it is open to Mr. King or Mr. Baird; and the question as to whether the returning officer acted rightly or wrongly can be easily determined by that court without any great expense, or at all events the one adjudged wrong will have to bear the greater portion of the cost. While I am prepared to vote for the amendment, I would have been prepared to vote directly against the resolution on account of the view I hold, not as expressing any opinion between the parties, not as expressing the opinion that Mr. King did not get a majority of the votes honestly, for I have no knowledge or evidence in regard to it, but simply to express my disapprobation of the course proposed that, although proper tribunals exist in the country for the trial of such questions, this case should be taken out of the hands of those tribunals and drawn into Parliament for the purpose of having it decided here. Simply as a protest against that course I would have voted against the resolution even if no amendment had been proposed; but as there is an amendment I am prepared to support it, and let the case go before the Committee on Privileges. For the reasons given I shall vote for the amendment, because the case should go before the proper legal tribunal instead of our endeavoring to try it here.

Mr. ELLIS. To a layman it is somewhat puzzling to hear the learned arguments which have been adduced on a matter that is exceedingly simple. When I hear hon. members on both sides of the House, who are lawyers, discussing this question, I cannot but think of the remarks of a very able Englishman who once attempted to study law, but who afterwards became famous in English literature, and whose writings have shed

a lustre on our language. After devoting a year in endeavoring to master one of the learned books of the profession he threw it up, declaring that it was a work which weighed four stone, that every sentence in it was inspired by the goddess of dulness, that it was nothing but reflections upon precedents that should be forgotten and of observations upon practices and customs that ought instantly and forever be abolished. It seems to me that, as far as justice is concerned, these remarks would apply to many of the precedents brought forward on the other side of the House. I desire, however, to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has somewhat misrepresented the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), in that he made it appear that that hon. member said that this was a case in some way which might go to a legal tribunal, to the courts.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he understood that I conveyed the idea to the House that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) had admitted that this particular case was one for a trial. I said, while challenging some of the points he had made, there was one sentence in his speech which I thought was exceedingly correct, and that was, that if there were irregularities in connection with the return, they could be remedied by the legal tribunal. I know the hon. gentleman did not apply it to this case, but I did.

Mr. ELLIS. I will read what the hon. gentleman said. It will be found in the *Hansard* of 15th April:

"The duty of the returning officer was simply the ministerial, or, to use the language of an eminent judge in England, in a very late case, his duty was the arithmetical calculation of the number of votes, and that is all. Beyond that he had no power, and if any of the proceedings were irregular there is a tribunal provided in the Controverted Elections Act by which returns can be rectified. But I say, without fear of contradiction, no power exists in a returning officer to declare an election invalid or to refuse to count up the votes, or to refuse to declare elected the candidate who had the majority of votes."

Now, I think the hon. gentleman, whatever he may have sought to do, conveyed a different impression by the remarks he made to this House. I desire to say that the Minister of Justice, in presenting the case, seemed to present it as though it were a case as between Mr. Baird and Mr. King. I submit that that is not a proper description of this case. It is a case in which the people are the plaintiffs, and they come to this court asking that justice shall be done. It is not a matter affecting Mr. King, except so far as it affects him as an individual in this land, but it is a case in which the majority of the electors of Queen's are interested. But it appeared to me that the hon. gentleman did not exhibit a great deal of earnestness in the arguments he used. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) in his speech ran in the same line as far as Mr. Baird is concerned. He said that a great injustice would be done to him if the House were to act in the manner proposed, because Mr. Baird would be in a worse position than if the House had not acted. I wish to call his attention to one matter—not with a view of introducing political feeling—but I wish to point out that Mr. Baird finds himself in his present position entirely from his own action, and if any wrong is done him by this House doing right he has himself to blame. I wish also to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) has not touched the point at all. He has dealt with the section of the Act which provides for a deposit, and which provides that if anybody wrongfully makes a deposit he is liable to a fine or some other punishment. But the whole case is covered by that section of the Act which provides that there shall be a nomination made in a particular manner and that the returning officer shall give a receipt; and it is a matter of fact that such a receipt was given, for the newspapers contained a report of the proceedings, showing that the nomination was regularly made and that the returning officer gave him a receipt

declaring that it was made according to law. There is another matter to which I wish to refer. On the day of declaration there was some speeches made at the court house, and Mr. Baird, among others, made a speech and here is the report of what he said :

"He felt that a respectable election had been run, and when it was over he was willing to accept the verdict of the people. Then he went to St. John afterwards; he met Mr. King on the street and congratulated him upon his victory. When asked about a protest he said no. Then he was called upon by the party leaders in St. John. They had asked him to go to Queen's and run the election and he had accepted. He was discharging a duty to the party in doing so. Mr. King, poor fellow, had fought hard, but had not won. Then after the election it was discovered that this error was in the nomination paper and there was one grand rush of the party to his office.

"These party leaders who had raided his office spoke thus to him: 'What kind of a party man are you? You are a part of a political machine, and we call upon you to drop your sentiment and open Queen's county again.' He consented to do so. He had no particular glory to gain for this election, but he was working in the interests of the party. He had tried to persuade them in the matter, but had failed, and they gave a majority for Mr. King.

"And he concluded his speech by declaring that the only hope that remained for the Liberal party was in the Province of Quebec, the majority in which was composed of Rielites."

I mention this, not for the purpose of arousing any political feeling, but because I think it is not the correct position of the leaders of the Conservative party of St. John or anywhere else. As far as I can judge from the public expressions of opinion which have been made on this question, the Conservative party in St. John, and throughout New Brunswick generally, have been surprised, astounded—I might almost say they have been paralysed—at the daring way in which this thing has been done, at this daring attempt to deprive the people of their rights. I do not think the Conservative party will be the gainers, if this course is pursued. I do not think the Conservative party will take the responsibility of sustaining Mr. Baird in his conduct. Moreover, Mr. Carrey, Mr. Baird's legal adviser, came to St. John and was interviewed by a reporter of one of the newspapers, and here is a report of the interview :

"When asked what Dunn had done with the ballots, Mr. Carrey stated that Baird, having been elected by acclamation, there was no ballots. He went on to say that this was the only way to elect Baird, as the revising barrister had disfranchised a great many Conservatives throughout the county, and it would have been impossible to elect Baird without taking advantage of a technicality."

Now on behalf of the revising barrister I feel bound to say that, although he is not a political friend of mine, he is an exceedingly fair and just man, who would not allow his party feelings—or rather his personal feelings, because I do not think he has any party feelings—to influence him to do a wrongful act. I believe the list was a fair one. I make these statements to the House and country because I think Mr. Baird places the Conservative party, by the speech he made on that occasion, in such a position that they will have to assume the great responsibility of saying whether he is right or wrong. It is the easiest and simplest thing in the world for every man to decide on his conscience what is right to do in this matter. It is an easy matter, perhaps even in the simplest case, to get up a large display of legal lore, but you cannot throw dust in the eyes of the people, or prevent them from seeing what is right or what is wrong in a matter of this kind. The Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Pictou, and indeed all who have spoken on that side of the House, admit that this Parliament has reserved to itself rights which enable it to deal with a question of this kind. These hon. gentlemen say that many of these questions should go before the courts for decision. No doubt it is true, but this is one case in which Parliament would be justified, under the powers which it has reserved, in interfering in the interests of public liberty, freedom, fair play and justice, as it is an important case in which all these are concerned.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat thinks it is an easy matter for this Parliament to

Mr. ELLIS.

interfere in the present case. But, Sir, I think this Parliament has denuded itself of the power of interfering in a case of this kind. So far as the question whether the returning officer has the power of deciding whether Mr. Baird or Mr. King is elected is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I think the returning officer has no such power. I agree that the position of the returning officer is as described by a member on this side—that he has nothing whatever to do but to make a return. He has no judicial function to discharge; all he has to do is to make a return. But in this case he has made a return. Let us suppose he has made a return in error—that he has subjected himself to the penalty clauses of this Act. What has this House to do? Is this House to take a course which will be contrary to the law as laid down by itself? Is this House—to use a colonialism—to go back upon itself? Is this House, to use the language of a great lawyer and parliamentarian, to drive a coach-and-four through its own Act of Parliament? That is the real question. We might set a precedent here which would be a very serious thing indeed. If this House decides that it can declare whether a man can take his seat here, in regard to the validity of whose election a question has arisen, then, Sir, we may find that when either the party with which I act has a majority here, or when the party opposed—if the day comes, as in the lapse of time it may—has a majority, we may find that this will be a precedent for seating a man here improperly. I will call the attention of the House to the case of Mr. Wilkes. He was elected to the Imperial Parliament. He was obnoxious to the majority in the House and what did the Imperial Parliament do? It unseated Mr. Wilkes although he had a majority. The fact that a person not seated here has according to the returns a majority, has nothing to do with the principle of the case. The question is this—has this House the right, having denuded itself of the power of dealing with such cases, to go and deal with them? When there was before the Imperial Parliament a Bill for taking out of the hands of Parliament the power of dealing with questions of this kind, the Right Hon. Mr. Bouvier, Chairman of Elections Committees for some time, a great parliamentary authority and a man of judicial mind and great force of character, spoke as follows :—

"They should recollect that once having parted with their authority, however much they might impugn the decisions of the judge, they would have no power to remove him."

Sir, this House has parted with its power to deal with a case of this kind; and even if it be the case, as I think is proved by the return, that Mr. Baird's opponent had a majority of the votes, even if it be the case that this returning officer has behaved badly or mistakenly, I think it would be a very improper thing for this House to take any action. I think it would be improper because, above all, political feeling may run high here at the present minute, and it would be unwise and undesirable that either Mr. King or Mr. Baird should be prejudiced by political passion. I look over the names on this committee, and I find that the leader of the Opposition and other distinguished lawyers on both sides of the House are on the committee; and can any man doubt that before such a tribunal, having all the advantages of a deliberative assembly like this, and at the same time the weight and responsibility of a judiciary, a question of this kind would be more properly entertained, more properly discussed, sifted, and decided upon than before this assembly? I happened to have my attention directed to a question of this kind before I took my seat in this honorable House. It happened that the gentleman who opposed me, Mr. Ross, had not resigned his seat in the North-West Council before running. The Act against dual representation did not come into force in the North-West Territories until the 1st of March, so that if he had resigned on the eve of the 1st of March he would probably have been a qualified candidate. But not having resigned by the 1st of

March, it was held by the lawyers, at all events, in the Territories, that he was disqualified. Suppose he had got a majority of the votes, what would have been the duty of the returning officer? I may think, as a lawyer, that the duty of the returning officer would be to have returned him as the candidate elected, and allowed me to go into the court, prove that he was not qualified, and demand the seat. According to my view, that would be the proper course. But suppose the returning officer had taken a different view, and said: This man is not qualified; he has been a member of the North-West Council while running and cannot be elected, and I declare his opponent elected, although having the minority of the votes. I, for my part, would be very sorry to have the question decided by this House, and I should never come before this House to have it settled. I should have gone before the proper tribunal appointed by statute, established my case and demanded the seat; and I think it would be a very unwise and improper thing for us to try to mend the mistake that the opponent of Mr. Baird has made in not taking that course. Now, if the House will permit me, I would call the attention of hon. members to the Act, and I will do so very rapidly, because the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) has with great force and cogency dealt with it. In clause 118 it is laid down in the most emphatic manner:

"No advance, loan or deposit, shall be made by or on behalf of any candidate at any election, before or during or after such election, on account of such election, otherwise than through an agent or agents, whose name or names, address or addresses, have been declared in writing to the returning officer, on or before the nomination day, or through an agent or agents to be appointed in his or their place, as herein provided; and any person who makes any such payment, advance, loan or deposit otherwise than through such agent or agents, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

If we turn to section 101, we read again:

"If any returning officer wilfully delays, neglects, or refuses duly to return any person who ought to be returned to serve in House of Commons for any electoral district, such person may, if it has been determined on the hearing of an election petition respecting the election for such electoral district, that such person was entitled to have been returned, sue the returning officer who has so wilfully delayed, neglected or refused duly to make such return of his election, in any court of record in the province in which such electoral is situate, and recover from him a sum of \$500."

Now, Sir, if the returning officer did not think he was acting in strict accordance with the first section I have read, could we for one minute believe that he would wilfully lay himself open to this serious penalty? There can be no doubt whatever that he has been acting *bonâ fide*, in accordance with the best interpretation of the law he could make. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said that he thought the only thing we could do was to proceed to vote upon the case. But this House, it seems to me, has its own dignity to guard, it has the justice of the case to guard, and—the hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke of the rights of the majority—it has the rights of the majority to guard. It cannot guard its own dignity, it cannot guard the interests of justice and the rights of the majority. It cannot guard the rights of the people unless it proceeds in strict accordance with the law. I have the Act of Parliament that declares the course, by its own solemn act, for any candidate for parliamentary election who feels himself aggrieved, to follow. For this House to set aside that Act, would be to betray its dignity, to betray justice and the rights of the people. It is quite a different matter to refer this subject to the committee. The committee will be able to look carefully into the precedents. It will be prepared to look carefully into the question of principle, on the very ground on which it should be discussed, and it will be able to report to this House the decision it shall come to.

Mr. MILLS. Why should we go to this trouble if the House has denuded itself of its authority, and the matter belongs to the courts? The hon. gentleman has made up his mind. Why refer the matter to a committee?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman thinks I have made up my mind. I can assure him my mind is in a perfect state of balance, and I am perfectly ready to go into this question in a thoroughly judicial spirit, and if I could convince myself that the proper course was that this House should proceed to decide upon the question, and vote upon the question, and that it had the authority to do so, that it had not stripped itself of the power of doing so, then I should probably be inclined to vote with them.

Mr. MILLS. You would be loaded up the other way.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is mistaken. One David said that all men were liars, and, of course, that means that another David may be mistaken. The legal aspect of this case has been very fully gone into by the learned Minister of Justice and by my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), and it has been to some extent gone into by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and I will trouble the House no further on this question. But I will certainly vote for the amendment, at the same time strongly expressing my conviction that the proper thing for the aggrieved member, the aggrieved candidate in this case, is to go before the proper tribunal appointed by this House, and if he establishes his claim there, if claim he has, he will get the seat; but if the facts are as reported to us here, if he did not comply with that section which declared that the candidate who makes a deposit in the way this gentleman has, is really not a candidate, the decision of that tribunal would be that Mr. Baird is entitled to his place.

Mr. BARRON. I am well aware of the fact that it is not often wise for a young member to address the House, but as hon. gentlemen know youth is sometimes the season of enthusiasm and advanced age that of wisdom and discretion. This enthusiasm is always ready, as well to applaud a righteous act as to resent injustice, and justifies me tonight in rising on this question, because I think a gross injustice has been perpetrated on the public and on a constituency in not having the gentleman sitting here to represent it who had the majority of votes. It has been stated by several hon. members, and I think that is the general opinion, that there has been too much law on this question. I agree with the opinion that by applying too much law to this case the public mind will seize the idea that it is a question of law altogether and not of justice. I think the public is anxious that the candidate who has the largest number of votes should sit in this House. Although I believe there has been too much law given to us, this House will pardon me if I take up a little of its time in answering some of the views advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), whether knowingly or not, I am not prepared to say, tried to create the opinion that the \$200 deposited in some instances became election expenses. Now I controvert that statement. In no case does the \$200 ever become the election expenses of the candidate. It does become part of the election expenses, not of the candidate but of the returning officer. This is the section, and I think the hon. member for Kent, if he had dealt fairly with this House, would have read the whole of it:

"The sum so paid and not returned" —

That is in the event of a defeated candidate not getting the moiety of votes,

—"as herein provided, shall be applied by the returning officer towards the payment of election expenses," —

The hon. member for Kent went so far but not farther. He should have read through to the end:

—"and an account thereof shall be rendered by him to the Auditor-General of Canada."

Showing, I think, that the \$200 in the event of the candidate not getting the moiety of votes, does not go into the election of the candidate, but into the election expenses of

the Crown, and the public get the benefit of it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) referred to this section, and said it must have some importance because there was already a case, involving the construction of this section, going on in the Lower Provinces. Do we not find that there are cases going on all over the Provinces involving the seats of hon. gentlemen in this House. I believe there is a case involving the seat of the member who has the honor of addressing the House now. I do not know for what reason, except that they may desire to challenge my right as the champion baby-kisser in the Province of Ontario. I do not think it is any reason, because there is a case going on involving the construction of that section, that we should attach so much importance to that section. The section has been read two or three times in this debate, but I will read it again with the permission of the House, because I want to refer to one or two considerations in connection with it:

"No payment (except in respect to the personal expenses of a candidate), and no advance, loan or deposit shall be made by or on behalf of any candidate at any election, before or during or after such election on account of such election, otherwise than through an agent or agents."

I think that is the whole pith of this case. It is contended, I believe, that the returning officer in this case had the right to return the minority candidate because the deposit was not made by the authorised agent. I say that, according to the statute, if anyone is to make the deposit, it is the witness to the nomination paper. The statute says, in a preceding clause, that the nomination paper shall be handed in, and it goes on:

"The returning officer shall require the person or one or more of the persons producing or filing any such nomination paper to make oath before them that he or they know that the several persons who have signed such nomination paper are electors duly entitled to vote."

So you see that the person who is to hand in the nomination paper is the witness to the paper itself, and the time at which it is handed in is the time to hand in the deposit. In no case can I find in the statute any reference whatever as to who is to pay in the money, and I think it is straining the law and doing violence to the constituency which Mr. Baird has come from, to say that he is to sit here, instead of the man who has the majority of votes, simply because the deposit was not handed in by the agent. There is this, also, in reference to the matter. That particular section, section 118 of the Revised Statutes, imposes a penalty:

"Any person who makes any such payment, advance, loan or deposit otherwise than through such agent or agents is guilty of a misdemeanor."

Now, you see there is a special penalty attached to the breach of that section, and I take it that no other penalty can be attached to the breach of that section. Several cases have been referred to in this discussion to show that the returning officer had no right, even if the gentleman who received the majority of votes was disqualified, to take cognisance of the matter, and I think the cases cited on this side of the House, and also on the other side, go to show that. I shall not, therefore, refer to them any more. I believe the country at large, apart from the legal aspect of this case, is not in sympathy with the hon. gentlemen opposite when they desire to deprive a gentleman, who has the majority of votes, of his seat in this House. I may refer to the *Mail* newspaper of the 7th March. It was discussing this case, and also referred to another case affecting the right to sit here of an hon. gentleman whom I am glad to see here. The *Mail* says:

"In both instances the moral, though there is not much comfort in it for either of the victims, is that none but men with an ordinary amount of common sense should be appointed as deputies. Meanwhile it may be said that the candidates who will accept an election by virtue of the errors of the officials, are not to be envied."

Mr. BARRON.

I think that, if there is one spirit that ought to animate, and does animate, most of the members of this House, it is a spirit of loyalty, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if, in depriving the gentleman who has the majority of votes in this case of his seat, they are loyal to the people of this country? I do not think they are. I think the first thing necessary in the sentiment of loyalty is to be loyal, not to one individual, but to the people, and I say that we are not truly loyal to the people of this country if we allow a gentleman to sit in this House who has a minority of the votes. I do not understand the argument, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to take cognisance of this according to the motion which is in your hands, but that it should be referred to a committee of this House. I am not yet familiar with the procedure in this House, but I take it that the committee will report to the House afterwards and that then the House will take cognisance of it. If we cannot take cognisance of it now, how can we take cognisance of it then? I think the country at large will be better satisfied—I know my own constituency will be better satisfied—if we dispose of this case now. I can say for my opponents that, if similar circumstances had arisen in my constituency, the Conservatives there would never have allowed the returning officer to return the minority candidate as in this case. I do that justice to my constituents, and to the Conservatives there, because I know they possess a sense of honor which would prevent their taking such a course as has been followed in this case. I hope and believe that the country at large will not be in sympathy with us on this occasion if we do not vote for the motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner).

Mr. LANDRY. One word of personal explanation. I am sure the hon. gentleman did not wish to misrepresent me, but he misunderstood me, because I take it to be an accusation against any hon. member to say that he cited one part of a section and left out a portion which would have given a different meaning to it. I did not read the section which he read at all, so he must have misunderstood me. I read this section of the Act of 1874, which says:

"The sum so paid shall be applied by the returning officer to the payment of election expenses."

And that is all there is to it. I know the hon. gentleman did not wish to misrepresent me.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the returning officer has anything to do with the payment of the election expenses of the candidate?

Mr. LANDRY. The argument I made was this: I said that under the Act of 1874 there was a provision that the deposit so made shall be applied by the returning officer towards the payment of election expenses.

Mr. MILLS. What election expenses?

Mr. LANDRY. The amount of \$50 which was deposited became virtually an election expense of the candidate. The law imposed it upon him. The hon. member may hold a different opinion, but I still maintain that it is a part of the election expenses. The argument I made was that the law imposed upon him a deposit of \$50, and that \$50 was part of his election expenses. I do not care where it went, it was part of his election expenses, as he paid it in connection with the election and it was not refunded to him.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the question of my hon. friend, I would say that I could not for one believe that he had quoted that section, because it was repealed in 1882.

Mr. LANDRY. I said it was repealed in 1882.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches on this subject, to the lengthy and learned arguments. We have been treated to

an endless verbosity of words, and I do not think that on either side they have shed much light upon the subject—certainly they have not changed my mind. I think that the conduct of the returning officer for the county of Queens, N.B., was the greatest outrage in connection with elections in Canada that has come to public knowledge for thirty years, and I think this House would only be consulting its own dignity if it summoned that man to the bar of the House and compelled him to correct his return, and to seat the gentleman who received the majority of votes. I am not going into any lengthy legal argument, but I say it is palpable to any man of common sense—and there is a common sense, and a sense of natural justice that will override all these legal quibbles in the minds of the people of this country—it is a matter of common sense that when the returning officer accepted that \$200 and allowed that election to go on until the day of declaration and summed up the vote, he should have ignored any petty technicality, if any such existed, and have seated the candidate who received the majority of votes. In our Act of 1874 for the trial of controverted elections it is provided that :

“ All elections held after the passing of this Act shall be subject to the provisions thereof, and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance therewith.”

The returning officer was only an executive officer on the day of declaration. He was not acting in a judicial capacity, and when this petty technical objection occurred, if it was an objection, he was out of his function in acting in a judicial capacity on the day of declaration, and the Controverted Elections Act provided how that should have been dealt with. For my part, I do not think this House ought to refer this to a committee. I intend to vote against referring it to a committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. I congratulate you on the cheers of your Grit friends.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I do not want the cheers of anybody, I want to do what is right. I wish to give you, as I have told you before, a fair and honorable support, and you will get no other from me. I think that it is a disgraceful thing if a minority candidate, by trick or quibble by any lawyers playing upon the mind of a credulous and ignorant returning officer, can obtain and hold a seat in this House, against the will of the majority of his constituents. It is upon this common sense ground, which I shall be able to justify to my constituents, to the people who sent me here, that I intend to vote. I was elected as an independent candidate, not to be dictated to by any man in this House, and I resent any impertinent allusion to my course or my action in this House. It is because I am in accordance with the wishes of my constituents in voting against any conduct of that kind, or any countenance in this House of such conduct on the part of the returning officer, that I shall give the vote I intend to give to-night.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but owing to certain remarks from the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) and from the hon. member sitting before me (Mr. Davin), I feel it my duty to say a few words in answer to their arguments, which to a certain extent contradict what has been said by the hon. the Minister of Justice and by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper). It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question now before us is simple enough to make it unnecessary for us to seek precedents in England or elsewhere, in order to form an opinion on the course followed by the returning officer, and to pronounce with a knowledge of the facts on the duties which this returning officer was bound to perform, and that is the first question which we have to consider. In the first place, how is the nomination of candidates to take place? We have a very positive law on that point, and if we only refer to its provisions we will

see that it leaves no room for doubt. In referring to the Revised Statutes, chapter 8, sections 22 and 23, it will be seen that the nomination of a candidate is made by means of a certificate signed by 25 electors, that a deposit in money must be made, and that the returning officer may require from the man who puts in the certificate an oath to the effect that he knows the candidate and the parties who signed the nomination, and that the person so nominated has consented to it, &c. Section 23 does not state that it will be the agent of the candidate who will file the certificate and deposit the money, but in order that a man may be legally nominated it will be sufficient for him to have a certificate signed by 25 electors, and that the sum of \$200 will be deposited in the hands of the returning officer, and the receipt given by him will be a sufficient proof of the nomination and of the deposit. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the present case it is just what has been done; therefore, the nomination was perfectly legal. No objection was made, when Mr. King, the candidate, was nominated, the proclamations were posted, a poll was granted, the votation took place regularly, and the votation having taken place, what was the duty of the returning officer? Again we have the statute, which says very clearly, and it seems to me that to any man who sees this thing in the light of justice and not in the light of party spirit, there are no two ways of judging this question. The only thing the returning officer has to do, when the summing up of the votes takes place, is to take the boxes, to open them, to take the returns, to add them up, and to ascertain which candidate has the majority of the votes. He has not even the right to open the envelopes to see the ballot papers, he has no right to refer to what has been done in the past, he is a passive subject and must carry out the letter of the law. He has no judiciary power, and all the law allows him to do is to sum up the votes, and when the votes are added, the sole and only duty he has to perform is to declare elected the candidate who has received the majority of votes. Sub-section 2 of section 60 says, that when the summing up of the votes takes place, the candidate who shall have the majority of the votes, will be proclaimed as elected. The returning officer has no right to say who will be declared as elected, he has no right to choose the candidate; the law is imperative, and all that he has to do, when the votes are added, is to proclaim as elected the one who has the majority of votes; the law says that such a candidate and no one else shall be proclaimed as elected. And to answer at once to an argument and to a precedent which has been quoted, I will say this: Even if, after the summing up of the votes, it should be pretended that the candidate who has the majority of votes is not of age, or is a felon, or an alien, I say that according to the Statutes the returning officer has no discretion to use, and that he must even in that case declare as elected the candidate who had the majority of votes, even if he is a minor, or an alien, or a felon, because the section says that the candidate who has the majority of votes, when the summing up is made by the returning officer, will be the candidate elected and no other. This is the way I look at it, and I believe that the law should not be construed otherwise, because if the power of putting aside one candidate or another is left with the returning officer, I say there will be cases—as it unfortunately happens too often—where a not over-scrupulous returning officer, in order to please his political leaders, will put aside a man who will have been elected, and, as in the present case, will give the seat to a man whom the majority of the electors of the county will have rejected. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a man has been regularly nominated, when the proceedings have been made legally, when no objection has been made at the nomination, when a poll has been granted, when the votes have been cast, the returning officer has no other alternative but to declare elected the candidate who has the

majority of votes when the summing up takes place. Now it is stated that the deposit should have been made by the agent and not by the candidate. Well, I think that if that was necessary, there are many hon. members who might have been deprived of their seats by the returning officer, and I myself would be one of them, for it was not my agent who deposited the money. Besides, the law does not require it. The law declares that what is wanted is a presentation paper, signed according to law, and a deposit. It has also been said that the deposit should be made by the agent because it is an election expense and that all such expenses should be paid by the agent only. Well, I believe it is not an election expense, because the deposit is to be remitted to the candidate who has received a certain number of votes, while even if he has received votes enough to save his deposit, his election expenses are not returned to him. Therefore it cannot be said to be an election expense. But even admitting that it should be an electoral expense, it is a personal expense, and the law allows the candidate to pay his personal expenses without the help of an agent. However, I say, this argument cannot hold because it is not even a personal expense, it is no expense at all, except in a certain case, and then it is a penalty, when the candidate is so unfortunate as to not obtain the required number of votes. Therefore this argument cannot hold in face of the law. I say, supposing it to be an election expense, it is not necessary that the agent should make the deposit, because then it would be a personal expense or a penalty, and the candidate can make this deposit himself or make it through his agent. Now it is said that this House has no right whatever to deal with this question, and that the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The hon. member who sits before me (Mr. Davin) has said that in this committee we have all the necessary guarantees, that we have the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we have prominent lawyers on both sides. It is true, but I only regret that the hon. member is not himself a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, for we will need his advice, and if the question is left to the House we shall have that advice. Mr. Speaker, does not the Committee on Privileges and Elections form part of this House? Will not the hon. members who will discuss and give their opinion before the committee, come back before the House with their report to have it approved or rejected by the majority of this House? Certainly, they will. Then why should we lose time? Why take this round-about way which is perfectly useless and go before the committee? If there was evidence to be adduced, if there were witnesses whose evidence it was absolutely necessary to hear, if the hon. gentleman who was proclaimed as elected could suffer any wrong because the question was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I would be the first to vote for the amendment, because I want no hon. member in this House to suffer wrongs, no more than I want to suffer them myself. But there is only one simple question at stake, a simple legal question; there is no need of witnesses, for we have already the written testimony of the returning officer, who says that the only reason why he has not proclaimed as elected the candidate who had the majority of votes, is that his deposit was not regularly made. Consequently, we have before us all we need to pronounce with a knowledge of the facts, and all we have to do is to read over the papers which are before the House. Why, then, should we not pronounce immediately? We have only one legal problem to solve, a question which was discussed on both sides of the House, in all manners and from every point of view. What need have we of the Committee on Privileges and Elections for those members of this House who have already expressed their views on this question? I see no other reason than a desire to gain time, to allow the Session to pass and to benefit by the vote of a man who represents the minority

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

of a county, and is so deficient in self-respect as to cling to a seat which he knows does not belong to him. Well, I say that for all these reasons, the House has a right to judge immediately this question upon its merits, being in possession of all the facts of the case, having before it all the documents necessary to discuss with a knowledge of the facts the only legal question which we have to decide. I say it is perfectly useless to refer the question to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the House can pronounce on this legal point, because there is no investigation to be made. We have before us all the papers, and the returning officer says in his report that the only reason why he has not declared as elected the candidate who had the majority of the votes, is that his deposit was not made by his agent. Now, I believe, that under the clauses of the Act which I have just quoted, the deposit was perfectly legal, and even if it was not legal, it is too late for the returning officer, on the day of the summing up of the votes, to pronounce and to use such an extraordinary power as he has seen fit to use, and to deprive a county of a man who had the confidence of the people. For all these reasons I shall vote against the amendment, for I consider that we would be losing time uselessly and depriving for a longer time the county of Queen's of the representative who was chosen by the majority of votes. I say we have a right to pronounce and to substitute the member who was regularly elected to the one who sits here illegally without having received the majority of votes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I take some interest in this discussion because it comes near home. I must say in reference to this remark of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), that I most heartily admire the man who is able to sink his party allegiance in the interest of justice and fair play. Twice already in connection with this Franchise Act, I have found that hon. gentleman on the side of justice and fair play, as I have found my hon. friend on my left, the king of the Gatineau (Mr. Wright), with some other hon. gentlemen, one of whom is now in my eye. On the occasion when this iniquitous Franchise Bill was brought in by the Government of the day, it became the duty of hon. members to point out the iniquities which it contained, I had certain suspicions as to the objects of certain provisions of that Bill, and did not hesitate to express my opinion about it. I find now, Sir, that that Bill, in some of its particulars, is now producing the fruits that the hon. gentlemen who proposed it and carried it through this House, contemplated, perhaps—I say perhaps—at the time. Sir, is it to be said in a free Parliament like this, that we who are here by the votes of the majority of the people in our different constituencies, are going to allow iniquities to pass such as this fraud on the part of the returning officer who was appointed by the Government of the day, a man who was the secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association, and an active partisan in the county of Queen's, N.B.? Shall it be said that we will allow that man deliberately to override the votes of the people, and permit him to return a man to this House who received a minority of the votes? Sir, if we countenance this thing to-day, what may be the effect of it? Are we going to perpetuate the power of these gentlemen on the other side of the House forever? At the next general election—if they remain as long, and I do not believe they will—what will be the effect of it? They will appoint other returning officers of this kind—I hope there will be too much honesty in some of them to consent to it—but we know they have appointed such persons in the past. I have nothing to complain of myself because they appointed the sheriff of the county who acted fairly, and when the Bill was passing I endeavored to get the local officers who had charge in the counties controlling the local elections, appointed to carry on the general elections in the Dominion. If that course had been pursued, and the sheriffs in the sev-

eral counties of New Brunswick had been appointed, we would have had no transactions like this, where a partisan officer, appointed by the Dominion Government, deliberately returned the man having a minority of votes on a technicality which has no foundation in justice or in facts. Sir, I have looked with some little care over this Act. I find that the law requires that \$200 shall be paid—for what?—paid as an assurance of the good faith of the candidate, in order to prevent persons from coming forward merely for the purpose of blocking legitimate and proper candidates who might come forward for these constituencies. That was the sole purpose of the deposit, to show that the man coming forward and being nominated was put in nomination in good faith to receive the votes of the people, and to prevent the blackmailing of *bona fide* candidates. In this case the money was paid. They claim it was not paid by the legal agent, or by the candidate himself. But he was recognised as the candidate, and the money was accepted by the returning officer, a receipt was given for that money, and Mr. King was sent forth to the country as one of the persons who was soliciting the suffrages of the people, and that fact alone forecloses, in my opinion, the right of any man to come in and say that Mr. King should be kept out of his seat on the alleged technicality. The fact is, that the returning officer recognised Mr. King as a candidate in the county, and the constituents recognised him by giving him a majority of the votes. I hope, by their votes, that the members of this House will see that justice is done to the people of that constituency, and I am encouraged to expect that from the fact that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), though a strong supporter of the Administration has yet the courage and honesty to come out and declare, no matter what his party proclivities, no matter how strong his fealty to his chief, no matter how strong his partisanship might be, he declined to be party to a fraud, as I declare this to be, on the people of Queen's county. I will not, at this time of the debate, enter into any of the details about this subject, because the House is tired of them, but I rose for the purpose of giving expression to my opinion as to the transaction itself. There are countries, and not very far removed from us, possessing free representative institutions, where, if such a transaction had taken place, the men that perpetrated it and the party—who might be the creature of the Government that retained him in office in defiance of justice, honesty and right, in place of receiving commendation and support—would be treated to a coat of tar and feathers. That is about the fitting remedy for some of those men. I am surprised that the Government of the day should countenance this transaction. I have been disappointed in the Minister of Justice, because he did not come out at once and say that this is a transaction that cannot be justified either by the principles of right and honor—and I doubt if it can be justified by law—and it would have been much more honorable if hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, instead of attempting to defend the corrupt act of a corrupt partisan officer, appointed by themselves, had at once come down and said that Mr. King has received the majority of votes of the electors of the Electoral District of Queen's, N.B., and is entitled to the seat, and the gentleman who occupies it has no right to it, and the House shall at once deal with the case. What is the object of sending it to a committee? Is there a particle of evidence wanting in the papers laid before us? Does not the return show that Mr. King obtained a majority of votes, that he deposited the necessary money, that his name was placed upon the candidates' list, that he was voted for in opposition to the sitting member? Then what else is wanted to enable the House to decide, and why is it sought to send the case to a committee? I will state the reason: The Government want to place a buffer between themselves and public opinion. They want some one on whom to cast the blame, and with a strong

majority in this House, and with a majority on the Committee of Privileges and Elections they will be able, if they are able to get a majority on the committee who possess partisanship above their ideas of what is pure, honest and just, to obtain a report that will confirm Mr. Baird in his seat, and the Government will at the same time be relieved of the responsibility. I hope the House will not shoulder the responsibility for the Government. I trust the House will say that here is a case completely proved, that we have a right to deal with it; that there are no matters to enquire into, and that it comes before the House to be dealt with; and, such being the case, there is no reason to send it to a committee. The House should take the responsibility of saying whether Mr. King or Mr. Baird has the majority of votes and is entitled to the seat. That is the simple question. I will not enter into the legal quibbles and technicalities by which hon. gentlemen opposite endeavor to accomplish their purposes and seat a gentleman whom they support, instead of the man whom the people want. It is the duty of the House to deal with the question directly. Let hon. members ask themselves: Has Mr. King a majority of votes? If so, seat him; if not, let Mr. Baird be confirmed in his seat. With these few remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When I first noticed the question under discussion on the paper it appeared to me that an officer of the Crown had been guilty of gross misconduct. I have learned with a great deal of interest, from the long speeches which some eminent lawyers on both sides of the House have delivered, that the points of law are so fine they have been unable to find them themselves. There are, in truth, no points of law involved in this case, and we have the facts before us contained in the papers laid on the Table. I agree with the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that the returning officer has been guilty of the most outrageous act of misconduct, whether through error or wilfully I am not prepared to say; but that we are in possession of all the facts, all will admit. I am able to say, as a layman, that although I have sat here for a number of years and heard many questions discussed I do not think I have ever heard a subject brought before the attention of members on which there was not at least an opportunity for able lawyers, by using special pleadings, such as we have had examples of to-night, to throw some mist over the question and enable members to have difference of opinion. But the facts are so few and simple in this particular case that any member of the House, any true Canadian, wishing to preserve the dignity, honor and position of this House, or even of the members of Parliament themselves, could entertain but one opinion. With respect to the propriety of sending the case to the Committee on Elections, it is said that the House has no right to deal with it; but I hold that if this House has the right to send it to a committee, it has a right itself to deal with it. Not being a lawyer, I cannot understand the matter in any other way. The opinion will spread among the people on both sides of politics, and extend to the world at large, that members of this Parliament are not able to express an honest and candid opinion when a simple matter arises that the most ordinary mind can understand. It places the members of this House in a most unfortunate position when it is found that partisanship runs so high that a member cannot give an honest expression of opinion on the most simple matter coming before the House. I regret that such is the case, although I was glad to know, after hearing the long speeches of many able lawyers, that there was one legal gentleman who agreed with me in the opinion that long speeches were made for the purpose, not of obtaining a fair and just decision, but of causing confusion, and with all the facts before him he declared that the returning officer had been guilty of the most outrageous conduct, and the first opportunity should be taken by the House to place the matter in a right position.

Mr. LISTER. If the charge made in this resolution had happened one hundred years ago, the individual would have been confined in the Tower by the unanimous consent of both sides of Parliament; while in this progressive age, in this age of great honesty, very little is said about the returning officer, and the contest is reduced to one between two candidates who ran at that election. The conduct of the returning officer was a most scandalous outrage on the rights of the electors of Queen's, and the Minister of Justice and his colleagues in the Government are guilty, as accessories to that crime, by moving the amendment which the Minister has moved to-night. The Secretary of State smiles. I would expect nothing else from him. It must have been gratifying to every gentleman to see the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), strong supporter as he is of the Government of the day, have the manliness and independence to rise and denounce the efforts of the Government to put a man in a seat in this House who obtained a minority of the votes of the electors of Queen's, N.B. A more dishonorable act it would be difficult to conceive—a more disgraceful act on the part of any man, than to seek to usurp the rights of another and deprive the people of the county of Queen's of their rights, I have never had brought before me since I have been a member of Parliament or otherwise. The speeches of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) were the speeches of special pleaders. The latter gentleman was badly briefed; his brief was an imperfect one, inasmuch as he possessed himself neither of the facts nor the law. The speech of the hon. member for Pictou was something better, but it was a special plea and nothing more. And as far as the speech of the Minister of Justice is concerned, what shall I call it? What ought we to expect from him—the man who appoints the judiciary, the man who, to a certain extent, administers the legal affairs of this country—what shall we say of him being a party to an act so scandalous as this? Sir, we know—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I do not think the hon. gentleman's expressions are parliamentary.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the matter with them? There is nothing wrong with them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order. I rise to ask what is wrong with them. I see nothing wrong with the expressions.

Mr. SPEAKER. I say that it is unparliamentary to say that an hon. member of this House—a Minister of the Crown—has been a party to a scandalous or dishonest act.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is so, whether it is in order or not.

Mr. LISTER. I say it is a scandalous act to put a minority candidate in this House. We have had enough election committees. We know what they are. I have had the honor of being a member of this House only four short years, and yet in that short time I have had some experience on election committees. I have seen your so-called election committee unseat an hon. member behind me, who had the majority of votes in a county in Prince Edward Island, and put the man who had the minority of votes in his place in this House, and he held that seat for four long years. The people of Prince Edward Island, when they had the opportunity, told you what they thought of such conduct as that. To tell us that the members of this Committee on Privileges and Elections are going to look at this matter as a judicial body, is to tell us something that our experience teaches us we cannot believe. Sir, the members of the committee have nothing in this case to decide; and, speaking about my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, while the members of that committee reported to this House that he ought to be unseated and the other man take his

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

place, the Chief Justice who has the appointment of the sheriff of the county, who was the returning officer—while this House said that that returning officer had acted rightly—the Chief Justice of Prince Edward Island declared that he had acted scandalously, shamelessly and shamefully. This is the legal result, the legal offspring, of the legislation you brought into the House within the last few years. You repealed the Act that Mr. Mackenzie passed providing that public officials should be returning officers. Why did you do so? Shall I say why? It was because you could not manipulate the public officers, and you appointed your own partisan returning officers from one end of the country to the other—men who would do your dirty work, and they have done it nobly. Here, Sir, a partisan of the most partisan character, the secretary of the Conservative Association of that county, is appointed the returning officer of that county, and he does his work well; he does his work clean. He puts in the minority candidate, and you are bound to keep him here. If you were not, you would resent this insult to the dignity of this House, this invasion of popular rights, because every county in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific is interested in this case. If a man violates the law in one case, it will be violated again, and the House owes it to itself to condemn in unmistakable language the conduct of that man. The Minister of Justice gets up here and admits that Mr. King had the majority of votes; he pleads for the man who has wronged Mr. King—for the man who has usurped his place. Sir, if Mr. King has been wronged, why perpetuate and intensify that wrong by throwing the case before the Privileges and Elections Committee? Why not deal with it at once, as the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) has said, and decide it here, because we can decide it at once, for the simple reason that there is no more evidence to be produced before the committee than we have before us to-day, and that evidence shows that Mr. King has been elected by a majority of sixty-one votes. The people of Queen's have decided who shall be their member, and you, in defiance of the popular wish, say that somebody else shall be the member, and not the man the people elected. If it goes before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when will it get out and what report will they make? I venture to say that if it goes before that committee it will result in seating, in keeping in his seat the man who has received the minority of votes. We will see the case go before that committee. The Government has decided that it must go there, and I suppose there are not sufficient hon. gentlemen on the other side to take an independent stand in the matter, although I know there are a number of them who feel that a great wrong is being done. I fear, Sir, that party fealty, that feeling that they have—that many of us have too much of perhaps—that feeling of fealty and allegiance to the party will force them to do what they know is abhorrent to their better feelings. There is no man sitting here to-night but must feel that the electors of the county of Queen's having decided that Mr. King shall be the member; there is no honorable man here to-night who does not feel in his heart of hearts that we are committing a wrong in keeping him out of the seat to which he was legally elected. I know that it will be doing violence to their feelings to allow the minority candidate to take a seat in the House. It is amazing—it must be amazing to every honorable man—how an hon. gentleman occupying the position he does, would not at the first opportunity say: No, the people of Queen's have not elected me, and I will never degrade myself by taking that seat. What is there to be decided? A paltry contemptible quibble—it is nothing more or less—that the two hundred dollars was not paid by the agent to the returning officer. Now, Sir, if the returning officer was a judicial officer—and I admit that he had quasi-judicial

functions—it was his duty at the time the money was paid to have decided that case one way or the other; to have told Mr. King that his deposit was not sufficient, and if he did not do that, then he should have decided that the deposit was sufficient and that the nomination was a proper one. Being a judicial officer and having decided that—because there can be no question that he did decide it—having received the money and given a receipt, having proclaimed these men as candidates and issued the notice, and held the elections, and printed the ballots, he was *functus officio*; he had no power whatever at a subsequent time to review his action. I am not arguing the question whether the nomination was lawful. I maintain that it was a perfectly regular and lawful nomination, but even if it were not that judicial officer, having exercised the power which the law gave him, it was not in his power subsequently to review that decision. Such being the case, the election took place, and Mr. King received a majority of the votes. The law, then, is perfectly plain and beyond controversy, that the duty of the returning officer was to declare Mr. King duly elected. The language of the Act is imperative; it says that he shall do so. Instead of that he disregarded his plain duty and the plain wording of the statutes, and declared the minority candidate elected. Sir, until this House votes, I cannot believe that the hon. members will do Mr. King a wrong—that they will be a party to an outrage perpetrated on the county of Queen's. I feel that it is the duty of this House at the earliest moment to purge itself of any suspicion of being a party to this wrong. It would be doing Mr. King a great wrong, doing the constituency a greater wrong, and it would be a dangerous act so far as the whole Dominion is concerned. It is all very well to laugh, but it may be your case, or mine, or any other hon. gentleman's at any time; and when questions affecting the dignity of Parliament come before Parliament, I say all hon. gentlemen on both sides should unite and say that the dignity of Parliament shall be upheld, and that no man shall have a seat here who does not hold it by the voice of a majority of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise simply to make two or three observations before the vote is taken on this question. I am glad, for his sake, that the senior member for the city and county of St. John is not present to-night. I remember when he rose to bring this question before the House, he invoked the spirit of impartiality, and he tried, so far as his voice went, to exorcise the spirit of partisanship from the discussion. If he had been here to-night and had witnessed the outburst of partisan feeling which has just been exhibited, he would, I think, come to the conclusion that neither his appeal nor his objurgation had very much effect, and that this House had sadly deteriorated from his ideal of what an impartial tribunal should be. The speaker who has just addressed the House declared that he had heard from this side nothing but special pleading, although he had supposed that the discussion would have been conducted in a calm, judicial way. I ask hon. members who have listened to his fiery and fierce harangue if he occupies the position of a special pleader or the position of a calm, impartial judge bringing to the decision of this question a judicial and fair spirit. If anything was needed to prove that this House is not the place where a question of this kind should be brought for decision, the speech we have just heard, and the two or three speeches preceding it, have been the best proof of that. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is very much opposed to the judicial committee of this House, the Committee on Privileges and Elections; he says that it is not a fair judicial body, and yet what does he propose to do? He proposes to take a body made up of men who have not all of them the legal attainments of that committee. He proposes to take a body of 215 men, of whom he is one, some

of whom I suppose, few, I hope, are animated by the same partisan spirit as himself. He proposes this as the judicial body to decide that question, but he is very much against relegating it to the committee of legal gentlemen chosen from amongst the best members of both sides of this House. My own opinion is, and has been from the first, that the courts of this country will take care of the rights of the people of this country, and that the courts of this country are well able to take care of this case. It has been brought here—who brought it? Not the candidate who at present has the seat in this House; it has not come through the courts; it has been brought here by gentlemen who did not dare trust the courts to give a decision upon it. It has been brought by gentlemen belonging to the same party who have over and over again deprecated the bringing of such questions to this body for decision, and who have laid down, and persistently argued from the dictum, that questions like this should be relegated for decision to judicial tribunals. An example of this is not very far distant, afforded by a late lamented member of this House. In 1883 the case of the King's county, P.E.I., election was before this House, and we were trying to decide which of two claimants had a right to the seat. I think it is reported in the *Hansard* of April, 1883, that Mr. Cameron, of Huron, made a motion on that case in this House, and made a speech in support of that motion. His motion was that inasmuch as this House was not a judicial body, but was partisan in part, and was not well adapted to take up and decide legal questions, therefore the question in dispute should be brought before the Supreme Court, in order that the law should be decided by that court for the guidance of this House.

Mr. MILLS. Did you agree to it?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better ask himself if he and his party are consistent to-day with what he and his party voted for in 1883. It is more of the hon. gentleman's concern to keep a little charge of his own consistency than to ask what position we took on that question in the premises. Mr. Cameron said:

"I say there may be something in the view which they hold; it is a question open to argument, and it is the bounden duty of Parliament to obtain the very highest legal adjudication upon it in order that the law may be settled and determined. It may be argued further, and I think with some propriety, that although this Parliament has the power, by virtue of the law of Parliament, to declare that a sitting member that occupies a seat in Parliament is disqualified for personal reasons, such as holding a Government office, being a minor or a lunatic, or something of that kind; but I deny that, although this Parliament has the power to declare as vacant a seat in Parliament, it has not the power to do anything else, to declare that any other person shall occupy the seat. * * * * * The power and jurisdiction of Parliament was never invoked to give a seat to a member whom the returning officer did not declare elected, and the people at the polls did not elect."

And the hon. gentleman opposite will find that not one or two but many of his own party stood at the back of Mr. Cameron and echoed his demand that this question should not be tried here, but that the legal points involved should be put before the Supreme Court in order that the House might have the benefit of the judges' decision. Now, to show the calm judicial spirit which animates hon. gentlemen opposite, they not only plead in a special way, they not only make their fierce and partisan harangues, such as that made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, but they actually passed sentence. They would tar and feather the returning officer; they would put him in a tower and keep him there, and from the many plaudits which came upon the heels of that assertion, it is not simply the hon. member for Lambton who has that fine, calm, judicial spirit, but a large number of hon. gentlemen on that side. These are the men who would be the judges. You heard what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) said. He bore testimony to the character, the straightforward character of the returning officer. I have never heard anyone speak ill of the returning officer.

Mr. ELLIS. If I said returning officer, I made a mistake. I meant revising officer.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that so far as I know, and I think my knowledge of the question is quite as great as that of most hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Dunn is a man of education and a man of intelligence, a man of good family and good character. I believe that what he did, he did because he conscientiously thought he was doing right; and I think it would be far better for us, unless there is evidence, and strong evidence, to the contrary, not to impugn the motives of the returning officer and thus show we are not in a judicial frame of mind. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) thought that he could not do better service in the interests of justice and of fair and judicial judgment than to read what purported to be a statement made by Mr. Baird at the time of the declaration. May I ask that hon. gentleman from what source those sentiments were obtained? Will he vouch for their being the sentiments of Mr. Baird? Does he not know they were published in a paper inimical to Mr. Baird and the party to which he belongs? Does he not know that they were publicly denied? And will he stand up and vouch for their truth in Parliament?

Mr. ELLIS. I will say this, that they were reported by one of the most competent reporters on the St. John press, and to my knowledge Mr. Baird has never denied them.

Mr. FOSTER. In what paper?

Mr. ELLIS. The *Daily Telegraph*.

Mr. FOSTER. All who know that paper and have been cognisant of its course for the last two years will require stronger testimony than this to prove anything true that appears in it. It is however an evidence, as I said before, an additional evidence of that fair, calm, judicial temper of the would-be judges in this case, in which the rights of individuals and the people are concerned, that they should take a newspaper report, which has been denied, and which has been made by a paper not noted for its veracity, but for its extreme partisanship, and cite it as evidence. Such things as that hardly comport with the character of judges deciding a case of such importance. The hon. member for the city of St. John said this was a case of the people against Mr. Baird. If it is, why now allow Mr. Baird a chance to be heard? But my hon. friend would come here, and, with his friends, decide the case off-hand. I am not a lawyer, and I am puzzled with reference to this matter. Laymen in this House are not in a position to decide this question. The first question to be asked is: Who is a candidate at an election? He is not every gentleman who puts his name before the people. There is a certain path by which a man comes to be a candidate, and if he does not come to be a candidate through travelling that path, no matter how good a man he may be, he is not a candidate in the eyes of the law. Did the candidate in Queen's county, for whom to-day hon. gentlemen opposite claim the seat, become a candidate in the legal acceptance of the term? Did he travel the path which is laid down by legal enactments? That is the question which lawyers are to decide; not one which we laymen can decide in a spare moment. Another question is: Has the returning officer judicial power? Hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted that he has. There is question as to the limits of these powers, as to when he becomes divested of them. That is a question for lawyers to decide; that is a question for judges to decide, and it is not a question which men, unversed in the law, can decide off-hand. Another question is as to precedents. I have listened to a great many to-night. I do not understand the full drift of them; I do not think any hon. gentleman can, until he studies up the cases himself, until he has ascertained what were the laws upon which these precedents are based, what were the circumstances, and whether these precedents go on all fours

Mr. FOSTER.

with the question before us. That is a question not for laymen unversed in the law to decide, but for legal gentlemen. These cases ought to be left where the wisdom of Parliament justifies their being left, namely, with the courts of the country, and the courts of the country will see that the rights of the people are not infringed upon. This question has been brought before this House in order to give a seat to a person who has not been declared to be returned by the returning officer, and as it is well for this to be decided, it is better it should be decided, after it has been thoroughly sifted by the best legal talent of the House. I will be prepared to vote to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where the best legal gentlemen on each side can take up the whole matter, go over the legal question, investigate precedents, and give us the benefit of a calm and judicial consideration of the matter. I have too high an opinion of hon. gentlemen who compose the Privileges and Elections Committee, to think that when they come to discuss this question they will turn themselves into partisans. I believe they will approach the question as fairly as legal minds can, and give us the benefit of their report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. gentleman, after carefully weighing the reasons and arguments advanced, has with pain and care made up his mind to consent to the course the Minister of Justice had adopted in advance; and it does him great credit to have been able after all that time to have come to a conclusion. I believe the conclusion which the House will draw and ought to draw, which the country has already drawn from this matter, is the gross impropriety of the Government of the country appointing the returning officers at their will and pleasure. I think that is the lesson to be drawn, and if hon. gentlemen on the other side are desirous of purging this House of the complicity in this outrage, they will take steps forthwith to get rid of this most obnoxious power, and put it in impartial hands—in the hands of the judiciary as is done elsewhere, or in the hands of some more permanent officials having a stake in the country, and who can reasonably expect to be trusted by both parties. What is the leading fact in this case? The hon. gentlemen have asked for precedents. I do not wonder that my hon. friends were unable to find any precedents for such a case. I do not believe that any precedent for such an outrage as this before this House can be found in the annals of any representative body in any quarter of the world, and, if there are no precedents found, it is because no precedent exists for such an act as this. But I want to ask if it is not true, as I have heard it asserted in many quarters, that there are in this House, holding their seats on both sides, a very considerable number of gentlemen in whose case the deposit was not made by their recognised agents, and who, if the ruling of this returning officer were right, have no business to sit here. I am informed—the hon. gentleman can contradict me if I am wrongly informed—that this is the case even in regard to the Premier of the Dominion in connection with his election for the county of Carleton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a mistake, altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I am very glad to hear it, because it would be a most unprecedented and extraordinary thing if the Premier was sitting here under such circumstances and was trying to deprive my hon. friend Mr. King of his seat on that ground, but, if it be not true in his case, it is true, as I have heard from many quarters, in the case of a number of other gentlemen who are here now. It appears to me to be one of the most pitiful and contemptible quibbles that I have ever heard of. Take these Consolidated Statutes to which my friend called the attention of the House, but to which I will venture to call the attention of the House again, and we will see what is

said with respect to these same elections. Here are the words :

"Unless a sum of \$200 is deposited in the hands of the returning officer at the time the nomination paper is filed with him, the nomination paper shall not be valid."

And it goes on to say :

"The receipt of the returning officer shall in every case be sufficient evidence of the production of the nomination paper, of the consent of the candidate, and of the payment herein mentioned."

It appears to me that if it be possible for words to have a clear meaning, it is evident that that section was drawn and intended to avoid just such petty mistakes, just such quibbles, and just such evasions as that by virtue of which my friend Mr. King is, I trust, only temporarily unseated. I do not think this is a matter which requires the subtlety of forty legal minds to decide. The facts are as clear as noon-day. Every man here knows that a great wrong has been committed; every man in this House, and every man out of the House, and the public press, to do them justice on both sides—supporters of the hon. gentleman as well as supporters of ours—have admitted that a great outrage has been committed in attempting to seat Mr. Baird in place of Mr. King. Why, they know perfectly well that the returning officer estopped himself, if ever a man was estopped in this world, by his own repeated acts from disputing the correctness of the deposit. Did not the returning officer, according to the papers which have been laid on the Table of this House, proclaim a poll; did he not give notice to all the inhabitants, or to all the electors of the county of Queen's, was not that poll held, and was it not weeks after this irregularity, so called, occurred that the returning officer attempted to go back on his own judgment? I will only say this. I do not believe that a large number of the hon. gentleman's supporters entertain the slightest difference of opinion from that which has been expressed on this side of the House, that a gross wrong has been done to Mr. King, and that the House ought to right it at once; and I do not believe that, if the position had been reversed, if any returning officer in this Dominion had been found, or had been insane enough to attempt to unseat a supporter of the hon. gentleman on this ground or any similar ground, that scarcely twenty-four hours would have elapsed after you, Mr. Speaker, were in the chair before that returning officer would have been brought to the bar of the House and this writ amended; and I do hope, in spite of all that has come and gone, that there will be enough members found in this new Parliament, on this important occasion, when we are called to act for the rights of the people and for our own rights, enough members found even among the hon. gentleman's supporters, to show that they would have done a wise and prudent thing, as well as a generous thing, in consenting to reverse this decision in the manner proposed, and in allowing the man who, according to the evidence which has been laid on our own Table, is unmistakably the choice of the people to take his seat, and allow Mr. Baird to take his remedy in the courts of law. If there be any difficulty, or any supposed difficulty, as has been stated by two or three gentlemen, as to Mr. Baird having the power to contest the seat afterwards, I am sure that both sides will be only too glad to give Mr. Baird that opportunity, if that is all that is standing in the hon. gentleman's way. Then there is another consideration. Who was the returning officer? The hon. Minister who spoke last was good enough to give him a certificate of character. I know nothing about him personally, but I do know that the returning officer who perpetrated this wrong was the last man who should have been placed in that position by any Government. He was the trusted agent of the Government; he was the secretary of the Conservative Association in that county; and no Minister and no Government which had any self-respect should have committed the out-

rageous indecency of appointing the secretary of the Conservative Association, the chief wire-puller against Mr. King, to a position in which he could sit in judgment on that unfortunate candidate.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). The gentlemen on the other side of the House have addressed themselves largely to the merits of the case, while the members on this side are contending for a principle which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to forget. I do not know that the rights of Mr. Baird, or the rights of Mr. King, or the rights of the county of Queen's are at stake here, but the question is the rights of the Province of New Brunswick and of the whole Dominion. I do not see the difference between trying to put one candidate in the place of a member elected, upon the ground of his having a larger number of votes, and upon any other ground which would void the election. The hon. gentleman who has last addressed the House says there is no precedent for the return of a candidate having a minority of the votes. In 1875 an election took place in the county of Victoria, which I have the honor to represent, when the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, was in power. That Government passed over the sheriff of the county, who was one of the two officers to be appointed to that position, and offered the position of returning officer to another, who refused. The sheriff of the county was never asked to accept the office, and the excuse the Government gave was that he was engaged in a local election and could not attend to the duties. Since that time, in 1878 and in 1883, the Local elections and the Dominion elections were held simultaneously, and the sheriff performed both duties without any disadvantage and without any protest being made by anyone. The appointment was offered to the registrar of deeds, and for various reasons he refused, the chief reason being that the sheriff had been passed over. A brother-in-law of one of the candidates, who at that time was running in the interests of the Government, was appointed. Now, I think, to any fair-minded person, it would be preferable to appoint a partisan to a judicial position than to have a brother-in-law of one of the candidates presiding over the elections. Well, a petition was presented to this House, the copy of which I hold in my hand. It is signed by sixteen Liberal justices of the peace in that county, and an M. P. supporting the Liberal Administration in the Province of Nova Scotia, and largely in sympathy with the Liberal party in Ottawa. I find the statement of facts contained in these petitions to be that the returning officer refused to count the ballots in one section of the county. The only excuse he gave was that in a box the deputy returning officer had not made a statement of the number of votes. On declaration day this was discovered, and the deputy returning officer was present and handed him a declaration under his hand of the number of votes polled for each candidate, and offered further to attest under oath before the returning officer that the statement was correct. This was rejected, and by throwing out the votes polled in that district, the party who actually was in the minority was returned to this House and sat in this Parliament for one year. Now, I have never yet to this day heard it stated that that returning officer did this to favor one party more than another. I believe that he did it, thinking that he had no right to take any statement which was not contained in the box. That petition was up here complaining of the action of the returning officer, and these facts which I have stated are all contained in the petition. The petition states that all the ballots being counted, the candidate who was not returned, received thirty-six majority over the one returned. Now, I find the leader of the Opposition of to-day who was then a member of the Government, presented this petition, and in presenting it he said that so long as this House had

conferred the duty of trying controverted elections upon the courts, he, for one, would not consent that the matter should be investigated before this House. He laid it down as a principle that when an act relating to that returning officer was complained of, the courts should take cognisance of it, and he would never consent that Parliament should have anything to do with it; but if he found that it was a matter over which the courts had no jurisdiction, then he would be willing that this House should investigate it. I have his words here. After reciting the petition and the matter of it, he says :

"But the most of the acts which the returning officer might be charged with would come before the cognisance of the courts, necessarily, and inasmuch as the principal acts here complained of in the conduct of the returning officer were such as properly came before the cognisance of the courts on the trial of an election petition, it did not appear to him that it would be acting in accordance with the spirit of the Act to invite the House to deal with the conduct of the officer in the present state of these proceedings. He would be very sorry to believe that the House had been deprived by the position of the Controverted Election Act of its power over returning officers of its power to investigate complaints made against them, and to punish them for improper conduct, but when Parliament transferred the trial of election petitions to the judges, and expressly provided that the conduct of returning officers might be complained of and they might be made respondents to petitions, Parliament thereby expressed a preference for that mode of investigation or at any rate a petitioner could adopt that course. Under these circumstances he did not think it would be proper to ask the House to enter into an investigation of the conduct of that returning officer pending the election trial. The appointment of the returning officer was a different matter."

He gave as an excuse that the sheriff was otherwise engaged. This was not the fact, because the sheriff was never offered the writ. Then it was offered to the registrar; and for the reason that it was not offered to the sheriff, thinking that no party would be appointed but the sheriff himself, he refused on that ground, and then another party was put in his place. Now, possibly hon. gentlemen may see a difference between this case and the one before us. I cannot see any difference. If the throwing out of one vote affected the result, and returned a party in the minority, I do not see any difference between that and rejecting two hundred votes, so long as the result is the same. I should be sorry indeed that the return of any person should be left in the hands of the House. I, for one, am prepared, had the motion been made, to reject it altogether, and I would have preferred voting upon the question here than to send it to a committee of the House. There is another point which I think has been referred to by hon. members, which is contained in section 63 of the Act of 1874, which is as follows :—

"All elections shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and shall not be questioned otherwise than in accordance herewith."

I think Mr. Bourinot, in his parliamentary work, lays it down that the House often refused to consider these petitions; and in fact since 1883 it is almost conclusive that in any matter that the court can investigate it is not wise for the House to interfere, and the House has invariably refused to deal with them, particularly when the time had not elapsed within which the petition must be filed. In Mr. Bourinot's work I find, on page 121, that he says :

"In any case it is always regular to receive a petition setting forth a grievance and praying for a remedy, providing that it does not question the return of a member within the meaning of the Controverted Elections Act of 1874."

I would have very much preferred that this House should not have entertained the motion at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). After the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member, it is, perhaps, necessary that a layman, about to cast his vote, should give his reasons. I understood the Minister of Marine to say that he was a layman and consequently was unable to judge this question. He wanted to divest himself of any responsibility in the matter. He wanted it to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and afterwards to be referred to the courts. Well, that may be the opinion of his judgment as a layman.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria).

He sets this value upon his own opinion : that he is incompetent to judge a simple question like that, and far be it from me to say that he is competent. But I would simply point out that the hon. gentleman, being incompetent, as he said, would have manifested a more becoming modesty if he had refrained from saying anything on the subject. People should only speak upon subjects they know something about.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then sit down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have some light upon it, and for that reason I am found speaking on this occasion, and there are some hon. members opposite who tender that advice to me who do well to retain their seats. But I fancy that it is hardly from a sense of modesty that they do so. I have thought that perhaps a feeling of shame entered into the composition of some of those gentlemen, of shame, perhaps, to defend in the House what they will vote for. Sir, I feel that I can approach this subject in a judicial spirit. We say, too, that we are sitting here as a jury to try this case. When we appeal to the people of the country at a general election, we speak of appealing to the great jury of our countrymen, and a jury of our countrymen said that George G. King should sit in this House, as the representative of Queen's county, N. B., and there is an attempt being made to carry out what has already been done, and to override the verdict of the jury, and to perpetuate what I deem to be an outrage on the rights and liberties of this Parliament. We should, therefore, approach the question in a spirit free from partisanship, though I agree with the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), although I cannot go his full length, when he said that he would view any man as a hypocrite who would say that he could utterly deprive himself of all party feeling in this matter. I suppose it is an impossibility to forget to which party we belong. But I feel that I am about to give, by my vote, expression to the decision arrived at in my own mind, and whether I am blinded by partisanship or not it will be for the House to judge; but I feel I have arrived at a conclusion that is honest and just, and I have no hesitation in casting my vote in the direction in which my mind is made up. The question is a plain one; it is a question for laymen as it is for the lawyers of this House. And I would say here that there is a feeling abroad in the Province from which I come—I do not know whether it prevails in other Provinces—a feeling, with which I am not in entire accord, but a feeling that prevails with many men, though I believe that legal men are necessary and many of them are ornaments to the House and are indispensable for the conduct of its business—I say there is a feeling stirring many minds that there are too many lawyers in this House, too many legal quibbles made and too many laws framed in their interest. When the speech of the Minister of Justice is read and understood by the country—the Minister of Justice he is called, and in Parliament he is supposed to carry out justice—and also the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), abounding in technicalities, plausibilities and sophistries, endeavoring to defeat what is clearly a just demand under the circumstances of the case, the feeling of the country will be deepened and intensified. No; I think it is a question on which every man, even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, ought to have his opinion, for I think every layman is able to form an opinion on this question, although that Minister said he was unable to do so. If the Minister of Marine is to be consistent with his own statement, what must he do? He must vote against the amendment as well as against the original motion, for he admits that he is not competent to pronounce an opinion; it is not for a pure simple layman like that hon. gentleman to do so. He says we must vote against the proposition and leave the matter to the courts. According to the speeches of the

Minister and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), this question must be left to the courts, and not dealt with by the House or by one of its committees. Let it be remembered, however, that we are responsible to our constituents for the votes we are about to give. I am about to cast a vote on this question, and I am responsible to them, and I claim to be able to judge respecting any question brought before Parliament. I shall be able to say this case was this: An election was held in Queen's county; nominations were received by the returning officer; both nominations were received; the necessary deposits were paid in; receipts were given; both names were accepted and were mentioned on bills printed by the returning officer, the name of Mr. King being printed as well as that of Mr. Baird; polls were opened throughout the different portions of the county; voters came and recorded their votes; ballots were returned and it was found that by a majority of 61 the voters of the electoral division declared Mr. King to be the candidate of their choice. That having been done, there was a legal quibble raised as to whether the deposit was paid in by the proper party, although a receipt was given; and this House deprived the candidate possessing a majority of votes, of a seat, while the minority candidate was given the seat. I shall tell my constituents that when the question came up there was a resolution moved to amend the writ by inserting the name of the majority candidate, a proposition that will commend itself to every honest man in the country, to whatever political party he belongs, and I am willing, having done that, to assume the responsibility as a layman to run all the risks of explaining to my constituents that I voted for it, and I am not afraid they will rebuke me for the position I have taken. There are not two sides to this case. There is not any question for argument; justice must be done first. Give the seat to the man elected, and then if the courts have to come into operation, let them do so in the regular manner. But this whole proceeding is discouraging to a lover of this country. All the movements that occurred during the last general elections are enough to make Canadians blush; taking power into the hands of the Government to appoint their own returning officers, coupled with their conduct as it has been revealed by the Franchise, Gerrymander and other Acts, trying to stifle "the free expression of the people's will;" all are discouraging to Canadians who desire in this country, no matter what political differences exist, that we shall recognise the fact that we believe in constitutional government and the right of the majority to rule. It is not for the members on the other side of this House to attack as to partisanship on this occasion. I desire to judge this question in a judicial spirit. I think we are so acting; but there is such a thing as honest indignation, when injustice is attempted to be perpetrated and wrong to be consummated simply because there is a majority in the House of Government followers. Is it too much to hope that those hon. gentlemen opposite who have been guilty of precisely the same irregularities as in the case of Queen's county will hesitate before they pronounce that the majority candidate in Queen's county is to be deprived of his seat, and that they will refuse him justice, while they themselves are suffering under the precisely same disqualification? This applies, I understand, to the two members for the city and to others. Hon. gentlemen opposite will each know for himself whether he is in that position or not. All the facts may not be known for some time, but when they come to light, and it appears that they have been guilty of the same irregularity as is alleged in the present case, and that they nevertheless voted to seat the minority candidate, it will be a sight for the country to behold and a subject for their constituents to consider. I feel somewhat strongly upon this matter. I do not now feel so, simply because a member of the Opposition happens to be involved in the case, although I have a strong personal friendship for the hon. gentleman deprived of

his seat. But I am cognisant of the fact that the Government possesses a majority, and that a change of one or two votes is not going to affect it. If I looked at this question purely from a party standpoint, I might consider that it would be an advantage to us for hon. gentlemen opposite in the face of these plain facts presented before us, facts that are incontrovertible and which no amount of legal quibble can remove, to allow them to perpetrate and consummate this outrage against the liberties of the people and leave the country to judge with respect to it. The country had a shock last year, when the First Minister hid himself to East York and standing on a public platform, as I understand from a newspaper report, used the very fact of the physical inability of one of the grandest members of this House, the fact that in the service of his country he had so broken down his health that his once powerful voice could be no longer heard in this Parliament—standing on a public platform he urged that as a reason why the electors in that county should reject Mr. Mackenzie and elect Alfred Boulton. Well, Sir, there are things which transpire in the heat of election conflicts which we may be sorry for afterwards, but it seems to me that, in the case of an hon. gentleman whom Conservative members in common with Reform members, have acknowledged to be one of the most honorable, honest and able men in Canadian public life, it would have been a generous thing—there would have been something of the spirit of chivalry in the act—if the First Minister could have abstained from going there or, if he must go there, abstained at least from urging that gentleman's physical disabilities as a reason for his being rejected in favor of Mr. Alfred Boulton. They talk about maintaining good feeling among our public men; but I ask them to put themselves in the places of the Opposition; let them put themselves in our place with a gerrymander forced upon us which lost us many ridings; let them put themselves in our place when they attempted their very best by an Act of Parliament to legislate men out of this House—sitting there as they do with a majority largely procured in this way; let them put themselves in the place of the Opposition who, weighed down as they were, and without whining accepted the position, and determined that they would rely only on a desire to maintain, as far as they can, the principles they believe are correct, and to urge the carrying out of those principles. We are here for that purpose. We seek no party triumph in this matter, but I rejoice to say that in this case I believe every member of the Liberal party will be found on the side of justice, on the side of the people in their desire to exercise their constitutional right of saying who shall be the member to represent them in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given us the very best evidence of the necessity for sending this question to some other tribunal than before the members of this House. Hon. gentlemen may convert this debate into levity; they may convert it into a subject of mirth, but I do not think the warmth displayed and the epithets employed by them are any evidence that the members who would judge this case if it were left to the House would judge it otherwise than partially. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has given us another exhibition of what I might almost call the hydrophobic attacks of political rancor which were displayed by him and others in the course of the heated debates over the Franchise Bill; and ever since that time, whenever that name is mentioned, there appears to be something in it which arouses their spirit of antagonism and vindictiveness, and the display of something which is not consistent with a calm, judicial consideration of any question like this. I would ask in the first place for what purpose does this House appoint a Committee on Privileges and Elections at the commencement of every Session? Is it expected when the committee is

appointed that anything will come before it? If it is intended that that committee is appointed for any purpose, then I think that such a case as we have before us to-night is one that should be dealt with by that committee. Mr. Bourinot, who is considered a very high authority, mentions that committee as the first committee of the House of Commons, and says that it shall be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters as may be referred to it by the House. But there are other things connected with this case that must be considered before giving a decision. I think we must at least assume that there is honesty in human nature, and remembering that there is provision made for the punishment of those who violate the principles of this law, we must assume if hon. gentlemen are correct, that the returning officer in this case was not only void of common sense and a disposition to do right but that he had not before his eyes any fear of the punishment which is provided for in the case of his committing a wrong. In the first place he takes an oath that he will do his duty, that he will act faithfully in that capacity, without partiality, without fear, favor or affection. Now if he violates that oath, as hon. gentlemen have assumed that he has, if he violates it wilfully he in the first place perjures himself, and in the next place he gives evidence that he is so sunk in dishonesty and vice that he is not fit to be recognised in respectable society. Now, we have not heard it claimed that he is such a character. We have not heard it claimed by any hon. gentlemen opposite that he is not a respectable man, a man who is honest in his intentions. If we assume that he is honest in his intentions and has taken that oath and believes that he has faithfully carried it out, then we have the right to assume that this is only a case of want of co-ordination in the interpretation of the law—he interpreting it in one way while others give it a different interpretation. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that this was only another evidence of what we might expect by the appointment of returning officers who were not sheriffs or registrars—in diverging from the former method of appointing sheriffs and registrars to act as returning officers. The hon. gentleman forgets that only last Parliament we dealt with a case where a sheriff was a returning officer and returned both candidates, and for so doing was dismissed from his office for the very act which they said would not have occurred in this case had this returning officer been a sheriff or registrar. If I am correctly informed the returning officer was not a lawyer but a layman. Now, what interpretation did he put on the clause which says that no payment shall be made—no advance, loan or deposit on behalf of any candidate before or during or after the election, on account of such election, except by the election agent. Now, if he interpreted the law as a layman to mean that this deposit which was made on behalf of the candidate must be made by the election agent, although he overlooked that fact at first, and in his scrutiny of the law afterwards, in the disposition to do what was fair, decided to reconsider it and held that it was the duty of the agent to make the deposit, instead of the party who had made it, I think we have the right to assume that he was honest in his intentions, in so far as his knowledge of the law went. Is it to be wondered at that we should find a difference in the interpretation of the law in such a case, when we find so much difference in its interpretation by the legal gentlemen of this House. Some of these gentlemen sitting on this side of the House give one interpretation of the law, and others sitting on the opposite side give an interpretation the very reverse; and is it, therefore, to be wondered at that this returning officer, who is not a lawyer or a judge, but only a layman, should happen to interpret the law a little differently from the best legal minds of the country. I think we should assume that the interpretation was made with the belief that he was justly

Mr. SPROULE.

interpreting the law and was honestly endeavoring to carry it out correctly. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) went on to say that the returning officer's interpretation of the law was such a crime and vice that it should be stamped out, and he wondered that any hon. gentleman should entertain the idea that this was a thing which should not be remedied by the House. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there is a penalty attaching to the crime of the returning officer, if crime it is. The penalty is that he can be sued and five hundred dollars can be recovered from him, as well as all the damages that the candidate has sustained and all the expenses connected therewith. That is one of the penalties. The other is that he can be prosecuted for perjury, if he wilfully violates his oath, and in addition he can be sued by any individual elector within a year, and the person suing can collect the sum of two hundred dollars. Are we to suppose that he did not think of these things, that he had not these penalties in view when these proceedings were going on and that he was not endeavoring to carry out the law? It seems to me that it is assuming a great deal to say that he deliberately misinterpreted the law and allowed his political fealty to lead him to declare the candidate elected who was not the choice of the people. The hon. member for South Oxford went on to say that we were violating a principle that had heretofore existed in elections by appointing other persons than sheriffs or registrars as returning officers. I think he forgets the Algoma case. The Provincial Government of Ontario reserved to itself power to pass over sheriffs or registrars for cause. Why did they pass over the registrar and sheriff in the Algoma case? It was currently rumored in the press that it was because those men were not venal enough to carry out their wishes, and therefore they selected a man who was a stronger partisan and was willing to do their bidding. If I understand the function of Parliament, it is to make laws, and the function of courts and judges and lawyers is to interpret them; and if this case can be brought before the courts, as no doubt it can, then I think we have no right to be asked, as laymen, as lawyers, as political partisans on both sides, to give our interpretation of the law, and sit as judge and jury on this particular case. In doing that, I think we would be abrogating our functions as the makers of laws. We would not only have ourselves placed in the position of men whose political bias might warp their judgment, but whose feelings might be excited by that bias, by the rancor of debate and a hundred other influences which would never affect the judges on the bench. In view of these considerations, I think it strictly in accordance with our duty that we should send this particular case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is appointed for the very purpose of dealing with such cases; and if that committee cannot decide the case, it can be taken to the courts of the country. The candidate who thinks he did not get justice has the courts of law to appeal to, and he can prosecute that officer for perjury if he has wilfully violated the law, and by these means he can obtain his rights if rights are to be got. But it is not consistent with our duty that we should take this case in hand, for in this House it is not likely to be decided in the calm, judicial spirit that would animate judges on the bench, who are not interested in seating one candidate or the other, as the political parties of this House might be expected to be.

Mr. AMYOT. I am rather surprised at the argument that because the returning officer knew the penalties attached to his wrong-doing, we must presume that he did not do the wrong intentionally. When a murderer is taken before a court we say to the jury, that man must have known that if he killed his fellow-citizen, he would be hanged. The returning officer is exposed to a penalty of \$500. When we see in some counties, I will not say by

which party, \$10,000 or \$20,000 spent to defeat an opponent, we may say that the returning officer will hope, if he pays his fine, that he will receive \$5,000 or \$6,000 compensation besides an increase in his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the punishment for perjury?

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, he would perhaps be tried by some jury that would be bought, as we have seen in some cases. What do we see to-night? Nearly half of the most respectable members of the House taking the part of a returning officer who has audaciously acted against the provisions of the law; and the returning officer might expect that if he were prosecuted, he would get a jury that would protect him. Some of the witnesses might disappear, as often happens in such cases; a juror will fall sick or some other incident will occur to make the law after all a dead letter. The returning officer has acted wrongly; we do not impute his motives; but we say he must have been either a scoundrel or a fool, and in either case he does not deserve the support of this House. I heard the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) saying a little while ago that we would set a dangerous precedent, if we did what? If we allowed this Parliament to punish the returning officer. Well, we would set a dangerous precedent indeed if we decided that the election of a member of this House now and in future should be in the hands of a single officer, chosen, not at the instigation of a Minister, but through the instigation of some political friends of the Minister. Such a precedent would be dangerous and it would be scandalous. It is said that this matter should go to the courts. Who has the right to say to the candidate who has the majority of votes that he is bound to make the \$1,000 deposit, that he is bound to fight against an opponent who has not, perhaps, a cent to refund him his expenses? Who has a right to say that the man who has the majority of the votes must search for witnesses and expose himself to the danger of a trial? Here the spirit and letter of the law says that when a candidate has a majority of the votes it shall be the duty of the returning officer to declare him elected. He does not do it; and because he has been either a scoundrel or a fool, he will tell to his victim: You pay the \$1,000, pay the witnesses and the lawyers, endure all the anxiety, and bear all the consequences of the act of the scoundrel or the fool. It has been said in this debate that we should not look at this question with party bias or from a party point of view, and I hope we will not do it. What are the reasons given for sending this case to the committee? Some have said we have no right to mix ourselves up in this matter—it is for the courts. To this I reply: when Mr. Macdonald came in the law was as it is to-day, and it was then, and is now, the provision of the law that all rights in controverted elections belong to the courts. Yet we have seen the hon. leader of this House, all his Ministers and the great majority of the Conservative party saying and voting that this Parliament has kept the right it always possessed of deciding questions of privilege. The question was then sent to a committee, and why? Because there was some evidence to collect. We did not know whether the opponent of Mr. Macdonald had or had not resigned his position as a local candidate at the time he contested his election. Then we decided the principle in accordance with the authorities, that Parliament is sovereign, that it is the guardian of its dignity and privileges, and of the liberty, not only of Parliament but of the people. The principle was decided that Parliament had the right to interfere. That doctrine cannot be changed to-night by the very parties who decided in the sense I have just told you. Being admitted by that party, which I respect, that it was our duty to interfere, we apply the same principle here, only we go a step further. I ask: Why send that case to

the Committee on Privileges and Elections? What facts do we want to elicit? Has there been an election? Have there been two candidates? That is not denied. Has there been a deposit? That is not denied. Has there been a receipt given, which is proof *prima facie*, and more than that *juris et de jure*, that the deposit was correct? That is not denied. It is not denied that an election has been had, that votes have been taken, that this candidate, by a pretended court—for there was no such thing as a court then—but the votes were counted by the returning officer—was, in defiance of the law and common sense, declared elected though a minority candidate. We have all these facts. What are the facts that can be elicited by the committee? In spite of the researches of hon. members who took the part of the returning officer, not one of them has been able to quote one single fact that required to be elicited by the committee. What can be the reason for sending this case to a committee? There can be only one, and I will not dare to attribute it to those who propose the measure, but it can have only one effect; that will be to try and kill the thing in some way or the other, to prepare the spoliation of the majority of that county, and allow a man to sit in this House representing the minority. That is as atrocious as if the minority on this side wanted to rule, and pretended by some fault of the returning officer, that the majority had not the right to rule. This is not only a question of justice but of dignity in this House. It has been said rightly that if the hon. member who has taken his seat by the vote of the minority respected this Parliament he would never have dared to come within its walls, but would have resigned his seat at once. Instead of that he comes in and takes his seat, and the majority say: You belong to us and we will protect you. A Government cannot do such acts as this very often without destroying its reputation and undermining the basis of its existence. When we ask for precedents, we ask for something impossible. No returning officer, with the law so clear, has gone so far as this one. Precedents are often the science of those who have no other science. If there are no precedents we will make one, and teach that officer that nobody who dares to defy the rules, regulations and laws of the country will escape severe punishment. He deserves the punishment, and it is this honorable House, which is the guardian of our liberty, to take the matter in hand, and justly and fairly proceed to punish the guilty party, and give to that county its real representative. I do not pretend to throw any light on the subject, but I record my protest against the idea that, because there is a punishment attached to the offence, we must assume it is no offence at all. Law like that would prevent the administration of justice and the holding of any court. It is entirely adverse to common sense and right dealing. We know what party spirit will do; we know the people who are seated above the returning officer, and how party spirit engages the returning officer to commit great mistakes, and when we see people seated above those committing those faults through party spirit, we know, when we come down to those party men, we may expect to see something worse. For my part, all party politics aside, if I saw a man sitting on this side representing a minority, I should refuse to remain with him, or else I would not respect myself.

Mr. GIROUARD. Notwithstanding the late hour, I hope I will be allowed to say a few words. It has been stated there is no reason for referring this case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, there being no new facts to be elicited. Granting this to be true, have we not an important question of law to examine, the question is whether we can deal with the case or not. This I consider to be a very important question, indeed; it is the first time it has been raised. In 1882, at the time of the discussion on the King's county election (Prince Edward Island), the point was

not raised at all. Mr. Cameron, the member for Huron, wanted to refer it as a special case for the Supreme Court of Canada upon a special order of this House; and if I recollect well I think it was laid down we had no such power. We had no power to deal with the case under the Controverted Elections Act of 1874, which still governs such cases. Had the attention of the House been called to that point, we might, perhaps, have referred the case to the ordinary courts of the country. There is, however, considerable difference between that and the present case. King's county election took place six months before the sitting of Parliament; the time had elapsed to file an election petition, and none had been filed, and there was no representative in the House for the county. The question was raised, that as the courts would not deal with the case, should we allow the county to remain unrepresented or not? In the present case, the time for filing the election petition has not lapsed; the parties who have been injured have all their rights intact; the question would be, whether this is the proper tribunal to examine the case. From the quotations from the Statutes, I have no doubt that we have no jurisdiction in the matter. I am satisfied that we have parted with that jurisdiction by vesting it in the ordinary courts of the country, and it should be to those that the parties ought to go. It is not a question of injustice or fraud, but purely a question of procedure: Have we the power to deal with the case? This is a question which should come before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and will be open there to the fullest discussion. Parties interested will have the right to employ counsel to plead their cause, and more than that we will not be called on to give a hasty decision, as we would, if we gave one this evening. These are sufficient considerations to induce hon. members to refer this case to the committee. The matter is a very important one. To-day it may be a clear case of injustice, but it may be a doubtful case to-morrow; and when you have the ordinary courts of justice given jurisdiction do not let Parliament take that jurisdiction that has been invested in them so wisely. To-morrow it may be a doubtful case, and partial majorities may, perhaps, deprive a member of his seat. I will refer to the statute and conclude by it, to show that really we have divested ourselves of all jurisdiction. Section 7 of the Controverted Elections Act of 1874, with rules this case, because the Revised Statutes only came into force on the 1st March, declares:

"The petition complaining of an undue return or an undue election of a member, or no return or a double return."—

Look at these expressions. "An undue return." That is, if the election has been irregular, if all the proceedings have been illegal up to the very day of the election, if there has been an illegal return, if there has been an undue return, then you should go to the court of justice. Then, if there is no return, or if there is a double return, as there was in King's county, P.E.I., in 1883, you should go to the court of justice, and yet the motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) is that we should declare who was returned, that we should declare that the majority candidate was returned. What power have we to do that? Section 29 of the same statute says:

"At the conclusion of the trial the judge shall declare whether the member whose election or return was complained of, or any other person is duly returned."

The judge is to declare that, and here you are proposing that we should declare who is returned. You have no jurisdiction in the matter. You have no more jurisdiction than the first man passing in the streets of Ottawa. Look at the last clause of the statute which is still more precise, which says that in every matter connected with an election we have no jurisdiction:

"All elections held after the passing of this Act shall be subject to the provisions thereof, and shall not be questioned except in accordance therewith."

Mr. GIBOUARD.

I am certainly against injustice. I am against oppression, whether exercised by a public officer or by anyone else. I am also against all frauds at elections. I am for justice for everyone, but I want justice in a constitutional manner, according to the rules laid down by the Parliament of this country, and, before coming to the relief of the county of Queen's, or coming to the relief of Mr. King, I will respect the law of the land which has been passed by this Parliament, and that I consider my first duty. For that reason I would have been prepared to declare immediately that we have no jurisdiction, but every member of this House, perhaps, is not so prepared; every member of this House is not a lawyer.

Mr. WELSH. Thank God.

Mr. GIROUARD. You say "thank God." Perhaps, if you knew more law, you would exercise your judgment a little better in this matter. Let us go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and hear counsel on both sides, and after a few days of deliberation we may be able to come to a more satisfactory conclusion. I express no opinion on the merits, but simply upon the jurisdiction of this Parliament to deal with the case.

Mr. FISHER. After the last few words of the last speaker, I think I have not the same high opinion of the profession to which he belongs that I think he would like all laymen to hold. He has told us very clearly and distinctly that he, as a lawyer, having examined this question thinks the proper course is to leave it to the courts, but, by his proposed action, he declares the very opposite to his expressed opinion. If the lawyers of this House give us such an example as this, may we not fairly consider that the laymen of this House are more trustworthy in their judgment, more trustworthy in dealing with a matter of justice and right than these professional gentlemen who give such opinions as that. I do not desire to say anything against that profession, or to say that there should not be in this House many members of that profession, but from the example we have had to-night from the lawyers on the other side of the House, I think it is very necessary that there should be in this Chamber some other members than lawyers. The whole burden of the song of the hon. gentlemen on the other side is that this matter is not within the jurisdiction of this House, that it should be referred to the courts of the land. If that is their conviction, why is it that they have not so proposed, why is it that an amendment has not been moved to leave it to the courts of the land and declaring that this House should not express an opinion upon it? They say now that it should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but what is the Committee on Privileges and Elections? As far as I understand the constitution of the standing committees of this House, they are committees to which are delegated the work of this House, which may do that work and then present a report upon which this House is called upon to pass. When the Committee on Privileges and Elections presents its report, the House will have to pass upon this question as we are asking the House to pass upon it to-day. If this means anything, it is simply a postponement of the question, a postponement of the date when the House will have to pass upon the question and declare its opinion upon it. I do not consider it necessary that this question should be entered into by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, because the whole facts of the case are before us. It is not such a case as that which has been cited by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. McDonald). He cited an instance in which the details of the case were unknown, in which there was a dispute as to the details, and it was necessary that witnesses should be summoned in order to arrive at a decision as to the details. In such a case, it might be right to

relegate that matter to the courts, where the details might be more thoroughly investigated, but here we have on the Votes and Proceedings every detail of this case. The hon. gentlemen have not suggested that there is any additional detail which they propose to lay before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or before the courts, if it should be sent before the courts; so we are to-day in as good a position as we could be after the committee have decided and presented their report. The only advantage which could be obtained would be that we would have the opinion expressed by a small number of the majority of that committee. But we have had already the advantage of the opinion of a large number of the members of this House, quite as many, I believe, as are on that committee, and I think we are quite justified in proceeding to an immediate decision. I believe that this is not so much a matter of law as a matter of justice. It is said that we should not decide the question between Mr. King and the present sitting member for that county. It is not only those two gentlemen who are concerned, but it is the voters of that county who are interested, and I believe they are the chief people to be considered. I believe that the rank and file of the voters of the county have the right to be considered much more than any person who happens to be for the moment the choice of the voters in any county. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries make some remarks in reference to the present sitting member for Queen's, N.B. I understood the member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) to refer to some statements put forth by the present sitting member and I understood the Minister of Marine to say that those statements had been denied, and that the sitting member had never made such statements. I should suppose that the sitting member would say "save me from my friends," because, if that gentleman ever showed that he was a man of honor, it was when he made those statements, if he did make them, and not now, when he takes his seat in this House in opposition to the votes of the county he is supposed to represent. If that hon. gentleman did not make use of these expressions, I regret to hear it. I am sorry to think that at no time did he feel the whole responsibility of his actions, that at no time was he actuated by that high sense of honor I had supposed had actuated him. But, Sir, there is a question to be considered also with regard to the returning officer to whom the hon. Minister of Marine gave a high character. I think, however, we had sufficient grounds to go upon without taking his character from anybody. This returning officer, when he knew that he was in the position of an active partisan, that he was holding confidential relations with one of the two candidates, deliberately accepted the position of judge, as between the two candidates of that county. Nobody who had a high sense of the duties of that position, who had a great sense of self-respect, would have accepted such an anomalous and invidious position. Had the returning officer been such a man as the Minister of Marine described him to be, he would have refused to act as returning officer after he had held the position of secretary of the Conservative Association of that county. Sir, I do not believe that as the facts are clearly laid before us, we ought to allow them to be surrounded by such a cloud of legal quibbling as that the people of the country may be led to believe that these facts are not clear as daylight. I can only believe that this proposition to refer this question to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, is a scheme by which the Government propose to relieve themselves and their supporters of a direct vote in this House, and of the responsibility of such a partisan action as the one in question. They think by shielding themselves under the report of a committee, the people of the country will be prevented from having a clear perception of the character of this act, and the Government hope thereby to shield themselves

from the condemnation of all right-minded people in the country. I trust the course of this debate has been such as to secure that they will not succeed. While speaking thus, I think I may defend those hon. gentlemen around me who have showed, perhaps, a little heat in the midst of this debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of having showed partisanship. Sir, the hon. gentleman who proposed this motion to the House is acknowledged by all on the opposite side to have done so in a judicial spirit, without showing any partisan feeling, but I do not wonder after they heard the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice, and the speeches of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and others, which precluded us from any hope that this question will be treated upon its merits, and which precluded us from any hope of obtaining justice from the Government for our friend, the late member for Queen's in the last Parliament. I do not wonder, I say, that the members of this side of the House allowing themselves to speak strongly, and if they have shown any heat it is only because they found that the Government of to-day were disposed to excuse this outrage, and were not prepared to grant justice to the man who had received the majority of the votes.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Thompson (p. 160):

YEAH:

Messieurs

Audet,	Guillet,	Putnam,
Bain (Soulanges),	Haggart,	Reid,
Bergeron,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Boyle,	Jamieson,	Roome,
Brown,	Joncas,	Ross,
Bryson,	Kenny,	Royal,
Burns,	Labelle,	Rykert,
Cameron,	Landry,	Scarth,
Campbell (Digby),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Shanly,
Carpenter,	McCarthy,	Small,
Caron, (Sir Adolphe),	McCulla,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Chapleau,	McDonald (Victoria),	Smith (Ontario),
Chisholm,	McDougald (Pictou),	Sproule,
Cockburn,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Stevenson,
Colby,	McGreevy,	Taylor,
Oostigan,	McKay,	Temple,
Coughlin,	McKeen,	Thérien,
Coulombe,	McLelan,	Thompson,
Couture,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Tisdale,
Curran,	McNeill,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Daly,	Madill,	Tupper (Pictou),
Davin,	Mara,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	Marshall,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	Masson,	Wallace,
Denton,	Mills (Annapolis),	Ward,
Desjardins,	Moncreiff,	White (Cardwell),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Montague,	White (Renfrew),
Foster,	Montplaisir,	Wilmot,
Freeman,	O'Brien,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Gaudet,	Perley (Assiniboia),	Wilson (Lennox),
Girouard,	Perley (Ottawa),	Wood (Brockville),
Gordon,	Pope,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Grandbois,	Porter,	Wright.—109.
Guilbault,		

NAYS

Messieurs

Amyot,	Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),
Armstrong,	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Mallory,
Barron,	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Béchar,	Fisher,	Mitchell,
Bernier,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Blake,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Essex),
Bourassa,	Gigault,	Perry,
Bowman,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Brien,	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Kent),	Guay,	Robertson (King's, P.E.I.),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hale,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cartwright (Sir Richd.),	Holton,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Innes,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Jones,	Semple,

Charlton,	Kirk,	Skinner,
Choquette,	Landerkin,	Somerville,
Cimon,	Lang,	Sutherland,
Clayes,	Laurier,	Trow,
Coursol,	Lavergne,	Turcot,
De St Georges,	Lister,	Watson,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Welsh,
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Wilson (Elgin),
Duchesnay,	Macdonald (Huron),	Yeo.—77.
Dupont,	McIntyre,	

Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—THE FISHERY PAPERS.

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

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman say anything as to the period when the fishery papers will be laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. They are quite rapidly approaching completion. The printers are making satisfactory progress.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1:5 o'clock a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th April, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the New Westminster Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Chisholm.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Regina and Wood Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No 33) to amend the Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Hamilton Central.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 39) to authorise the Grange Trust (Limited) to wind up its affairs.—(Mr. Masson)

DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS AND DEPARTMENT OF INLAND REVENUE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) respecting the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue. He said: If the House will permit me to postpone a statement of the provisions of this Bill to another stage, I will be obliged, as I have such a cold that I really cannot speak. This Bill I wish to have read the second time with another Bill, relating to a proposed Department of Trade and Commerce, which now stands for the second reading. The two might be connected together, and might properly be discussed as one portion of the reorganisation of the Departments.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us whether it is the intention of the Bill to make one Department of Customs and Inland Revenue.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say, in the first place, that the Bill will provide that it shall not come in force until proclaimed—it will come into effect by procla-

Mr. FISHER.

mation. The two Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue are administrative departments merely; they are not suggestive departments, and it is intended that in due time these two departments shall, as it were, be sub-departments of the Department of Trade and Commerce. It is also provided that the heads of those sub-departments shall be Under-Secretaries as it were—to go in and out, but not to be members of the Cabinet, and to have diminished salaries. That is the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMIESON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. JAMIESON. I may say that the Bill at present introduced is somewhat similar to the Bill introduced by me during two Sessions of the late Parliament. Many of the provisions of this Bill received the approval of this House, but they failed to receive the assent of the Senate. It has been deemed advisable, owing to the fact that the Canada Temperance Act is in force in so many counties and cities of this Dominion, to make the Act as perfect and as workable as possible. The first clause of this Bill provides that in the case of there being more than one registry office in a county, the depositing of the petition in one of them shall be sufficient. It is proposed also to make this law applicable to the Province of British Columbia. At present, owing to the fact that there are no organised municipal divisions in British Columbia, the Act has not been applicable to that Province. We propose by this Bill to allow the Act to be submitted in the electoral districts of that Province, as provided for representation in the House of Commons. We also propose to make the Act applicable to the provisional or temporary judicial districts in the Dominion, of which there are several in the Province of Ontario. In addition to that we propose that penalties may be imposed upon physicians who may give colorable or fraudulent certificates, as we think this is necessary in order to the effective working of that Act. We also propose that the quantity of liquor which may be prescribed by a physician shall be in his discretion. At present he cannot prescribe less than a pint. It is also proposed to apply the search clauses of the Canada Temperance Act to the Dunkin Act, where a by-law under the Dunkin Act may be in force in any part of the Dominion. Further, we think it necessary that the provisions with respect to a search should be amended so as to permit of a search at any time. At present a search is only permitted in the daytime. We also provide a set of forms which we think are necessary, because a great deal of difficulty has arisen owing to the fact that many of those connected with the administration of the law are not lawyers or skilled in legal matters. The last clause of the Bill—and it is a most important one—provides that all penalties imposed under the Act shall be payable, in cases where the prosecutor is a provincial or public officer, to such officer, for the purpose of enforcing the law; and where any other person is prosecutor, one-half shall be paid to him and the other half to the local municipality in which the offence is committed. We think it is necessary that these amendments should be made in order that the law may have a fair test in the Dominion. There are some minor amendments which I shall explain at a subsequent stage of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a favorable opportunity to call the attention of the House and the country to the way in which the Government are shirking a very important part of the responsibility which devolves upon them. Sir, if there is any question upon which it is

the duty of the Government to have a policy, upon which it is their duty to mark out for themselves the line in which they intend to travel, with a view of meeting the public sentiment, it is with reference to the question which is now before us. Sir, we remember very well when another Administration occupied the position which these gentlemen now occupy, that an hon. member from the Province of Manitoba, who has now a seat in the other House, proposed to this House a resolution declaring that it was the duty of the Government to take up the question of prohibition, and to guide the House and the country upon that subject. That resolution, if I rightly remember, received the support of every gentleman now on the Treasury benches who was then a member of the House. The Government of the day did take the question up, and introduced in the following Session the measure known as the Canada Temperance Act. That measure, which is still on the Statute-book, and which some hon. gentlemen who are not members of the Government are endeavoring to make a more perfect and satisfactory measure, was enacted as one relating to the peace, order and good government of the country, and our jurisdiction in passing it was sustained by the courts on the ground that it was a measure of that character. There can be no longer any doubt, therefore, that it is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament to deal with the subject; and yet these hon. gentlemen, who were ready to take up the license question, which did not belong to them, have, during the past eight years, been shirking their responsibility with regard to this question. Now, I think the time has come when we have a right to know where these gentlemen stand. I think the time has come when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should declare himself on this question. That hon. gentleman peregrinated through this country advocating the principle of prohibition. He pressed upon the attention of the country the propriety of supporting no man for a seat in this House who would not pledge himself to vote for prohibition. More than ten years ago he declared that the public opinion of this country was sufficiently ripe to have such a measure placed upon the Statute-book. Well, Sir, how is it that the hon. gentleman has not been heard from on this question since he has occupied a seat on the Treasury benches? The hon. gentleman still poses as the apostle of prohibition. He is still put forward as the light of this country, if not of the world, on this particular question; and how is it that with his splendid opportunities, with a seat in the Cabinet, with a majority of this House to sustain the Government of which he is a member, he has not ventured to assume the responsibility of proposing to this House a measure upon a question admitted to be so important by a vast number of the people of this country, and by many of the supporters of the Administration? Why should this important question, affecting the public revenues as it does, be eliminated from the policy of the Government, and be transferred to the hands of a private member? There are questions upon which it is, no doubt, the right of an Administration to differ, and which may be left as open questions; but, Sir, any question affecting the public revenue is not a question of this sort; it is the duty of the Government to have a policy upon such a question. A Government is not bound to direct the general legislative policy of the House; upon all ordinary questions individual members, and even members of the Cabinet, may be left to take such a line as they see fit; but upon a question which has been held to affect the peace, order and good government of the country, a question relating to the morals of the people, ought not to be left in the hands of a private member. Upon such a question it is the business of the Government to have a policy and to enunciate that policy to the House; yet these hon. gentlemen have not yet spoken on this question. We would like to know what course the Government intend to take. Are

they going to support a policy of free traffic in liquor? Are they going to furnish facilities for the encouragement of this particular manufacturing industry, or are they going to adopt the views of the hon. gentleman who has proposed this motion? They cannot shirk their responsibility. Why, Sir, a large portion of the people of this country are scarcely satisfied because the Opposition, who are in a minority, do not undertake to direct the affairs of the country on this subject. How much more are these gentlemen, whom the public have entrusted with their confidence, and who are supposed to direct the affairs of the country on this subject, responsible, than gentlemen on this side of the House? They can no longer shirk their responsibility, and I trust the House and the country will insist upon their having the courage of their convictions, whatever those convictions may be.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

APPOINTMENT OF SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Mr. THOMPSON, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 42) to make provision for the appointment of a Solicitor General, said: The effect of this Bill will be not only to establish this office, but to define the duties of the officer. They will be in connection with the Department of Justice, and such other duties as may be assigned to him from time to time by the Governor in Council. He will be eligible to a seat in either House of Parliament.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it the intention of the Government to create two new Departments?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not the intention. It is simply intended to have this officer, whose duties will be principally connected with the counsel work of the Department; that is to say, he will attend as counsel for the Crown in the litigation in the principal courts. It is not intended to establish a new Department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it intended by this appointment to obviate the necessity of employing counsel throughout the country, as hitherto?

Mr. THOMPSON. In so far as it will be possible for one person to attend to those duties. He will attend to them and to such duties as we employ counsel for now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume the office will be political, and he will go in and out with the Administration.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Bill provides that he will have a seat in either House, and, therefore, the office will be political.

Mr. MITCHELL. But he will not have a seat in the Cabinet?

Mr. THOMPSON. Not necessarily.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved, That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following Resolution:—

That the salary of the Minister of Trade and Commerce be seven thousand dollars per annum.

Motion agreed to.

SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Mr. THOMPSON moved, That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following Resolution:—

That the salary of the Solicitor General be six thousand dollars per annum.

Motion agreed to.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire of the hon. Minister of Finance whether he is yet in a position to give any information as to the probable date of bringing down the Estimates and the Budget Speech? I need not tell him that the House is meeting here at this very late day at great inconvenience to all the hon. members, and that, of course, the longer it is necessary for him to delay the Budget Speech the longer we will be here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope at the early part of next week to be able to intimate the probable time.

PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Mr. McLELAN [moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting Public Officers. He said: This Bill relates only to the securities which may be accepted by the Government from public officers for the performance faithfully of their duties, in addition to what we received before. It enables the Government to take an assignment of any amount that the officer may have at his credit in the books of the Post Office or Government Savings Bank. That is the whole purport of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. POPE moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Government Railways Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to facilitate crossing, and give greater despatch to trains over lines of railway where they have all they can do to make up their time. This is done by other Governments, and has been found to work well. On the Intercolonial Railway, for instance, we have the greatest possible difficulty to make time, and the stops we have to make retard us very much. I anticipate no danger from it. However, I do not propose to say it shall positively come into operation, so that if it be found a source of danger it can be stopped. With regard to the gates, questions have arisen as to what are proper fastenings for them. It is declared here there should be two upright posts supporting the gate at each end, if the gate is fifteen inches longer than the opening, which shall be deemed proper fastenings.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that this is introducing a very dangerous practice indeed, as we have always understood it, because, when a railway train passes a crossing of another railway, it always has to come to a stop; but this is to provide that they may go straight through at full speed. There may be appliances which have been invented to make that safe, but surely they must be very complicated appliances, and the Minister has only told us that he understands they have been introduced somewhere in the western States. If that is the only case in which they have been introduced, I think we should wait a little longer before we make any death-traps on our railways. I should like to know what companies have applied for this. Have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Company urged that this change should be made in the law? I think, before the House is asked to read this Bill a second time, we ought to know what representations have been made to the Government on the subject.

Mr. POPE. The railway company that has principally urged this upon us is the Canada Southern.

Mr. EDGAR. That is, the Michigan Central.

Mr. POPE. Yes; and the Michigan Central has applied this now. There is no danger, because the other road is perfectly stopped while the train is crossing. I agree with

MR. THOMPSON.

the hon. gentleman that we always did provide that a train should come to a standstill at a crossing for one minute. but I am quite satisfied that this is quite as safe, and that it will expedite the business of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand the Minister of Railways to say that this Bill is introduced in consequence of an application from the Michigan Central?

Mr. POPE. No, not the Michigan Central.

Mr. MULOCK. Because it only applies to the case of a private railway crossing a Government railway. As I read it, it is limited to any other than a Government railway crossing a Government railway. I suppose what is meant in this Bill is the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. POPE. Yes; but there will be another Bill introduced to apply to other railways in the same way.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see why, if it be a sound principle, it should not be applied generally as well as to a private railway crossing a Government railway.

Mr. POPE. So it will.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see that the Minister of Railways is a better judge in regard to the carrying out of this provision than the manager of a railway would be. If the principle is sound, it should be made general. If it is unsound, it should not be adopted at all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) respecting the Department of Trade and Commerce. He said: This is simply a Bill to establish the Department and provide for the duties. There are only three clauses in it. As I mentioned on the first reading, there is another Bill affecting this subject. I have just introduced that, and this Bill can be discussed together with the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, under the circumstances, we can have no objection to the two Bills being discussed together, but I would take this opportunity to mention to the hon. gentleman, and also to the House, that I think a measure of this importance will require considerable discussion. I have always felt that we committed a great, although, perhaps, an almost unavoidable, mistake in constituting our present Cabinet as we have done, with thirteen or fourteen Cabinet Ministers of the first rank. I have always believed, although I was never able to put my opinions into practice, that we would have done a very great deal better if we had a much smaller number of Ministers of the first rank, and a considerable number of Under-Secretaries of State, selected from junior members of the House, as is done in England. If we are going to enlarge the Government, and constitute a Cabinet of fifteen members, it may be worth the consideration of the House whether an attempt should not be made to go back to a more wholesome system, difficult as I know it is at this time. I only throw out that suggestion now, because the whole thing can be discussed when the two Bills come up together, as the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that we are simply increasing the expenditure for the administration of the government of the country, and making the machine of administrative government more and more unwieldy. We know very well that, in England, they have sub-heads of the various Departments representing the Government in one House, while the real head of the Department sits in the

other. There, of course, they have an immensely larger and an infinitely more complicated field of administrative work than it is possible for us to have in this country, and therefore it is necessary for them to have a larger number of persons engaged in the administration of public affairs in order to master the details, and to make the Parliament acquainted with the details of each Department of the Government. The administrative machine in England is, perhaps, not by any means as efficient as it might be. We know what the custom is in that country, and how they are addicted to allow matters to go on from time to time without any other alteration than such as may arise from additions. Sir James Mackintosh said long ago that it was something like a gentleman's mansion. It had little architectural beauty, but it had perhaps very little inconvenience, additions had been made to it from time to time, which made it unwise to tear it down in order to make a more symmetrical structure, but no man in the world who was about to build an original structure would take it for a model. It seems to me that the tendency of the hon. gentleman is to undertake to make a system of administrative government upon a model, which, in a new country, ought never to be followed. It always seemed to me that the Italian system was very much better adapted to a new country like Canada than that of England. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, examined it and considered it. A Minister of the Crown having charge of a particular Department, though a member of but one House, may nevertheless speak for the Government in both; and as an administrator of the Government, responsible for the conduct of an important Department, he is at liberty to act as an exponent and defender of that Department in both Houses. If we were to have a change at all, a change based upon the Italian system, it seems to me, is much better adapted to the wants of a comparatively new and poor country in which the administrative machinery need not be complex, and in which that machinery ought to be kept as simple as possible. It is always easier to exercise effective control over the administration of a Department when it is under the conduct of a single head, than when it is under the control of two. Now, I am not, any more than my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), going to oppose this measure at this particular stage, but I think the House would make a great mistake in allowing the Bill to go through in silence, or without full consideration. Every change in the organisation or administration of a Department of the Government, ought to receive a very full consideration, certainly a much fuller consideration than we would give to an ordinary measure, because it is part of the machine by which the operations of the Government are to be carried on, and being so, it ought to receive very full consideration at the hands of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I leave to hon. gentlemen opposite the business of reconciling their views concerning this measure. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says there must be good reasons given for altering the present organisation. He, himself, suggests a very considerable alteration by adopting the Italian system, as that would involve an application to the Imperial Government, and an alteration of the British North America Act. I think I would rather listen to the counsels of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). His suggestion is that the Cabinet should be reduced, and that there should be subordinate officers, members of the Government, but not members of the Cabinet. That is exactly what this system is intended to introduce, and eventually will be brought into force, having the effect of reducing the number of Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I differ not only from the views of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but I differ

entirely with the right hon. gentleman as to the necessity of this Bill at all. I do not think this Bill is calculated to advance the true interests of the Administration of public affairs. I think the whole tendency of the Administration is to increase the expense and increase the heads of the Department. The right hon. gentleman, a Session or two ago, divided his Department into four, and made four heads. Have we found any special advantage from that? Have the expenses been reduced? Have there not been as many complaints against the manner in which supplies are let, and the public affairs administered? Sir, what would be the result here? There will be a policy in relation to one Department different from that which will be applied to another Department of the Government. This new Department of Trade and Commerce is to have supervision of these other two Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue, of which they are to be sub-heads. Do they propose reducing the position of my hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) from being a member of the Cabinet to that of a sub-head in the Department to be created? Is it the object of this Bill to get rid of my hon. friend? If that is the object of this Bill, why is it not so stated at once? What do they propose to do with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell)? Do they propose to get rid of him, too? Is that the object of the Bill? It looks to me very like it, and I think if it is the object, they had better state it at once. My objection to the Bill is that it is adding to the expense of the country. It is a Bill which is not in the direction of the public interest, a Bill which, I believe, is going to increase, not alone the expense of an additional head of Department, but going to add a new staff of officers, which will constantly increase. We will want new buildings directly if this system goes on. I think we had better economise the public affairs of this country, reduce the debt and keep down the charges, and endeavor to relieve us from the payment of the enormous annual sum of ten or eleven millions interest which we are paying to-day. That is the course which the Government ought to take in their legislature, instead of going on, year after year, with Bills changing the laws and creating new Departments in the direction of adding to the expense of the country, as this Bill is going to do. I say this will be the result of it, and for my part I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, and when the subject is up again for discussion, I shall endeavor to give my views at greater length in order that the country may understand what the Government are doing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could the First Minister give us an idea what will be the probable cost of this Department; because we could consider that in detail when it comes up for discussion at a future time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is proposed that on the second reading the two Bills shall be discussed together, and I hope the principle of this Bill will be adopted by the House, as I suppose it will be, and I hope the principle of the other Bill as well, on Tuesday. Then after that we can go into Committee of the Whole on the two Bills, and full discussion can be taken on every clause, including the cost of the measure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not wish to discuss the measure to-day, but I quite concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that this country is being, to some extent, governed to death. The increase of officials has been something alarming for the last few years, and it is about time the Government should call a halt, instead of going on to increase the Departments as they propose by these two Bills.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BANFF NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 16) respecting the Banff National Park.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is only proper that the Minister should explain in some detail, not merely the object, which we can gather from the title of the Bill, but what it is in reality that the Government propose to do, and also what the probable cost is likely to be. The Bill, which I have only had time to glance at, appears to propose to take charge of several hundred square miles of land in the North-West for the purpose of preserving it as a national park. Now, if I am correctly informed, in that two or three hundred square miles there are a considerable number of special grants made to several parties, some of whom, in former days, have been members of this House, and it does appear to me that it is a questionable thing that these parties should be left in possession of these properties there. If we are going to have a national park, I think we ought to own everything that is included within its circuit. If it cannot be possible for the Government to recover possession of these without very considerable expense, we ought to know, before we commit ourselves to this project absolutely and definitely, what the views of the Government are with respect to the cost, and with respect to these private properties, which are, apparently, included within the boundaries of the park. I see that the area covered is 200 square miles, more or less, and all that portion is to be withdrawn from sale and settlement. A number of regulations are made with respect to the control of the streams, the working of mines, &c. If I am not misinformed, some large hotels have already been erected in this district, and the leases of some of the hot springs have been given to gentlemen, many of whom were formerly members of this House. Altogether, I believe the Bill requires a good deal of discussion and consideration before we proceed to pass it.

Mr. EDGAR. This area is about equal to the extent of an ordinary county in this part of the world, and we should like to know from the Minister as to the agricultural quality of this large section of land which he proposes to treat in this very peculiar way. The action is entirely unprecedented in this country. We have heard of a government taking a quantity of land around Niagara Falls for a specific and clearly defined purpose; but here it is proposed to take into special charge a principality almost, and to take power to work mines and develop mining interest in that district, to lease the land for all such purposes, to carry on trade and commerce, and to grant permits for the grazing of cattle. Moreover, all regulations passed by the Minister of Interior will, after publication for four weeks in the *Canada Gazette*, have all the force and effect of law. So the Minister of the Interior can, when seated in his office, legislate for that whole principality by a stroke of his pen, and legislate with reference to every individual and interest in that large district. Those powers are entirely unprecedented, and I am sure the House should not be asked to grant them without very full explanations from the Government. No such powers have been asked within my knowledge previous to this time by any government or corporation in British America. No doubt we have large quantities of land, but there must be some particular and special value in this area or it would not be proposed to set it apart. The hot springs are, no doubt, very valuable, but we hear that they have been claimed by many parties. The Government should inform the House as to the nature of the claims, and state in a general way how they propose to adjudicate and legislate upon them. All these explanations should be given before the Bill is allowed to pass.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Most of the hon. members of this House, or, at all events, a very large number of them, Mr. MITCHELL.

have already visited the springs. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) was one of the first to call my attention to the importance of the Government reserving them, after having had an opportunity of visiting them and ascertaining something of their value. The springs are said to be of exceptional value from their curative properties. The scenery about the springs is exceedingly beautiful, and the area which is reserved, although it is large, is not agricultural land in the ordinary acceptation of that term, but a very considerable part of the area is water. For instance, this particular reservation includes Devil's Lake, which is a very beautiful sheet of water some fifteen miles in length.

An hon. MEMBER. Is it hot water?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is hot enough, no doubt, for the hon. gentlemen opposite; they can go up there and bathe in it. The object of making so large a reservation is, that all experience proves it is a matter of great consequence to have very strict regulations. As to what those regulations may be, as to the character of them, it would be almost impossible to embody all of them in an Act of Parliament. With regard to the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to certain persons having already possession of leases of the springs, I may say that the hon. gentleman is misinformed, if he means by that remark that parties have any exclusive possession of the springs. It is quite true that Dr. Brett and other gentlemen associated with him have put up an hotel there, and it is already becoming a very important resort. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are erecting another hotel, the foundation of which is completed, and for the purpose they have appropriated \$100,000; and they propose within the area leased to them for that purpose—for we propose to lease the land to persons who put up hotels—to make it as attractive as possible, and in that way secure a large number of patrons for the springs. There is no exclusive property in the springs given to any one. On the other side of Bow River there is a town site. The Government have already surveyed it and laid it out, and are selling lots; and I am told by the Secretary of the Department, who has recently been up there with a view to making a report as to the progress of matters, and to determine the conditions on which sales should be made, that \$15,000 worth of lots have already been applied for. The intention is, of course, to frame such regulations as will make the springs a respectable resort, as well as an attractive one in all respects. Those who know anything of the hot springs of Arkansas are aware that this is one of the great difficulties. It is not a resort to which people will care to go if they can possibly avoid it. They go there for health purposes and for nothing else. If we can make this particular reserve a really attractive resort, I believe great advantage will accrue to the country at large. My own impression is, that the revenue we shall obtain from the town site, from the lease of the privileges at the springs, that is from the water of the springs, will almost recoup the Government for the amount that will have to be expended in connection with the undertaking. Even if the amount is not quite adequate, still in the interests of the country it is well worth while reserving the springs in the way proposed by this Bill. Of course the area seems a very large one, twenty-six miles long by ten miles wide; but when it is remembered that one lake in that area is fifteen miles long—and it will prove very attractive, and efforts are being put forth to make it a good place for sport—I am inclined to think that the House will agree, that the action of the Government in this regard has been well taken. I am not aware of any reservations there. Of course, there were some grants in this area before it was reserved; they are private properties in the meantime and will have to be protected. If we can get them back into the hands of the

Government without serious cost, I think it would be desirable to do so, so that the whole of them should belong to us, except in so far as the building up of a town on the opposite side of the Bow River may necessitate the sale of a portion of them for that purpose. The object really is to make an attractive resort and to benefit that part of the mountain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the course pursued by the Government in relation to preserving that property as a public park. I think amongst the earliest means of calling the attention of the Department to the matter was a letter addressed by myself to the right hon. the Premier, after I had visited those springs and saw what they were like. I have had some experience in visiting some of the springs of the United States, and I saw what difficulties existed in that country in relation to such resorts. The Minister has correctly stated that they become the resort of a very doubtful class of people, so that life was, and is now, practically unsafe in many of the southern springs. I think it is of great importance that these springs, which are said to be of very great value for their disease-curing qualities, should be preserved for the use of the sick in such a manner that they can enjoy the greatest amount of comfort, and be surrounded by the greatest respectability. As to the extent of the park, I for one do not object. Anybody who has seen that section of the country knows that it is practically a territory of mountains, and when we consider that an immense lake exists in the middle of it I don't think it would be wise to risk the limiting the amount of the property taken. As to the regulations which ought to govern such a resort, I must say that I do not exactly agree with the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in relation to that part. It is impossible to make these regulations and embody them in an Act of Parliament; you can only tell by the experience of the persons controlling such a place, from month to month, and from year to year, what is really required in order to establish those health-giving resources of nature on a proper basis. For that reason I do not think it would be wise to embarrass the Minister by asking him to embody in the Bill the regulations under which the springs should be governed. I do think, however, that when the Bill comes to be discussed an estimate ought to be given of the contemplated outlay, and also, as nearly as can be arrived at, a statement of any of the embarrassments or difficulties in the way of private lands within the limits of this reserve. I am aware that there are hotels building on the property, and I think it is desirable that that should be the case. Two years ago when I was there the people were flocking to the place, and they were lying on the hill-sides and rocks taking the benefit of the springs, without any of the comforts and conveniences that sick people ought to have; and if one-tenth part of the reports of the health-giving qualities of these springs have any truth in them, then I say that no reasonable amount of money that the country can lay out in improving and beautifying a locality with such advantages should be—and I am sure will not be—refused by the Parliament of Canada. Therefore I give the measure introduced by the hon. Minister such a fair and just support as, in my opinion, it has a right to receive in this House.

Mr. CASEY. I think everybody is agreed as to the advisability of reserving some portion of our vast domain near the Rocky Mountains for the purposes of a public pleasure ground. But I must differ from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and agree with my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in thinking that the provisions of this Bill are something very different from a mere reservation of a public holiday ground, and that they are, in fact, extremely peculiar in their nature. In the first place, I call the attention of those who have not read the Bill to the fact that, in dealing with these two hundred

and sixty square miles of territory, the Government is freed from the trammels now laid upon them in dealing with the public lands in the North-West, by the Dominion Lands Act, and any regulations made under said Act, or any other Act with respect to mining or timber licenses, or any other matter whatsoever. Now, it is evidently expected and believed by the Government—probably they know as a matter of fact—that this reservation included not only lands fit for some purposes of settlement, but territory containing minerals, territory upon which timber is growing, or upon which timber licenses may naturally be expected to issue. The Government, after proposing nominally to reserve this district as a public pleasure ground, contradict that statement by taking to themselves power to deal with it in the way of issuing timber licenses, mining licenses, and so on. They first introduce an Act on the assumption that it is proper and advisable to withdraw this land from settlement, from mining, from timber licenses, for the purpose of making it a public playground, which is a very good purpose, and then they turn round and take to themselves power to give licenses to cut timber, to dig minerals, to pasture cattle, to build hotels, to lease or sell the lands, and to make provision for trade and traffic of every description. So, after pretending to preserve the lands for a park, they say they do not intend to reserve them for a park at all, but they are reserving power to deal with them as if they were still public property, by giving these licenses just as in any other part of the public domain. The only effect of the Act in that respect is to set the Government free from the restrictions placed upon them in their dealings with the public lands, under the Public Lands Acts, by the repealing of those Acts so far as they apply in these territories, and to enable them to deal with them in any manner they choose. Now, I think that, on the face of it, such an Act is, as my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said, one which ought to be very closely scrutinised. The Government evidently appear to be about to enter into a big speculation. On the hon. gentleman's own statement they are going to give, not exclusive possession, but a limited possession, of the lands around these springs, to certain parties. Now, why should they not give to everybody who gives certain securities and certain proofs of his respectability and the amount of capital he has to invest, the liberty to go and build a hotel near those springs, and have a share of the profit which is to be made out of them? They propose not to do that, but to let the Minister say who is to build private hotels around the Banff Springs; in other words, the Minister reserves power to make the fortunes of some of his friends who wish to go into hotel-keeping. I do not know whether they will do so or not, but he reserves that power. He says that certain parties, one of whom he named—Dr. Brett—another being, I believe, Dr. Orton, lately a member of this House—have already built a hotel near the springs, and he has led us to understand that there will be no interference with them. He does not tell us whether he intends to give a monopoly to them and to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it would be quite within his power under the Act to give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Doctors Brett and Orton a monopoly of the hotel-building there. And if you recollect certain transactions in the way of hotel-keeping which took place in the maritime portion of the Dominion—I refer to the Inch Arran Hotel—we cannot feel confident that this Government is quite above putting advantages in the way of its friends in this way. The Minister reserves to himself the uncontrolled power to give timber licenses and mining licenses to anybody, regardless of the existing Acts on the subject. How can mining be carried on within this district hand-in-hand with the keeping of the place as a public resort? You cannot have a public park, with all the wild animals preserved in it, and have mining industries going on at the

same time; you cannot have trade and traffic, involving railways going to and from the mines, and at the same time keep the place for sport. If you intend to keep it as a park, you must shut out trade, traffic and mining. If you are going to preserve it for mining, do not call it a park reserve; the two things are inconsistent. Then the hon. Minister proposes to let people pasture cattle, in other words, to have ranching privileges, in this so-called public park. I would like to know how ranching privileges and the preservation of wild animals and sport can go together, or how a collection of cowboys in this park is going to add to its attractiveness as a public resort, or a reservation for game and sport. I conclude from all this that there is something in the Bill that we do not understand, and something the Minister does not propose to tell us, for he has not answered the questions put to him by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). He has given no idea of the cost of the scheme or of how many claims there are in the district; he has given us no information on the matter at all, except what is contained in the Bill itself. In this state of darkness in regard to the Government's intention, I think we should proceed very gingerly with this Bill. The hon. Minister objected to the proposal of the hon. member for West Ontario that he should put regulations into this Bill. I do not see why that should not be done. I do not suppose that the Minister, or any other man, can at once draw up the regulations, but he intends to draw them after the Bill passes, and I do not see why it should not be delayed until he is able to insert them. Then we shall know how we are acting. But to ask us to proclaim this district, and to put it under his exclusive control, is asking too much, notwithstanding the confidence we have in the Minister of the Interior. For these reasons, although I suppose the Bill will go to the second reading now, I think, when it comes up in committee, it will be the duty of the House, without regard to party, to scrutinise it very closely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not given us information on a very important matter connected with this measure. If I rightly remember this part is within the limits of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, it is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is immediately on the border of the fertile belt east of the summit of the mountains. Of course, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have declared their intention not to make any claim to these lands, then we will know that we are not undertaking to include their property; but in the regulations as they stand, there is nothing to prevent the company making a claim if they see fit to do so. Now, there are certain provisions of this Bill to which my hon. friend from West Elgin has referred, and with regard to which I shall not again trouble the House; but it does seem to me that in sub-clauses *c*, *b*, *e*, *g*, *h*, and sub-clause 2 of clause 4, extraordinary powers are given to the Minister. In fact, if the Bill passes in its present form, it will be necessary that geographers should describe Canada as consisting of seven Provinces, four territorial Provinces and a Government of the Minister of the Interior. It is, in fact, creating a small Province and holding it under the jurisdiction of the Minister. Now, I can understand that where a Government is treading upon new ground, and where they have no path to guide them as to what to do, in order to carry out the administrative operations they have in hand, the Governor in Council should have power to make regulations; but it is altogether an unusual course to confer upon the head of a Department the power to make regulations that practically have the force of the law of the land. The hon. Minister will see, for instance, that the working of mines is provided for in sub-section *d* of section 4. Why

Mr. CASEY.

should not the hon. gentleman state what the regulations are to be? If there are valuable mines in the territory, why should not the ordinary mining regulations apply? Why should the hon. gentleman take to himself power which would enable him to make arrangements with any private parties for the working of the mines, provided that they conferred upon him a great fortune. That is a power which I certainly would not ask for any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, if we were in the position the Government occupy, and it is a power which I think no Government should ask us to put into the hands of any Minister. It is true, there are some limitations; but in this matter I think the power of making regulations ought to be in the hands of the Governor in Council, subject to the approval of Parliament. Then, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to sub-section 2 of section 4, where he proposes to take power to alter the criminal law. He has power to legislate for the government of persons in the territory with regard to the commission of offences that come under the criminal law. We refused to confer power of that sort on the great railway corporations in 1875. I have no doubt the First Minister will remember the discussions we had in this House when it was proposed to confer on the great railway corporations certain powers for the punishment of their own officers in certain cases; and yet this Bill confers on the Minister power which will actually place the liberty of the subject within that territory in his hands. I do not think the difficulty of making regulations to govern the park is so serious that it is necessary to confer upon the Minister these extraordinary powers. It does seem to me that the Government, when they come down to the House proposing such a measure, ought at least to be prepared to lay before the House general plans and limitations of any power they propose to take, so that it may not become a source of abuse, and the liberty of the subject will not be in the hands of a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. TROW. The Minister of Interior has just stated that he thinks I was the individual who first drew the attention of the Government to the advisability of reserving a portion of the territory near Banff for a public park. I had occasion to visit, two years ago, the celebrated springs, and I considered the place was one of vital importance, which should not be placed in the hands of squatters to be destroyed, because it required very lavish expenditure to make it valuable as it is valuable. I consider that no one should be allowed to lease that property unless he was in a position to expend from \$80,000 to \$100,000, because it is unquestionably, in my estimation, the greatest boon to this Dominion. Immediately after leaving the springs, I made it my business to have an interview with the hon. Minister of Interior, to whom I stated the Government should unquestionably reserve a large tract of the country, as there may be other valuable springs in the locality not known. I was not aware that I had much influence with the Minister, but I stated the true facts of the case, and that it would be advisable to make of this place a park similar to the Yellowstone Park in Montana. I made it also my business to see the present Minister of Finance immediately afterwards, who, if I recollect rightly, told me he would write the First Minister in regard to my statement. I do not know of any portion of the Dominion that will become more celebrated in the history of this great country than that park. The Bow River, running within a few yards of the celebrated springs, has a depth of thirty feet, and gives thirty miles of excellent boating. Near the summit of the mountains you have perpetual snow in view, and beneath you have natural parks surrounding you for a score of miles. I cannot, under any circumstances, blame the Government for making a large reservation until such time as they know the value of the land in that locality. There

is no squatter could have any claim there, because there is no timber or agricultural lands. I do not know if there are any mining limits, but, no doubt, some will be discovered, for on the other side of the river there is coal belonging to Mr. McLeod Stewart, of this city, the best coal property we have in that section. There may also be coal in this reserve, but as for timber, there is none valuable. It is very scrubby, and a very great portion of the limit reserved is covered by this celebrated lake. I take a little responsibility in the matter for various reasons. I do not know that I did my duty properly when I did not speak to the Minister on that occasion, of the mission I was expected to perform. Two young men of my county claimed the springs. They informed me they were the explorers and discoverers of the springs, and that it was my duty, seeing their friends and connections in my county had aided me in every contest, to speak to the Minister respecting their claim. I declined to do so, because I considered no man had a right to such valuable property without being in possession of means to put valuable places of accommodation upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a word in reference to one of the parties who set up the claim to be the first who found out those springs. We have heard a good deal in reference to their value. They have probably medicinal properties of great importance. If they are of such importance, if they are so valuable, those parties who were the original discoverers are entitled to some consideration at the hands of the Government. Some few years ago I accompanied one of the young men—there were two of them—said to be the first parties to find out the springs, and application was made to the Department, either for control of the springs or for compensation for finding them. At that time it was said they were not surveyed, consequently the Department was not cognisant of them, and the party was requested to hold over his application for some time. He was also assured that when the Government had sufficient knowledge of them to do anything, if a license was not granted it was likely some compensation would be given him as one of the explorers. I understand since then some unprincipled speculators have so manipulated things that the right has gone out of the hands of the two young men, and that today they are without compensation. I think the Government could afford to deal liberally with the young men, and should compensate them handsomely since they have not been allowed the privilege of making anything out of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister of the Interior to say that, before he proceeds to discuss this in committee, he will supply an estimate of the cost, and also bring down to us a list of the persons having leases—a memorandum showing the extent of property under lease and the nature of the leases passed?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The only other points that I would call attention to are, first, the one to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) called attention. I think that these regulations provide that, in certain cases, a very heavy fine, amounting to \$200, or, in default of payment, six months' imprisonment, may be inflicted. I think where regulations are going to be imposed by the Governor in Council, the infraction of which is to be visited by severe penalties like these, most assuredly they ought to be confirmed by Parliament. They might be allowed to have interim force until the next Session of Parliament, but where you are dealing with the liberty of the subject, the least that can be done is that regulations requiring such penalties for enforcement should be approved by the Parliament of Canada as well as by the Governor in Council. The other thing that I would like to know, and probably the Minister has had it before his eyes when drawing this

Bill, is under what terms and restrictions the Government of the United States have incorporated their national park? Have they taken powers similar to those which the Minister proposes to take? But is it not the case that in the United States national park, the property is reserved absolutely as the property of the United States? I have not recently looked over the Act, but my recollection is that in the case of the United States national parks, the United States keep absolute control.

Mr. EDGAR. I have just sent for the Act relating to the Yellowstone Park, and I find the provisions of the Act are much more restricted than those proposed here:

"The secretary may, in his discretion, grant leases for building purposes, for terms not exceeding ten years, of small parcels of ground, at such places in said park as shall require the erection of buildings for the accommodation of visitors; all of the proceeds of said park to be expended under his direction in the management and the construction of roads and bridle-paths therein."

The restriction as to granting leases seems there to be restricted, whereas the unrestricted powers proposed to be asked in this Bill will enable the Minister of the Interior to give leases for 100 years, which would be equal to an out-and-out sale. It is to be considered whether the objects, which are very laudable indeed in one sense, ought to be accomplished, would not be much better accomplished by keeping control in the Crown of the property, as the Americans have done.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE N. W. T.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Senate of Canada. He said: This is a Bill merely to give the North-West Territories two Senators, to give them a representation in the Senate which they have not yet, although last Session we gave them representation in this House. At the time that the Bill was introduced and carried last Session, the Government was of opinion that the appointment of members to the Upper House might stand over until the Territories were made a Province, but there is a very considerable opinion existing among the people of the North-West that they should be on an equality with the other Provinces, although they are not yet a Province or Provinces, that they should have representation in the Upper Chamber as well as in this. The measure provides, therefore, that the North-West shall be represented in the Senate by two members. An Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament, as the House knows, authorising this Parliament to give representation to the North-West in both Houses. The hon. the leader of the Opposition asked the other day if that Imperial Act was warranted by the resolutions and the address as passed in this House previously. I was not able to answer that at the time, but on looking at it I see that the address asks the Imperial Government to introduce an Act to enable the Parliament of Canada to give the North-West Territories representation in Parliament. It does not say representation in this House, but representation in Parliament, and the Imperial Parliament, considering our address in the obvious meaning of our language, have given us the power to give representation in the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is any condition going to be put in this Bill that those appointed shall be residents, as is the case in all the other Provinces of the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister has referred to the Imperial Act. Has the hon. gentleman the Act before him, so as to see what the exact words are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not, but I have looked at it.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman remember the precise words of the Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are "representation in the Senate and House of Commons," I think. I am sure of it. Representation in both Houses expressly.

Mr. MILLS. Without any limitation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Without any limitation.

Mr. MILLS. So the Parliament of Canada could give twenty Senators to the North-West instead of two, if it saw fit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I took exception to the address which the hon. gentleman proposed last year on this subject, and I think the power which the hon. gentleman says the Imperial Parliament has conferred shows that the exception I took was well founded. When we proposed on a former occasion to alter the British North America Act and provide for the admission of Manitoba under the Federal system, which was not done before Manitoba was actually admitted into the Confederation, we also prevented the Government from undertaking to proceed by address, and we indicated here in the House what were to be the provisions of the Imperial Act which was to alter and amend the constitution in that particular. Last year the hon. gentleman proposed to this House an address asking the Imperial Parliament to legislate, not doing what we had done before, not indicating to the Imperial Parliament the precise character of the legislation which was required, but an address asking simply for legislation. It did not require any very serious consideration of the subject to see that the members of that Parliament, unfamiliar with our system of Government, without any disposition or motive to give the question serious consideration, were likely to make alterations in our constitution which might prove of the most serious character. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes under this Bill to give to the people of the North-West Territories representation in the Senate by two members. The hon. gentleman knows that the British North America Act limited the number of members that might be appointed to the Senate for the Province of Ontario, for the Province of Quebec, for the Maritime Provinces. They were restricted. The hon. gentleman cannot appoint more than twenty-four senators for the Province of Ontario, but the hon. gentleman admits that in this case there is no such restriction. There is a radical alteration in the terms of our constitution, and it is in the power of the Administration to propose a measure to Parliament, and it is in the power of Parliament to carry through such a measure, to give to the North-West Territories, where there are at this moment but little more than twenty thousand people, as large a representation in the Senate as all the other Provinces have put together. The hon. gentleman has done this, and I call his attention to the fact that, if there was a change of Government to-morrow, if the new Government had a majority in this House and could obtain the consent of the Senate to it, there would be nothing to prevent their asking this House to appoint forty senators, so as to enable the Reform party to counterbalance the representation that the hon. gentleman and his friends have already acquired in that body. That is the position in which our constitution is placed by this action of the hon. gentleman. There is nothing to prevent an unlimited number of senators being appointed. All that is necessary is that these senators shall be called senators for the North-West Territories. If that is done, the law is complied with, the constitution is not violated, and the flexibility of the English system, which the hon. gentleman has so frequently lauded in this House, will have been actually introduced into our second chamber. I do not know that the people of this country are especially anxious

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that the number of nominated senators should be increased. I do not know that that body has proved so thoroughly efficient, so necessary to the proper balancing of our constitution, that the people would be very indignant with the Administration if they failed to bring this portion of the constitution into effect. I admit that there are many very important enquiries, many important functions that a second chamber might undertake to discharge. There are important functions that are performed by the House of Lords, but these functions are not performed by the Senate of this country; and it does seem to me that people who, altogether number only 23,000, the number to be found in an ordinary constituency, will be quite content to have four representatives in this House without having a certain number of illusory representatives in the second chamber. There is no pressing or special necessity for it. In the United States, where they live under a democratic system of Government, where the rights of the individual are very carefully guarded, the Congress of the United States has given to the people in the Territories two representatives from each territory. They have the privilege of explaining their position in the House of Representatives, but they are not voters in that House. Their constituents are supposed to be too largely dependent on the Executive to make it the interest of the country that they should exercise any influence by way of voting in that chamber. But in the Senate, in this second body, which is intended to protect the rights of the state and to prevent encroachments being made upon their autonomy or authority, there is no representation at all. It is not supposed that representation is necessary; it is not felt. Why, Sir, the great majority of the people of this country have an idea they could get on without representation in the Senate as it is now constituted. To this Senate each Province returns, or is supposed to be represented by a certain number of senators. But what important interest of a Province has that body, as it is now, ever guarded. What encroachment undertaken by this House upon the rights of the Provinces has been resisted by the Senate? The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have disregarded the provisions of the constitution, they have violated its spirit and have disallowed measures that are clearly within the competency of the Legislatures, and within their jurisdiction; but in what instance has this body, that was intended specially to guard the interests of the Provinces, come to the rescue of the Provinces, and protected provincial rights against national encroachment? In not a single instance. So I do not see that the Territories are likely to suffer for want of the two members which the hon. gentleman proposes to put into the Senate on behalf of the Territories. It does not seem from the Bill that it is necessary that they should come from the Territories.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that all the clauses are taken from the British North America Act and applied.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says all the clauses are applied. If they are in the Province of Quebec, the senator must reside in the particular district which he represents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought to read over the Bill before he criticises it.

Mr. MILLS. I have read the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not much.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I have a better opportunity of knowing than the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He has forgotten the terms of the Bill, that is all.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Sir, I say that the people of the Territories have not asked for this; they are not pressing upon the Government the appointment of two senators. What

does it mean? What has the hon. gentleman done for the people of the Territories? Why, last year he insisted upon the retention of the appointees in the territorial legislature, who are appointees of the Crown. The hon. gentleman did not dare wholly to trust the people of the North-West, for two years ago he proposed to increase the number of nominated members. Now, because the people have elected from these Territories four representatives to this Chamber, the hon. gentleman thinks it necessary that the Government should appoint two of their friends to the other House. At the present time we know, Sir, that financially this country is in straightened circumstances; we know that the extravagance of the Government has largely increased the public debt, and increased the public burden. We know that the hon. gentleman had to dismiss from office his Finance Minister, and to recall a former colleague from the other side of the Atlantic to take charge of the financial affairs of the Government; and in these circumstances, the hon. gentleman proposes further to add to the public burdens by appointing two supporters of the Administration to seats in the Senate. I am quite certain that the public opinion of this country is anxious for a reform in that Chamber, that the public opinion of this country is in favor of taking out of the hands of the Crown the appointment of members to the second chamber. That being the case, I think the hon. gentleman should retrace his steps, he should refrain from the exercise of the power which he asks by this particular measure, and he had better wait a while until he sees what the public are disposed to do with reference to the reconstitution of that body.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has evidently got some unholy design against the Senate, and I have no doubt he will carry it out when he becomes a Minister. You see how naturally the hon. gentleman's mind runs towards gerrymandering. We are charged with gerrymandering this House; so he suggests that if he comes in he will gerrymander the Upper House by putting in forty of his friends as senators. Well, I shall give the hon. gentleman full liberty, when he gets on this side, to put forty senators in the Upper House from the North-West. The hon. gentleman always looks towards the United States for his model, and because the Territories of the United States have no representation at Washington, he says therefore we ought not to give it here. They have no representation; they can send two men to make speeches, to sit on the floor of the House of Representatives, and to explain the interests of the people of the Territory—in other words, instead of sending in petitions and papers, to be there on the spot and state verbally what the Territory wants. Now, if my memory does not fail me, the hon. gentlemen opposite—I cannot speak from recollection of the hon. gentleman himself—some of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the last Parliament spoke very strongly in favor of giving representation in this House in the British sense and not in the American sense. Well, we did so, we gave them four members. There was a feeling which I have discerned—and I think I know as much about it as the hon. gentleman—that the Territories did not want to be in any respect in an inferior position from the Provinces, and that they should have representation in both Houses. The hon. gentleman says that this country is not in favor of a nominated Senate. Well, we have just come from the people, Mr. Speaker; we know what the people want, what they have been thinking about. I have been over a very considerable portion of the Province of Ontario, and sometimes my exertions in educating the people to good Conservatism were not exactly successful. But I have never met either a Conservative or a Reformer during my tour that ever brought up the subject of the Senate at all. It is not a burning ques-

tion, it is not a question at all among the public; it is only by speculative political philosophers that this question is sought to be brought into importance by being discussed here. But the hon. gentleman said that this Act will do away with the balance of power in the Senate. If we look at the British North America Act we will see that that Act was applicable only to the older Provinces, and that the Maritime Provinces had 12 senators, Quebec 12, Ontario 12; but that did not prevent us from afterwards giving representation in the Senate to British Columbia and to Manitoba. I do not think the balance of power has been in any way disturbed by those Provinces being represented in the Senate, although there was no allusion to them, especially Manitoba, in the Act, but I think there was in regard to British Columbia, and certainly as to Prince Edward Island. British Columbia, however, got its representation in both Houses, as did Manitoba, and this is simply a Bill to give the Territories representation in both Houses. If there is going to be any change in the constitution of the Senate it will, of course, apply to the senators from the North-West Territories as well as to those from the rest of the Dominion. If the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) carries out his system of having an elective instead of a nominative Senate, or if the Senate is to be annihilated, of course, in such an event there will be no more senators from the North-West. As to the argument that the revenues of the country are going to be overtaxed by paying the parliamentary allowance to two members of the Senate from the North-West, I think it is a rather small objection to a constitutional Act of this kind which is done for the purpose of placing the North-West Provinces on an equality in every respect with the old Provinces. I think it is too small an addition to our expenses to be worthy of allusion. If the enquiring minds of hon. gentlemen opposite would allow them to consider the question of economy in moving for returns, a judicious economy in the expenditure for that purpose, it would enable us to give the North-West Territories a dozen senators instead of two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has the slightest objection to these Territories being represented in due proportion to the number of their inhabitants. If we have any objection at all, it is an objection which goes much further than the North-West Territories, and the objection is a very well-founded and well-grounded one; it is to any small number of people in any part of the Dominion having a representation on the floor of this House many fold in excess of what their number would entitle them. One of the fundamental features of our federal compact was that each Province should be represented here in proportion to its numbers. That fundamental feature the hon. gentleman, and I think inadvisedly and unwisely, has repeatedly violated. Perhaps one of the least objectionable violations is in regard to these North-West Territories, because we may hope, in spite of the exceedingly unfortunate results that have so far attended the exertions of the Government in settling those Territories, that a better day may dawn for them, and they may within a moderate number of years acquire a population entitling them to four representatives on the floor of this House. I have seen so much in the past few years of the very great misfortune which has befallen this country from the extreme ignorance of responsible Ministers about that country, that I am glad to see anyone here who can speak with knowledge as to the affairs of the North-West, as I have no doubt my hon. friend can do. Although I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will be able to obtain a couple of gentlemen in the North-West willing to take one thousand dollars a year and their mileage, the same objection which I stated applies as to the disproportion of representation to population in the representation which the hon. gentleman proposes to give the North-West Territories in the Senate.

There are about 23,000 people in the North-West Provinces, or there were that number when the last census were taken. That number does not entitle them to the representation which the hon. gentleman proposes to give them in the Senate, on a numerical basis at all events. The Province of Prince Edward Island with its 100,000 souls has three or it may be four, I forget which.

Mr. DAVIES. Four.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Our own Province, with a population of about two millions, has a representation of but twenty-four; and although there may be a fair reason for granting to the various groups throughout this country a somewhat larger representation than the numerical one, still I do not think that, looking at what is done in the Senate, which I notice is adjourned for a fortnight at this very moment, from having nothing to do, there is no very burning necessity for having more than one representative from the North-West Territories. There is another point to which the hon. gentleman alluded, in regard to which I beg to take exception. The hon. gentleman travelled all over Ontario, and he said he did not find a single man, Conservative or Reformer, who had any objection to make to the Senate, or who thought that the Senate was a body of partisans appointed by the Government of the day. I travelled all over Ontario and visited a great number of places, and I venture to say this, that if the elections in the various counties had been conducted on an honest voters' list, on a voters' list made by the people and not by partisans of the Government, the hon. gentleman would not occupy his present seat to-day. But whether this be the case or not, I have this to say: In no one assembly out of the scores I addressed, attended largely both by Conservatives and Reformers, did I fail to call attention to the blot on our system of representative government, caused by the existence of a Senate, which was nominated exclusively by the Government of the day; and in no one of these places did I find any single question which seemed to take more hold of the popular mind, which seemed to commend itself more to the audiences (composed as they were of both Conservatives and Reformers), and if men of both political parties expressed themselves to me after the meeting more unreservedly on one question than another, it was as to the fact that the Senate, as now constituted, is a disgrace and a scandal in every respect to our system of government. It is not like the British House of Lords; there is no sort of comparison—it is not fit to be named in the same year, let alone on the same day. It is a perfectly useless, worthless body of partisans, and the sooner it is reformed the better for the people of the country, although it may not be better for the hon. gentleman and the party he controls.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to add a word to what has been said in regard to this matter. I apprehend that the leader of the Government does not make this addition to the Senate because he is fearful of being too weak in that revered body. I think the relative proportion of parties is about 15 to 63.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About two to one.

Mr. CHARLTON. The addition is not necessary, therefore, in the interest of his party? I rise, however, to corroborate what my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated. The First Minister could have hardly judged very accurately the condition of sentiment in the west if he supposes that the Senate of Canada is a popular body with the great mass of the people. I as well as the hon. gentleman travelled somewhat through Canada, and whatever sentiment might fail to receive the approval of the audiences, the one which was sure to meet with approbation was any reference in an unfavorable sense to the Canadian Senate. The Senate, Sir, is unquestionably unpopular with the people of Canada. The people of Canada recognise it as a useless appendage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

age to the Parliament of this country, a packed body of partisans—

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether it is in order to speak of the second chamber of the legislature in those terms.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would say upon the question of order which the hon. gentleman has raised, that there can be nothing disorderly in speaking of the Senate as a packed body of partisans, unless the hon. gentleman thinks it is discreditable to be considered a partisan of the Conservative party. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the Conservative party is right in its views, that it is an honest, respectable party, why it is, of course, no discredit to the Senate to speak of it as a packed body of partisans of the Tory party.

Mr. McNEILL. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now whether two new members ought to be added to the Senate, and, of course, it is competent for hon. gentlemen to discuss the advisability of such a measure, and even to dispute the usefulness of that honorable body. As to the expressions used by the honorable member for Bothwell, I consider them rather objectionable, and I do not think such language ought to be used towards a legislative body which forms a part of our Parliament, and which, as such, ought to deserve the respect of this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept your ruling. I have this to say in explanation—that I spoke of the Senate as a partisan body, because, Sir, it does not in any sense reflect the sentiments, or wishes, or feelings of the people of this country. The people in this country have no voice in the selection of its members; they are placed there by the nomination of the Crown; they are invariably men of one party. When a Reform member of the Senate dies his place is filled by a gentleman of the other party, and if the right hon. gentleman remains in power five or six years longer it is possible that you would not have five Reform members in that Chamber. If he should remain in power for ten years it would be a body which in all probability would be unanimously Tory—a body in which not a representative of one of the great political parties of this country could be found; and it was speaking in that sense that I referred to the Senate as a packed partisan body. I only had reference to the mode in which it was constituted. At the time the point of order was raised I was saying that if there is one unpopular feature of Canadian affairs, if there is one sentiment which appeals to public sympathy, in speaking to the people of this country, it is a denunciation of the mode of constituting the Senate, and the assertion that it is an unnecessary and a partisan body. With regard to the statement of the right hon. gentleman, that he comes here to this House with the approval of the people with regard to the constitution of the Senate and all the public questions that were raised in the election, and that therefore his policy with regard to the Senate is approved by the people, the answer to that statement is that we have not got an unbiassed, free, direct opinion from the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman had taken away either the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Act, or the corrupt influences used by the Government, we would have come here with a majority; but, handicapped as we were with all these three influences and outrages, we have not got a free expression of the popular will. The hon. gentleman owes the majority at his back, not to an untrammelled expression of the popular sentiments of this country, but to the influences I have named—to loading the dice, to the arrangement of the constituencies in such a way as to enable two hundred and fifty thousand Conservatives in Ontario to exercise as much influence as would three hundred and fifty thousand Reformers, to the fixing of

the Franchise Act, and to the accumulation of a great fund of money which we know was lavishly used in the election and the results of which we see to-day. There has been no free expression of public sentiment. The right hon. gentleman, I believe, asserted that I got some money from Michigan. I think this assertion was made when he visited some friends in Toronto, when he called together the manufacturers of that city to meet him. It is said that the right hon. gentleman once appealed to a meeting of manufacturers, when asking for election funds, and told them that they ought to remember their friends; that they should not act like the swine picking up the apples under the trees, without remembering the bountiful and munificent hand that was shaking down the apples. The right hon. gentleman appealed to the manufacturers in this case, and he went on to say that the Reformers were accumulating a fund, that Charlton had been to Michigan appealing to the lumbermen of that State, and that he had come back with a large amount of money. Well, as the hon. gentleman made this statement in a way that gave it publicity, I may say that I had not been in Michigan for many months, that I never received a dollar from Michigan or any other portion of the United States for any political purpose whatever. With regard to the use of money in the elections, I may state that it was with the utmost difficulty that the Reform party were able to raise a meagre sum of less than ten thousand dollars to pay the expenses of committees, to furnish campaign literature, and to supply speakers in various parts of the country. So far as any influences of that kind were used, if used at all, they were used on the side of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman boasts that he came to this House from the country with a majority at his back, but I tell him that he has not come here with the verdict of a free unbiassed expression of opinion by the people, but that he comes here by virtue of the Gerry-mander, the Franchise Act and boodle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks of something I said in Toronto. Well, I dare say that is a subject which will come up in this House at another time, and then we will discuss more about it and where it came from. As regards the statement that we do not represent the people of Canada, that we are not here by a full, fair expression of the majority of the people—that I deny; and the statement is only made by hon. gentlemen opposite because they were utterly disappointed by the result of the election. Although there was the Gerry-mander Bill, as they call it, although there was this objection and that objection, hon. gentlemen opposite were satisfied they were going to carry the country. There is indubitable evidence that they made arrangements in the belief that they were going to be transferred from the cool shades of opposition to this side of the House. There is indubitable evidence before us and before the country that hon. gentlemen were so satisfied of that, that all the preliminary arrangements of many of them were made so that they could at once take full possession and govern this country. Here in Ottawa, in Toronto, and in other great centres we know that there were pro-scription lists made out, equal to those which were prepared by the old Roman triumvirates, to cut off the heads of the unfortunate Conservatives who had offices worth anything, and perhaps in a good many cases their successors were already indicated. We know that a great many men worked at the election with the understanding that Mr. Blake was certain to come in, and that the Tories had at last come to the end of their tether. The Conservatives were going out and the Reformers were coming in, and I am sorry to say that we have found, in very many cases, that the civil servants, believing in the open and ostentatious statements as to the certainty of the Reformers carrying the country—and they were told at the same time

in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere that they would be punished if they did not vote on the winning side—I say we found that these civil servants, a body which used to be said was of course going with the Government of the day, were voting as a general rule against the Government for fear of their being dismissed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, for fear of being dismissed by the incoming Government. The policy of *ux victis* was going to be carried out to the utmost extent; and I ask the hon. gentlemen if that does not prove that they fully expected to carry the country, gerrymander or no gerrymander. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they did not believe until the last hour that they were going to carry the country. The people of Canada had before them the whole policy of the Government of the day for the last eight years; they had before them the statements of a different policy which would be pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the people of Canada showed their approval of the policy of the Government, both as to its legislation and its administration, by returning a large majority in its favor. It was a very remarkable thing that they should have done so for the third time in succession, because we all know that just as the people of Athens tired of hearing Aristides called "the just," so the people of Canada might be supposed to be tired of hearing that the National Policy was a great success, that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was an exhibition of great administrative ability and boldness, and had raised the prestige and credit of Canada to an enormous extent, and therefore it might naturally be supposed that we could not last forever, and hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly expect that their turn would come. But it was the ingrained opinion of the people of Canada that the five years administration of hon. gentlemen opposite were five years of misfortune, disaster and incapacity of every kind. Notwithstanding all our faults, all our shortcomings, all our errors, they thought it better to keep us, after eight years of mismanagement, according to the statement of these hon. gentlemen, and to give us a commission to misgovern the country for five years more. I said I would challenge the hon. gentlemen to say whether they did not expect to carry the country beyond a doubt. That belief existed after the 22nd day of February, and it existed especially in the mind of the hon. leader of the Opposition. You may remember that on the night of the 22nd it was pretty well known that we had a majority; but the North-West and Manitoba elections were still to come on, and so the Grit press, with that energy and accuracy which distinguish them, telegraphed all over the west that the Tories were down, the reign of corruption had ended, and the party of purity had carried the country by a majority of eight. They have a Grit party, or the nucleus of one, in the town of Victoria, in British Columbia; and they, believing these telegrams—and it was a wonder that the Grits, knowing what their press was, did believe them—telegraphed to the hon. leader of the Opposition their hearty congratulations on his glorious victory. That telegram, according to its date, left Victoria at 2:37 the next day, the 23rd of February. By that time I think it was pretty well known that this majority of eight was rather mythical than otherwise; but on the 24th, two days after the election, the hon. leader of the Opposition telegraphed: "Thanks for your congratulations; work with all your heart and complete the victory." So that two days after hon. gentlemen opposite had been beaten, horse, foot and artillery, such was the impression upon their minds that they would not believe the plainest facts, and they still believed that they had carried the country, and that the reign of corruption was over. These are the exact words of the telegram:—

Mr. McMULLEN. How did you get it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why, it was published in the Grit papers of British Columbia.

"TORONTO, 24th February, 1887.

"To J. C. McLAGAN.

"Thank Victoria Liberals for congratulations. May they do their duty and complete a Liberal triumph.

"EDWARD BLAKE."

This was sent two days after the election had been held. Now, Sir, let us return for a moment to the question of the Senate. I was led away by the eloquent speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, to follow him in his rather discursive discourse into things in general. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that he objected to there being a disproportion between the number represented and the number of representatives. Well, that is to a certain extent the case in these small communities. The same objection was taken when Manitoba was granted a constitution as a Province. It had then a very small population indeed; but it was argued in the House—and Parliament saw the reasonableness of the argument—that it would be of no use to give them one man to sit in the Senate without a friend to communicate with in regard to the affairs of his Province. The proper course was to give them a certain number, and provide that that number should not be increased until the population of the Province reached a certain point, when it would fall into the same arrangement of representation by population provided by the British North America Act for the other Provinces. I suppose Manitoba will now very nearly have her right by population to the number of senators she has now. At any rate, the number will not be increased until the population will give the Province the right to have it increased under the provisions of the British North America Act. I think, Sir, this Act will meet with the general approbation of the country. I did not in my remarks say that the whole country was in favor of the Senate. I did not speak of the popularity or unpopularity of the Senate. What I said was that during my political travels through Ontario last autumn and winter, the question of altering the constitution of the Senate or abrogating the Senate altogether was never once alluded to by any speaker or by any person I communicated with during the whole of my travels, so that it could not be a burning question in any sense of the word. It was not alluded to. Nobody asked me: Are you going to alter the constitution of the Senate? I heard a great many enquiries about the matters in which the people were interested, and discussed various questions of importance in public and private during my itinerary, but that question was never put to me from the beginning to the end of my journey.

Mr. DAVIES. I am sure, Sir, no one will grudge the hon. gentleman the time he has taken in singing his little song of victory over the events of the 22nd of February last. He has a right to put a little pluck into his followers. While I admit he has a very accurate knowledge of all that transpires in his own party, I do not think his knowledge extends with equal accuracy to the transactions of his opponents, and he is a little premature in stating that he knows exactly what arrangements were made by us in expectation of the victory. I have no hesitation in saying that we hoped and expected, as we had a right to hope and expect, a victory, and if we did not achieve that victory, no one knows better than the hon. gentleman that our defeat was due to foul and not to fair means. The hon. gentleman smiles, but he knows that what I say is correct. No one in Canada has a better knowledge of this than he, for he superintended the arrangements and devices of his party. The right hon. gentleman intimates that during a rather extended campaign in the Province of Ontario, he had never heard the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

question of the Senate discussed by the people, and he did not think the people took much interest in it. As far as I can gather from reading of the progress of the hon. gentleman in the "Jamaica," he took good care to deliver his address from platforms where he was surrounded by members of the Government, and where there were no political opponents to challenge his statements. It was not likely he would, at those meetings, hear any matters discussed except those which it was in his own interest to bring before the people. Be that as it may, if the hon. gentleman's information with respect to the political feeling of the other Provinces before the elections, is as inaccurate as his statements with reference to Prince Edward Island, there is not much reliance to be placed on it. He has ventured to say that an important factor in the campaign in Prince Edward Island, where the Reformers did their duty by returning a solid plank to oppose the right hon. gentleman, was threats used against the civil servants of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I have no hesitation, at this the earliest opportunity, in telling the hon. gentleman that there is no foundation whatever for the statement; and I challenge him to bring before the House the name of the author of that statement, in order that I may give it particular denial. The campaign was conducted there, so far as we were concerned, in a fair, open manner, on broad political issues, such as the action of the Government in connection with the fisheries, in connection with the question of reciprocity, and the question of expenditure, and all other great questions which should come before the people; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that while we succeeded in gaining the support of the electorate of that Province upon these questions, and upon them alone, we were not met in exactly the same way by the hon. gentleman. No one knows better than he that the project of constructing a tunnel across the straits received his *imprimatur*, a very few days before the elections, and that his letter was circulated through the island. True, with his usual caution, he guarded himself, so that when the letter is read in Parliament, it will be seen he has not positively bound himself to the expenditure of so much money. His followers cheer that. I admit he is an adept at writing political letters of that kind, which to the electors may mean a great deal, but which to the hon. gentleman when called upon to keep his promise, mean nothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no promise.

Mr. DAVIES. The people were led to believe there was a promise, and no man knows it better than the right hon. gentleman. But the assumed promise, the letter which his supporters said contained a promise or a pledge, was circulated from one end of the Province to the other, and the reliance the people placed upon the word of the right hon. gentleman is seen in the representation they have sent here. The hon. gentleman was disposed to deal with the Province still more kindly. Rumor has it, the Local Government leaders stated it on every platform, that they had a letter from the hon. gentleman, telling them he had placed \$500,000 to the credit of the people of Prince Edward Island, in the hope they would return six men to support him here. I wonder if the right hon. gentleman is prepared to deny that he gave members of the Local Government the assurance that \$500,000 would be placed at the credit of the Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I gave no such assurance.

Mr. DAVIES. If he did not, his most prominent supporters in the Island will stand branded before the people as having been guilty of a wicked and a most deliberate lie.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, they will not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh! that would not hurt them.

Mr. DAVIES. Not only the hon. gentleman, but if I mistake not the Finance Minister was interested in the result of the election, and although not able to come there himself, he had in the previous part of the summer done us the honor of paying us a visit, and had paved the way in the strong political speech which he made at the time he was High Commissioner. He, too, spoke to the people from Amherst, and, if I mistake not, lent the weight of his influence and his voice to the scheme for the construction of a tunnel which would involve the outlay of so many millions. The right hon. gentleman will see, with the positive denial I make, speaking for myself, and I think I can speak for my hon. colleague, for he was with me during the whole canvass, that no threats were made against the Civil Service. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not only made the statement in this House, but I am given to understand he has already instituted proceedings against those civil servants who had the temerity or the honesty to express, by their votes, their opinion, and has authorised a commission, an inquisitorial commission, to sit in secret, and these men, it is rumored, are to have their heads cut off as servants of the Crown. I know men who have been dragged before the commission charged with having used their influence in favor of the Opposition candidates—men who I was not aware had taken any active interest in the election at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To your knowledge.

Mr. DAVIES. To my knowledge. They had not even canvassed. When the hon. gentleman reads the evidence, he will see that those who gave the information have misled him, that these men who were informed against were not guilty of doing anything else than simply expressing their opinions, as they have a constitutional right to do, by their votes. They may or may not be dismissed. The policy may or may not be laid down by the hon. gentleman that to the victors belong the spoils, but if it should be, all I can say is that the day for the Reformers to return may not be so very far off, and hon. gentlemen on this side may reap some of the benefit of that policy, if that be the policy laid down. Experienced politician as the right hon. gentleman is, he might have manliness enough not to act on mere rumors or information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By no means.

Mr. DAVIES. No doubt if he acts fairly on the evidence those gentlemen, whose political heads are said to be cut off, will remain in their places.

Mr. JONES. I am rather surprised that the right hon. gentleman should make any reference to the influences which he says were brought to bear against the civil servants in Prince Edward Island or elsewhere. Had the right hon. gentleman been aware of the influences which were brought to bear in the Province of Nova Scotia against a large number of people who held positions under the Government there, I am sure he would have avoided any discussion of this subject to-night. The hon. gentleman went into the discussion of his position here with a majority to support his party in this House, and he was to a certain extent amusing his people with some of the expectations which some on our side of the House entertained previous to the elections. As has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, we had a good right to expect, if there was any sense of fair play, or any honesty in this country, if there was any intelligence in this country, looking at the history of the Government for the last seven

years, looking at the extravagance and corruption which had characterised every branch of the Government, that our party should have succeeded on the 22nd February; but we went into that fight like a man going into a contest with his right arm in a sling, with all those influences against us, with corrupt revising barristers and corrupt returning officers, and with the Civil Service against us, and with all these men brought up against us day by day, and with Ministers of the Crown going through the Province of Nova Scotia, to which I particularly refer, promising railway subsidies to every part of that Province, stating that the Government having now completed the Pacific Railway, would carry out their policy and complete all the local roads required in that Province. Why, the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General, during their peregrinations through Nova Scotia, promised subsidies to various railways in that Province amounting to not less than eight or ten millions of dollars. A Minute of Council passed just before the election was scattered through Colchester and Cumberland and Pictou, and, if the present members for those counties are here to-day it is owing to the influence they exercised through those Minutes of Council which they brought there, pointing out that, if they were returned, the Government were going to build those local roads which the people of those counties considered necessary for their interests. In the city of Halifax, we have got about four hundred men who are in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, and what course did the Government take in regard to them? The requisition to my hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) and his colleague who ran the election there, was circulated through all the workshops from one end of the city to the other, and these men who were in the employment of the Government were threatened that if they did not sign that requisition the influence of the Government would be brought against them. The day before that election, when it was known that a certain number of railway men in Halifax, wanted to exercise their franchise—and franchise means freedom, and these men should exercise their franchise according to their own judgment—an order came from Moncton, from the head of the Railway Department, and every man in Halifax who was supposed to have any sympathy with the Liberal party was ordered to report himself in Moncton the next day, and every man in Moncton who was supposed to have any sympathy for the Liberal candidate was ordered to report himself at Halifax the next day, and any man at Colchester who was supposed to have any sympathy with our friends there was ordered to be in Moncton the next day, and it was the same thing with regard to Pictou. They were sent from Pictou to Halifax, from Colchester to Moncton, and from Moncton down to Halifax in that way, and so those men were deprived of the privilege of exercising the franchise. I say unhesitatingly that, were it not for the influence of Dominion officials, exercised by order of the Tory committee in Halifax, my hon. colleague would not be here to-day. He does not represent the people of Halifax in that respect. He only represents those who were controlled by the election committee in Halifax, and therefore I say that, when the right hon. gentleman ventures in this House to lecture hon. gentlemen with reference to the coercion of civil servants in this country, he had better take care to make himself familiar with all the facts. When his own colleagues the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General, went through the counties and distributed Minutes of Council which they had prepared for the occasion, if it may not in a legal sense be put down to intimidation or bribery, it was to all intents and purposes offering the greatest bribe they could offer to the people of that country; and when this question comes up, I think they will find that we in the Province of Nova Scotia have no ground to fear the fullest, the most ample, and the most searching investigation that can be had.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker,——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, I will say that either this Bill can be read a second time now and this discussion renewed on Tuesday when we go into committee, or we can adjourn the debate. It is not worth while, in view of what is on the paper, to come back again to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not object to that on condition that the hon. gentleman will consent that the motions which stand on the paper for Monday in my name may be taken up on Tuesday or Wednesday, as the case may be, as I shall be absent on Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Niagara River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 45) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Popo.)

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 46) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us some idea of the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. EDGAR. The provisions of the Bill are such as I hope will commend themselves to all hon. members who have recently gone through an election contest, as their experience must have convinced them that a good many provisions of the law required improvement. One provision of the Bill is to ensure greater secrecy of the ballot. There is no use having the ballot at all unless it is a secret one, and I found, from my own experience in voting, in a good many places, as well as from what has been told me by others, that the ballot paper used was so thin and flimsy that the voting by ballot was not by any means secret, owing to the fact that the pencil mark made on the ballot showed plainly on the other side, and could be seen by the deputy returning officers, the agents, the poll clerks, and everybody else. Another little defect has been mentioned to me, and it is this: that in some places a rough board has been provided for a desk or table on which to have the ballot marked, and when this is the case, no matter how thick the paper is, it is apt to show the pencil mark on the other side. I therefore suggest that a hard and smooth surface be provided, as well as a certain thickness

Mr. JONES.

of paper. I have made enquiry at the Stationery Office as to the qualities and weights of different papers, and I find that a change to a suitable quality of paper to obviate this difficulty will involve so trifling a difference in cost as to be hardly worth mentioning. Then it is well known that a good deal of difference of opinion has existed between lawyers, as to whether deputy returning officers and poll clerks had a right to vote at the last election. I know that very eminent lawyers have disagreed upon that point, and, therefore, I propose to insert a provision declaring that these officers shall have the right to vote, thus preventing any possibility of disqualification in that way. Then, it is also alleged that abuses have prevailed in some cases by the improper use of certificates given to agents by returning officers. It is alleged that a large number of such certificates have been improperly given by deputy returning officers to persons alleged to be agents. I propose that only two certificates of this kind may be given——

Mr. BOWELL. The deputy returning officer has no power to give them.

Mr. EDGAR. No, it is the returning officer who gives them.

Mr. BOWELL. The only reason I interrupted the hon. gentleman, was because I understood him to say that the deputy returning officers gave these certificates.

Mr. EDGAR. I did say so, but it was a slip of the tongue. It is the returning officer who gives them out, but the deputy returning officer takes the votes, and some of them have so understood the law that they thought it was proper to accept a great many certificates in some cases, and that certainly was not the intention of the law. Then, the law as it stands provides that each deputy returning officer and the poll clerk, after counting up the votes, and before putting their final statement into the ballot box, shall take an oath as to the accuracy of their proceedings. The deputy returning officer must take it before either the returning officer himself or a justice of the peace, which implies that he must keep a justice of the peace on hand at the poll, or else he cannot comply with that provision of the Act. I am sure I do not see how it has been done in the absence of a justice of the peace. The poll clerk is allowed to take his oath before the deputy returning officer, so that in his case there is no difficulty. I propose the simple change, which is at present the law in Ontario as well as in Quebec, that the deputy returning officer may take that oath either before the returning officer or a justice of the peace, as hitherto, or before the poll clerk, so that there will be no excuse for keeping the ballot box open until a magistrate can be obtained. I think these amendments will commend themselves to the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No 22) to incorporate the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

IMPORTATION OF DISEASED CATTLE.

Mr. MADILL, in the absence of Mr. SMITH (Ontario), asked, Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit the

importation of cattle into Canada from Great Britain and Ireland, fearing the introduction of diseased cattle?

Mr. CARLING. The Government have not decided to prohibit the importation of cattle into Canada from Great Britain and Ireland. The whole subject of restrictive legislation is, however, under consideration.

GAZETTING OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, Whether any member of the Ministry had any conversation, correspondence or communication of any kind, mediate or immediate, with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on the subject of gazetting members elected to this House? If so, which member of the Government, and what was the nature of such correspondence, conversation or suggestions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. member will move for correspondence it will be brought down. The Government decline to be cross-examined about their conversations with anybody.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. RINFRET, in the absence of Mr. DE ST. GEORGES, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure for a repeal of the Electoral Franchise Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

STATUTES OF CANADA.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Who were the Commissioners appointed to revise and consolidate the Statutes of Canada? Has the compensation to be paid to said Commissioners for such work been fixed; and if so, what is the amount, and have they been paid in full? Has a claim been made on the Government by any of the Commissioners for further compensation? If so, which of them? Has an application been made to the Minister of Justice for a fiat to file a petition of right for the enforcement of such claim? Was such application granted? If not, why?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am sorry that, as to the first part of the question it must stand, as I left behind me the memo. giving the information. No claim for further compensation has been made by any commissioner, and no application for a fiat to file a petition of right.

BANK CIRCULATION.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any measure whereby the bank circulation will be rendered absolutely secure—say by compelling banks to deposit Government bonds against circulation, as in the United States? Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure compelling the banks at all times to keep adequate reserves?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The action proposed could not be done without amendment to the Banking Act. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any amendment to the Banking Act during the present Session.

WEIGHT OF SALT IN BARRELS.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation for regulating the weight of a barrel of salt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is under consideration.

WHARF AT MATANE.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair the wharf at Matane, and more especially the last work executed under the direction of J. C. Taché, Engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a note from the Chief Engineer of my department, who states that there are in the department no information showing that repairs are necessary for that wharf.

RIVER RIMOUSKI IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. FISET asked, What is the amount expended for improvements made at River Rimouski in the years 1885 and 1886? Is it the intention of the Government to carry on the said improvements during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount expended in 1885 is about \$1,200, in 1886, \$1,000. The question of continuing the works this year is yet undecided.

WHARF AT RIVER BLANCHE.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry on and complete this next summer the work already commenced at the wharf at River Blanche?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Engineer of my department says that we have no report showing that additional expenses are required for that work.

IMPORTATION OF BUTTER SUBSTITUTES.

Mr. FISHER asked, Whether, since last Session of Parliament, the Government have issued any instructions to the officers of the Customs Department by which proper enforcement of the prohibition of the importation of oleomargarine, butterine, and other substitutes for butter may be effected, or has issued any instructions to the officers of the Inland Revenue Department by which the effective enforcement of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 42, may be accomplished?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs Department placed the amended law in the hands of all officers of Customs in the usual way, the result of which was that a few samples of what was supposed to be oleomargarine were sent to the Department to be tested. They were given to the Dominion analyst, who pronounced them to be butter. With regard to the Inland Revenue Department, my impression is there was nothing further done than to give general information to the officers to carry out the law, and the result was as I have already indicated.

FOG-ALARM AND LIGHTHOUSE, MURR LEDGES.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, Is it the intention of the Government to erect a fog-alarm and lighthouse on some part of the Murr Ledges, near the southern head of Grand Manan, and will an appropriation be made this Session for that purpose?

Mr. FOSTER. Preliminary investigations were last year made, and it is the intention of the Government to erect a fog-alarm and lighthouse on one of the Murr Ledges. Whether the construction will be commenced during the present season or not, is still under consideration by the Department.

QUEENS, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. MULOCK, asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay the cost and expense

of the election contest in Queen's, N.B. (other than those of an election by acclamation) in case it should be determined that the returning officer was right in returning G. F. Baird as elected by acclamation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the case comes up, it will be time enough to answer. The whole subject is now engaging the attention of the Department.

SUBSIDY TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has a sum of money been placed to the credit of the Government of Prince Edward Island by the Federal Government, from the first day of July, 1886, up to date? If so, what amount? If not, is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates during the present Session for that purpose? And what sum?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No sum, in addition to the usual subsidy, has been placed to the credit of Prince Edward Island by the Federal Government from the 1st of July, 1876, to date. It is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament at this present Session for authority to grant an additional subsidy of \$20,000 to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. Is that yearly?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have constructed during next summer a new steamer to assist the *Northern Light* in carrying on winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland? If so, what steps (if any) have been taken to that end? If not, how do they propose carrying out the terms of union with that Province, next winter, in respect to such communication?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole subject is now engaging the attention of the Department.

CLAIM OF THE SIX NATION INDIANS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed to examine into and report upon the claim of the Six-Nation Indians, as set forth in their petition presented to this House on 18th April, 1887, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Mills (Pothwell), Dawson, Lister, McNeill, Armstrong, O'Brien, Casey, Paterson (Essex), Burdett, Guillet, and the mover, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

He said: I am not unaware of the fact that, in moving for a special committee of the House with power to send for persons, records, &c., some expenditure is involved, but I think the subject I move upon is of such importance as to warrant it. The claim of the Six Nation Indians to a large tract of land has, I think, been under the consideration of the Government for some years, and the chiefs and warriors of those nations feel they have been unable to obtain a satisfactory explanation, or receive what they deem a satisfactory answer; in short, they feel that the claim they prefer to such lands, mentioned in the petition, is a just and valid claim. They feel that they are unable to present their case as favorably for themselves as they would desire, owing to the lack of full information on the subject; and the First Minister and the House will recognise that I, who present their claim, lie under the same difficulty in not having access to, and in not having the opportunity of examining the documents and records connected with this matter, so that I can only make such representations as have been made by the Indians by myself. I am in hopes that the First Minister will be able to give us some explanation; and if he sees his way clear to send the case to a committee, I hope that committee will be in a position to order

all the papers and records bearing on this important matter. It would be well, in order to place the House in possession of the nature of the claim of these warriors, that I should just read the petition which they presented to the House, and which has not yet been read:

"To the Honorable the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament Assembled:—

"The Petition of the Six Nation Indians, respectfully and humbly sheweth—

"That, by a certain instrument, dated the 25th day of October, 1784, under the hand and seal of arms of Sir Frederick Haldimand, then Captain General and Governor in Chief of the Province of Quebec and Territories depending thereon, the Mohawk Nation and such other of the Six Nation Indians as wished to settle in that quarter were authorised and permitted to take possession of and settle upon the banks of the river commonly called Oswego or Grand River running into Lake Erie, allotting to them for that purpose six miles deep on each side of the river, beginning at Lake Erie and extending in that proportion to the head of said river, which they and their posterity were to enjoy forever.

"That the Six Nation Indians, from time to time, by deeds dated respectively January 15th, 1798, February 5th, 1798, November 19th, 1809, April 19th, 1830, April 19th, 1831, February 8th, 1834, March 26th, 1835, and January 18th, 1841, surrendered to the Crown that portion of the said lands so granted to them from Lake Erie to the north boundary of the township of Nicol, in the county of Wellington, excepting thereout lands in the township of Tuscarora, Oneida, Onondaga and Brantford, which are held and occupied by your humble petitioners.

"That the head of the Grand River is in the 4th concession of the township of Melancthon, a distance of about forty miles from the north-boundary of the said township of Nicol.

"That the Six Nations had not at any time surrendered a right to the lands between the said north boundary of the township of Nicol and the head of the said Grand River, nor had they been allowed or granted any other lands in lieu thereof, nor had they been paid or allowed any sum for the value of the said lands, but the said lands have been taken by the Crown and sold, and the right and title of your petitioners to the same has been ignored.

"That the said Six Nations believe that they were justly entitled to the said lands in question which they claim according to the reading of the said instrument as the only deed they always recognise—the deed of the said Sir Frederick Haldimand—which they have always had in their possession, and which the Imperial Government also recognised, as evidenced by their action whenever the Six Nation Indians surrendered any land to the Crown, even subsequent to the issuing of the Simcoe deed, which your august Assembly seems endeavoring to put forward in place of the first deed.

"In the report of the Hon. John Henry Dunn, the Hon. George Herchmer Markland, and William Hepbourn, Esquire, the trustees who were appointed by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor on behalf of the Six Nation Indians to investigate and report for his information on claims preferred by various persons to lands belonging to the Six Nation Indians and situated on the Grand River, are the words: 'The trustees are satisfied, from copies laid before them of the correspondence in the year 1797 between the late President Russell and Captain Joseph Brant, deceased, as well as a power of attorney dated 10th October, 1804, and executed, it appears, by the Sachem and Chiefs at a council especially convened for the purpose, that Captain Joseph Brant was the accredited agent of the Six Nations, and invested with full power on their behalf to obtain deeds from the Crown conveying the tracts of land granted to them on the Grand River by the late Sir Frederick Haldimand in the year 1784, and which grant, it would seem from the correspondence above alluded to, was confirmed by the Home Government during the Duke of Portland's administration.'

"It is therefore the prayer and humble desire of your petitioners that your august Assembly do fully investigate and give your serious consideration to the said claims of the Six Nation Indians now presented before you, and your petitioners in duty bound will ever pray.

"Signed in behalf of the Six Nation Council and warriors,

"WILLIAM SMITH,
"Mohawk Chief."

That is the wording of their petition to the House. It recites in a brief manner the claim that is preferred. The Six Nation Indians, as the House will know, remained during the time of the Revolutionary War true to the British Crown. They lost their possessions in what became the United States of America as the result of that, and the English Government, recognising their services, recognising their loyalty to the Crown, through Sir Frederick Haldimand, then Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec and the Territories appertaining thereto, gave to these Indians, under the hand and seal of Governor Haldimand, a grant of six miles in width on each side of the Grand River from its source to its mouth. Thither these Indians removed, there they were residing, and there their descendants reside to-

day. The House will need no arguments to be advanced to lead them to a sense of justice and right towards these Indians. I do not for one moment desire to seem to intimate that the Government are at all lacking in that matter, but there is this difficulty, I suppose, connected with it: that the First Minister being the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and the First Minister of the country, has a very great deal to attend to, and perhaps he has not even himself as fully investigated this claim as we might hope to be able to investigate it were a committee granted. The Six Nation Indians being in a peculiar position, standing rather in a peculiar position as wards of the nation, of course it is understood that the Superintendent General himself shall exercise peculiar care and regard for them, though I am not insensible to the fact that, while he stands in that relation to the Indians, and is thus bound to protect all their rights, as head of the Government he has to do what is just and right as between other parts of the community. Nor do I think these Indians desire that anything which they do not believe they are fully entitled to should be done; nor would I be found advocating any claim which I did not believe was founded on justice and equity; nor do I pronounce in any way on the subject, because I have not access to all the documents in regard to it. But these Indians feel that their claim is good, and I believe it is unanimous amongst them, and the correspondence which has taken place, and the answers they have received have not been of such a nature as to satisfy them. My object is to get all the facts in connection with these matters before us, so that we may be in a position to summon representatives of the Six Nations before us who would have an opportunity of stating their case before a committee, which would have the opportunity itself of examining all these different documents. I have no doubt that, if the claim can be established to be a good one, the Commons of Canada, acting in a proper manner, will grant to these Indians what is their right; and I feel equally sure that, if it is made apparent and plain to them that their claim is one which is not founded in justice and in equity, they would be perfectly satisfied after having had this full opportunity of investigating the matter and being assured of that result. But I assure the First Minister and members of this House that, unless this be done, unless some way be adopted in which they can have access to these documents and can have a full understanding of this matter, there will be a feeling of uneasiness, a feeling that they have been imposed upon, that the Government and Parliament of Canada have been careless in reference to their demands and have not given them that which they deem to be their rights. I am not insensible to the fact that it would have been a proper thing to place the name of the First Minister, as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as the first name upon this committee, but I hesitated to do so, knowing how fully his time is occupied elsewhere. I have understood that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has had a good deal of experience with Indian matters, and, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is unwilling that his name should be put on, I would, with the consent of the House, if the First Minister declines to have his name upon the committee, substitute the name of Mr. McCarthy, of North Simcoe, in place of the name of the Hon. Mr. Mills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not at all object to the hon. gentleman bringing the subject up; indeed I think the petition having been placed in his hands, he could not do otherwise than to bring it before Parliament. I think, however, that instead of moving for a committee in the first place, he ought to have moved to have papers laid on the Table of the House, all the papers, in order that they might be referred to a committee of the House, and disposed of in the ordinary way. The mere power of a committee

to send for papers and records is not regular, nor has it the force of giving possession for any practical purpose, of the papers and records of the Government. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that it is the duty of the Indian Department to protect the rights of the Indians. The Department is supposed to be the guardian—or, rather, the Sovereign is supposed to be, and is, the guardian of the rights of the Indians of Canada; and it is the pride of Canada, and of all Administrations, that the Indians, on the whole, have been fairly and liberally attended to. This question, however, is surrounded with a great deal of difficulty. In the first place, it is a very old one—three-quarters of a century old, at least, and has been before the old Province of Upper Canada, before the Province of United Canada, and now it is brought up here. The question is a legal one, and a committee cannot well decide a question of title. It is simply a question of title, and is one of a very considerable magnitude with respect to the pecuniary interests involved in the settlement of this claim. The lands which are claimed by the Six Nations now are not in the possession of the Crown. They belong to other parties, and have belonged for many years, and it comes to this simply, that if this land belongs to the Indians and is improperly disposed of, the Province of Ontario must make compensation to these Indians for the value of these lands. Well, the hon. gentleman opposite shakes his head. Somebody has got to make compensation; the lands have been sold or disposed of; they cannot be transferred to these Indians, because they belong to other people, and therefore if the Indians have been wrongfully dispossessed of these lands, of course they must be compensated either by the Dominion Parliament, or the united Province of Canada, or the old Province of Upper Canada. It is simply a matter of title, and it can only be decided by the courts. The Indians have applied again and again, and Government after Government have decided and have declared that the Indians have no legal nor equitable claim, and I fancy that if it is pressed it will have to go to the Supreme Court in some way or another in order to be decided. The Six Nation Indians, after having brought it up before several Governments for many years, applied to Her Majesty's Government, and they have relegated it here for reconsideration. The matter has been lately before me, and I have carefully examined the papers. I do not wish to express an opinion at this moment, either for or against the claim of the Six Nations. The most proper way and the only satisfactory way of deciding this question, is by having it brought in some way before the Supreme Court—whether by submitting it in the way of a question, or by the Department of Indian Affairs asking for a fiat as against the Crown to have the subject before the Supreme Court, I am not prepared to say. I thought, perhaps, when the hon. gentleman moved just now, that he would have some statement or argument which he had received from his constituents—I will not say his clients—that would throw some light on the subject. The hon. gentleman very naturally said he had no information further than he had gathered from that petition; therefore we are not in a position to grant that committee. I would prefer that the hon. gentleman, instead of moving for a committee, should move for the papers, and I shall see that they are all brought down. They are very important and very interesting, for there is a very interesting question connected with this grant, or supposed grant, from the Lieutenant Governor—I think Lieutenant Governor Haldimand—to the Indians; but we do not know its extent, nor its value, nor what was really conveyed, or promised to be conveyed, to the Indians, and I think, with the consent of the House, the hon. gentleman had better alter his motion and make it a motion for the papers in the meantime. As a reference from England has only arrived lately, or within a very short time, the Government will consider

the question whether it ought not to be referred at once to the Supreme Court. When we have the papers, then the hon gentleman perhaps may make up his mind as to the course he will pursue. Of course I feel the full responsibility of my position as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. I feel that the red man should be protected against the white men and against their intrusions upon his rights. I believe that the Government, without reference to political changes in Canada, have always tried to do justice to the Indians. The present Government have every desire to do justice to the Indians. We have no object in not doing justice to them. This question is one of very considerable magnitude, as I have already stated, and perhaps, now that the hon. gentleman has brought it before Parliament, we may as well have it decided, so far as Parliament can decide it, and obtain the opinion of Parliament as to how the matter should be finally disposed of. After hearing the facts hon. members will be of the opinion that the case can only be properly decided by a court of law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the First Minister will explain the difference between this case and the one with which he dealt two years ago, the case of the Mississauga Indians, at Trenton. I think the hon. gentleman in that case made provision out of the public Treasury that a very considerable sum, \$40,000 or \$60,000, should be paid to those Indians by way of compensating them for some claim about the same age as this claim. I think in that case the hon. gentleman did not invoke the aid of the courts, did not obtain a judicial expression of opinion on the merits, before he dealt with it; and, perhaps, he will be able to say why in this case a different course is proposed to be pursued from that which the Government took in the case of the Mississauga Indians just before the elections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak as to the Mississauga case, because I do not remember the circumstance at this moment. The hon. gentleman has got elections on the brain. He says that case was dealt with just before the elections. I am quite sure the Department decided what was right in the matter. In this case there is a series of legal opinions against the claim of the Six Nation Indians. I speak not by way of comparison, but as to what I think is the proper way of dealing with the case at present before us.

Mr. MILLS. All judicial decisions are matters of comparison.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The observations of the First Minister are, in effect, that I should change my motion. I do not know that I object to do so very much. I had two reasons in moving as I have done, for one of which the hon. gentleman should give me credit. We on this side of the House are often found fault with for moving for voluminous and costly returns. Before taking action I consulted with the Deputy of the Department, and, in fact, the suggestion came from him—it was thought best to move for a select committee which might have before it the original papers and save the work of copying, which would be a task of great magnitude. The other reason was one which pressed itself strongly on my mind, namely, that the work being so great we might not be able to get the papers before the close of the Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will get them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, if the First Minister makes me that promise, and will lend me his powerful aid, for he can do almost anything as the House is at present constituted—and he certainly can do it with the help of the Opposition—we can, no doubt, obtain the papers. If the case is to go before the courts it is desirable that all the documents bearing upon it should be printed. I would point out also, with respect to obtaining a legal decision,

that the Indians' case might fail on some technicality. For instance, it might be held, as it has been held, I believe, in some cases in which incidentally the question of a Haldimand patent came up, that the patent was given under the Governor's own seal, and not the Great Seal. What I would desire to secure therefore, is, that the Indians' claim should be considered as one of justice and equity aside from legal technicality. There can be no doubt that Governor Haldimand gave that patent, whether it is formal or informal. The Government are not acting upon that patent, however, for they recognise a subsequent one, the Simcoe deed, dated 1797, I believe. There was a line struck north-west from the head of Burlington Bay. The Indians do not go by that, but always by the Haldimand deed of 1784. A fact that I cannot very well explain, is, why the Indian Department always recognises the Simcoe deed and ignores the Haldimand deed, and why this has been done in all the surrenders the Indians have made; in fact, all the surrenders have been made under the Haldimand deed, which those who administer Indian affairs have set aside. The Indians have furnished me with a copy of one of the surrenders, and I will trouble the House by reading it, in order to emphasise this point. It is dated on 19th November of the 49th year of the reign of His said Majesty:

"Whereas the Sachems, principal Warriors and people of the Mohawk or Six Nation Indians, in consideration of William Dickson, of Niagara, Esquire, had given counsel and advice and done other professional services to and for the said Nations, did in full Council assembled, at the head of the Lake, on the 19th day of November, in the forty-ninth year of the reign of His present Majesty, deeming such services worthy of remuneration, decree, resolve and determine that on reward and compensation thereof, the said Nations would surrender to His said Majesty, his heirs and successors, a tract of land containing by admeasurement about four thousand acres, situate at the mouth or entrance of the Grand River, by virtue of and under the authority of a certain instrument in writing, under the hand and seal at arms of Sir Frederick Haldimand, late His Majesty's Captain General and Governor in Chief of His Province of Quebec and Territories thereon depending, (now His Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada,) done at the castle of St. Lewis, the twenty-fifth day of October, 1784, and in the twenty-fifth year of His said Majesty's reign, to the intent that the said tract of land so to be surrendered should be granted by His said Majesty, his heirs or successors, to the said William Dickson for the purposes aforesaid.

That is a copy of one of the surrenders made by them, and it is an instance, as I am informed, of the fact that in all the surrenders made the Haldimand deed is referred to and not the Simcoe deed. It appears to my lay mind there is a point in the Indians' favor in that circumstance, and it is a point that requires explanation. It has been stated in some of the courts where the question has been incidentally raised, that the Haldimand deed was informal; but that deed, whether informal or not, was some years afterwards registered in the Secretary's office, and the Simcoe deed was not registered. This statement with respect to the Simcoe deed is made on the authority of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), for I do not know it myself. I mention these matters to point out to the House that there is a case for investigation, and as the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said when the First Minister took into consideration the claim of the Mississauga Indians, and without any recourse to the courts, but determined on the authority of the Department, the Department making the award—I say this made them more strong in their belief that their object can be attained by a proper representation of their case. I do not know that it is necessary to say more, after the First Minister has indicated the direction in which he would like this enquiry to proceed. Of course, as the Indians are very much interested in the matter, I rely on his promise that all the papers will be brought down with as much expedition as possible; and I also count on his help to see that they are printed, in order that we may have that advantage in dealing with them.

Motion withdrawn, and the following substituted:—

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all title deeds, patents and records concerning the claim of the Six Nations Indians, in their petition presented to this House on April 18th, 1837."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would you not add the word correspondence? From a conversation I had with Mr. Vankoughnet, I find that the Department claim that they have the authority of Joseph Brant, acting as the accredited agent of the Indians, for the substitution of the Simcoe deed for the other; and, if that is in existence, it should be brought down with all documents of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The motion, as I understand, is to be a broad one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in the widest sense. Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PURCHASE OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILROAD.

Mr. GIGAULT, in the absence of Mr. AMYOT, moved for:

Copies of the bargains, agreements or contracts made between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, respecting the purchase of the North Shore Railroad between Montreal and Quebec, or between St. Martin's and Quebec; and also for copies of the contracts between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purchase or transfer of the said portion of the North Shore Railway.

Mr. POPE. Those papers were all laid on the Table of the House last year, I believe; but if there are any which were not, there is no objection to bringing them down.

Motion amended by inserting after the word "copies" the words "all papers not already brought down."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURNS OF GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1874.

Mr. TUPPER moved for:

Return showing as to each electoral district the date of the return made to the writ by the returning officer in each electoral district after the General Elections of 1874, the date at which such return reached the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the date at which such return was gazetted, and all correspondence between himself and the returning officer in reference to the returns.

He said: I wish to explain to the House my object for making this motion, which will be somewhat similar in its result to the motion made a short time ago in reference to the election returns of the last election. It will be recollected that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) laid considerable stress on the fact that, in the returns after the last general election, he found that members on one side of the House seemed to be gazetted exclusively in the first *Gazettes* after the election, and he took the trouble to explain to the House the result of an investigation he had made into those returns. He said:

"But we know right well when we find that, in the first instance, members on that side of the House are exclusively gazetted, and members on this side of the House are excluded from the *Gazette*, that it is done for a purpose, and it is the duty of this House to enquire into the irregularities of the proceedings in this particular."

Now, I took the trouble to look up the returns of the election run under the Reform Government of this country—the only election of that kind which had ever been conducted, both before and after, under the auspices of a Reform Government in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about 1878?

Mr. TUPPER. I said both before and after, but in the election of 1878 the Reform Government ceased to exist by the time the returns were in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TUPPER. Virtually and constitutionally it ceased to exist.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, not constitutionally.

Mr. TUPPER. However, be that as it may, in explaining the object I have in view it is simply necessary to draw attention to what happened in that particular year, in the same line of argument as that adopted by the hon. member for Bothwell. He found that on the 5th of March, 1887, seven Tories and one Liberal were gazetted. Now, I find that on the 31st of January, 1874, there were gazetted ten Grits and one Conservative. Then, my hon. friend found that on the 12th of March, 1887, twenty-eight Tories and five Reformers were gazetted. I find that on 7th February, 1874, twenty-three Grits and twelve Conservatives were gazetted. Then, I find that the hon. gentleman laid stress on the fact that, on the 19th of March, 1887, fourteen Tories and three Reformers were gazetted, while I find that on the 28th of February, 1874, twenty-eight Grits and eleven Conservatives were gazetted, so that if my hon. friend looks at all the returns he will find that he can find no good argument upon such a coincidence. I make no charge against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in connection with the performance of his duties in 1874; but I think the returns on that occasion will show that no good charge can be made against that officer in connection with the performance of his duties in the last election. It will be found that prominent names of Reformers reached the *Gazette*, and were published before those of Conservatives at that time. For instance, there were no less than seven batches of returns after that election made by the Clerk, and published in the *Gazette*. Those returns continued from early in February, through the month of March, and extended over a period of eight or nine weeks. I find the names of nearly all the prominent Liberals in the first two *Gazettes*—the names, for instance, if I may be excused for mentioning them, of the leader of the Government of that day, Mr. Mackenzie, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Ross, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Charlton, and other leading members of the party. I think that fact weakens considerably that portion of my hon. friend's argument. It is quite true, in 1874 the elections were not by law required to be held simultaneously; and whatever difference that may make, I do not think it has much bearing on this point. But, as the Reform party had previously claimed that in justice and right those elections should be held simultaneously, I find in the *Toronto Globe* the boast was made that Mr. Mackenzie had, so far as possible, carried out the view he had advocated while in Opposition and had, on the first opportunity, though not required by the law, so arranged the elections as to have them, as far as possible, held simultaneously. In Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, the nomination day was on the 22nd of January, and polling day on the 29th of January; and in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island nomination day and polling day were respectively two days later. Therefore, I think the weakness of my hon. friend's argument is tolerably well demonstrated by a reference to the returns about which he knows so much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no intention of renewing the discussion of the subject I brought before the House a few days ago. I have a motion on the paper, which will come up to-morrow, when I think I shall be able to show to the House that the views I have expressed already, in condemnation of the conduct of this officer, are amply justified by the returns brought down. The hon. gentleman has moved for a return in connection with the election of 1874. That return will not sustain the proposition he has undertaken to establish. If the conduct of the former Government were as objectionable as the hon. gentleman would seek to have the House believe, I altogether repudiate the notion that a wrong done by one Administration, if a wrong has been done, is any justification for a course being persisted in that interferes with the liberties of the people at this hour. If that

Government did wrong, it was the duty of hon. gentlemen, when on this side of the House, to bring their conduct before Parliament, and to see that they were condemned for it. But the statement is not well founded. I have the *Gazettes* before me to which the hon. gentleman's motion refers, and what do I find? The hon. gentleman read the names of a number of members who were gazetted first; why were they? Because the majority of them were elected by acclamation, and therefore their returns were in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before those of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were at that time under a cloud. I have a list of those names, and I find that among them the following gentlemen who were not Reformers, were gazetted on the 31st of January: Mr. Little, the member for North Simcoe; Mr. Ouimet, of Laval; Mr. Colby, of Stanstead; Mr. Masson, of Terrebonne; Mr. Dugas, of Montcalm; Mr. Lanthier, of Soulanges, and Mr. Desjardins, of Hochelaga. There were thirty-seven members gazetted at that time, twenty-five Reformers and twelve Conservatives, just about the proportion of the two parties in the House. Then, I find in the *Gazette* of 7th February, thirty-five members gazetted, twenty-three Reformers and twelve Conservatives, about the same proportion. The Conservatives constituted about one-third of the House. In the *Gazette* I find the names of Mr. McDougall, of Three Rivers; Mr. Ryan, of Montreal Centre; Mr. Pope, of Compton; Mr. Caron, of Quebec Centre; Mr. Baby, of Joliette; Mr. Alonzo Wright, of Ottawa County; Mr. Mousseau, Mr. McGreevy, Mr. Robillard and others. Then, in the *Gazette* of the 14th of February, I find the names of hon. gentlemen opposite, in proportion to their numbers, to be just as numerous as those of our friends. Do we find all the Conservatives left to be gazetted in the third or fourth *Gazette*, and all the Reformers in the first or second? Not at all. In this *Gazette* I find the names of Messrs. Dorion, Cheval, Bernier, Laurier, Fiset, Geoffrion, Huntington, Tremblay and Holton, from Quebec; Messrs. Ross, Church, Melsaac and Coffin, from Nova Scotia; Picard, Charles Burpee, Domville, Anglin, and Smith from New Brunswick. So you will see that the return moved for by the hon. gentleman does not at all establish the proposition he has undertaken to establish. It shows beyond all controversy that the Government of that day did not interfere with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the performance of his duties. What was the position of things at that time? The law did not require simultaneous elections, and yet the Government adopted that principle. They put the Government on an equality with their opponents in the election, and they abided by the decision of public opinion, honestly and fairly obtained without any undue advantage that administrative influence could give them; and the same fairness was exhibited by the Government in the publication of these returns in the *Gazette*. If the hon. gentleman wishes a full and fair report, let him amend his return to include the elections of 1878 as well as those of 1882, brought down in the form in which we have the return respecting the elections of 1886, and then we shall see how two elections under a Reform Administration and two under a Conservative Administration were conducted, and whether any undue or improper influence was used over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in connection with the gazetting of members. I shall show that that officer flagrantly violated his duty, that he violated his oath of office, and the Government ought to dismiss him for his improper conduct.

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friend seems to think I brought this motion forward as a *tu quoque*. I said I did not from these facts, which I thought harmless both in 1874 and in 1887, draw any conclusion adverse to the officer under a Reform or under a Liberal-Conservative Government; and I read—and the hon. gentleman repeated to some extent the statement—the same in reference to the numbers returned

Mr. MILLS,

in these different *Gazettes*. So far as the hon. member disagrees with me in that matter, we can be both set right by any hon. gentleman who will look the subject up when these returns are all presented. I based my remarks on the opinion that I thought the hon. gentleman had discovered a mare's nest.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not present at the beginning of the argument, but I judge from what the hon. member from Bothwell said that he imputed to the mover the desire to set off the misconduct of the previous Administration against that of this Administration, and that the hon. gentleman repudiates the idea of any such attitude being taken by him. As one independent of both Administrations, certainly not favorable to the Administration at the date to which the motion refers, and not particularly friendly to the Administration of the day, I entirely agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that the publications of the returns from the different constituencies are so marked in their character, so very unfair, that the House should demand explanations from the Officer of the Crown whose duty it was to publish these, in order that we may find whether his course was suggested to him or whether it was an accident. If it was, it was certainly a very remarkable one.

Mr. MILLS. It is impossible it was an accident.

Motion agreed to.

ICE BOATS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return showing the names of all the parties who tendered for carrying the mails to and from the board ice at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island; the amount of each tender, and to whom contract given?

He said: In my opinion, and in that of the people of the Island, the ice-boats ought to be kept longer on the route. I remember well this winter, I think it was on the 5th or 6th of April, the *Northern Light* made her first trip from Georgetown to Pictou, and a day or two afterwards boats at the capes were ordered to be put up and the *Northern Light* got caught in the ice. From that day, there were no mails landed on the island for eight days afterwards and the boats were idle. If the management of the service were left to the Agent of Marine and Fisheries there, he would keep the boats going until later, and far more satisfaction would be given. The least one would expect from the Government, in view of the large number of passengers who cross, would be to keep these boats on the route as late as required. Until the Government think well to build the subway that we hear so much about, or a tunnel, or a bridge, I hope they will keep these boats long enough on the route in the spring to carry mails and passengers, until the *Northern Light* or some other steamer will be able to cross daily.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SUPPLIES.

Mr. JONES moved for:

Return of supplies furnished to the Intercolonial Railway, Halifax and Truro, with names of parties, quantity, and prices paid, stating in each case whether by contract or by private agreement.

He said: I make this motion with the object of obtaining from the Government some explanation with reference to the mode adopted in obtaining supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. It amounts to a very large sum in the Lower Provinces, and I have been informed that the same mode is followed there which was followed under the Administration some few years ago, and which then resulted in a very unsatisfactory agitation, as hon. gentlemen on that side will remember. It would appear from all the reports in circulation, that certain parties have the supplying of the road pretty much on their own terms; at least

such is the boast among certain friends of the Government in that quarter, and it may also possibly account for the very large stock on hand. I do not pretend to be a judge, but over \$750,000 of stores on hand does seem to be a very large amount, when all the necessary supplies can be obtained at almost 24 hours' notice. I move this resolution with the object of arriving at some information as to the mode which the Government propose to adopt of obtaining supplies for that very important public work.

Mr. POPE. I think my hon. friend is laboring under a great misapprehension. Almost all the supplies for the Intercolonial Railway are obtained by tender.

Mr. JONES. Public tender?

Mr. POPE. Public tender. We certainly have not a large quantity of supplies, and all that we do get which are of much consequence without tender are such as we have to get immediately, and they are as small as possible. I have no objection to the motion of the hon. gentleman, but I would like him to confine it to some time. I do not know whether he means to have a list of the stores since the railway was built, or what he means.

Mr. JONES. The last year.

Mr. POPE. We will say since 1874.

Mr. MITCHELL. While this subject is under consideration, I would like to draw attention to a matter which is cognate to it, and I would ask the hon. gentleman's attention to the question of some supplies which are obtained at Moncton. I have heard it stated from one end to the other of the county which I have the honor to represent, I have heard statements, insinuations, charges and assertions, that the lumber supplies for the railway at Moncton are confined to one individual—if the hon. gentleman wants his name, I will give it to him—and that that gentleman tenders at a certain rate, and, instead of giving the class of lumber which is asked for, he rushes in all kinds of lumber of all grades and qualities, to the detriment of the fair competitors, many of whom live in the county I represent. I have heard this from many who are connected with the trade. Whether it is true or not I do not know, but I ask the Minister to enquire whether it is true that a certain party resident in the town of Newcastle, who became a very bitter opponent of mine, gets all the contracts for these supplies.

Mr. POPE. Give his name.

Mr. MITCHELL. His name is Edward Sinclair. He has, as I am informed, been constantly supplying great quantities of lumber, and it is said that the quality is much lower than that which is asked for, and which the other competitors have to tender for. I ask the hon. gentleman to make a note of this. I do not want to make any motion in regard to it, but I have the courage to give the name of the man. He was a very active participant against me in the election, and, as he had not taken any part in politics before, and took a very active part then, I thought he might have some reason for it.

Mr. POPE. I thought he might have been a supporter of the hon. gentleman before, but when the hon. gentleman left this side and went to the other, I suppose he thought it his duty to fight him. However, I may say that a large part of the lumber used in Moncton is got outside of this county, because the oak and other kinds cannot be got in the section which the hon. gentleman represents, and as a general thing, the lumber is got by tender. I do not know this man, but I will cause enquiries to be made in regard to the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I complain of is that, while tenders have been asked for a certain class of lumber of one kind, while a first-class has been asked for, a third or fourth quality is supplied. That is the point. My action in chang-

ing from that side of the House to this has no significance. I changed my place over here in order to get a better seat; I am as Independent now as I was when I sat there and opposed the hon. gentleman's motions. All those which I thought worthy of consideration—and I do not think there were many—I supported; and I will continue to support any measure which he may bring in which I think a good one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I shall lose the measure?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know that the hon. gentleman will lose the measure, but he may get a dressing.

Mr. POPE. I accept the apology of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The Minister says that he obtained these supplies by public tender. I observe the daily papers in my part of the country with as much regularity as most people, and I have not seen any advertisements for supplies of this kind. It may be possible that the Government have sent simply to their own friends to ask them to tender, but that is not public tender.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I was going to ask in what mode the supplies were tendered for, because I agree with my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) that we do not see these advertisements in the papers. I understand that circulars have been sent around, and, in regard to one building, the first the carpenters in St. John knew of the proposed erection of that building was when the contract was given to a gentleman who managed somehow to get nearly all those contracts on the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I refer to Messrs. Rhodes, Currie & Co., of Amherst. It was said that the notices were put out, but those sent to St. John, instead of being posted, were discovered some months after the tender was accepted, under some boxes in a portion of the freight house at St. John.

Mr. POPE. I admit that, in the particular case the hon. gentleman refers to, the notices were not put up as it was intended they should be and as they ought to have been. When the hon. gentleman speaks of no tenders having been asked for, he always refers to that particular occasion which has been discussed here again and again. I forget exactly what the building was, but I know that it had to be done in a hurry. The notices were sent out and stuck up, because we had not time to wait; but, as a general thing, the notices are given in the ordinary way.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF BUTTER FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for:

Return showing the number of pounds of butter imported into Canada from the United States, and entered for consumption for the years 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, and up to the 1st of April, 1887; showing also the Provinces into which such butter has been imported and entered for consumption.

He said: I read in the *Globe* of Saturday, the 23rd of April, the following:—

"IMPORTATION OF ALLEGED BUTTER.

"Since the American Dairymen's Association commenced their war upon oleomargarine, and especially since they secured State and National legislation forbidding the vending or exporting of the stuff except under its real name, there has been a significant change in the quantity of American butter handled in Canada. The following figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns show what the change has been:—

IMPORTS OF BUTTER FROM UNITED STATES INTO CANADA.

Into Ontario and Quebec.	Imported. Lbs.	Entered for home consumption. Lbs.
1883	169,403	26,740
1884	262,359	39,750
1885	773,055	139,064
1886	932,857	145,925

I took a leading part, and was largely instrumental in bringing about the legislation of last Session dealing with this question, although hon. gentlemen opposite, and the press representing them, claimed all the credit for that measure which the *Globe* says now is not producing the desired result. I may say that when I read this article I was somewhat surprised, and immediately undertook to investigate the correctness of the statements it had made, because, if the figures quoted by the *Globe* are correct, some further legislation would be necessary in order to protect the dairy industry, and, I am sure the Government would grant this legislation to the farmers of this country at once. But, Mr. Speaker, I find the figures given by the *Globe* as being a correct statement, have been manufactured for the purpose of misleading the farmers of this country, and making them believe that they are being injured, when such is not the case. The correct figures were given by the Trade and Navigation Returns. The quantity of butter imported into the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and entered for consumption in the year 1883, was 115,218 lbs., while the *Globe* says there were 26,740 lbs. In 1884, the quantity entered for consumption was 13,068 lbs., while the *Globe* says it was 39,750 lbs.

Mr. CASEY. For Ontario, or the Dominion?

Mr. TAYLOR. For Ontario and Quebec; the *Globe* only deals with these two Provinces. In 1885 the *Globe* says there was imported 139,064 lbs., while the fact is there were but 4,468 lbs. imported and entered for consumption in those two Provinces. The *Globe* says that in 1886 there were 145,925 lbs. imported, while the fact is there were 59,007 lbs. imported and entered for consumption. I also have a statement of the quantity imported during the last six months of the year 1885 and the corresponding six months for 1886, after the Oleomargarine Bill was passed by this House last Session. During the last six months of the year 1885, there were 148,751 lbs. entered into the whole Dominion, and during the last six months of 1886, there were 86,696 lbs. entered for consumption in the whole Dominion. But 78,439 lbs. of that was entered in British Columbia, leaving but 6,167 lbs. for the balance of the Dominion for the last six months of 1886, after the Oleomargarine Bill was passed. For Ontario and Quebec, the quantity was 5,237 lbs. But the *Globe* goes on further to make some other points in dealing with this matter. It says:

"Why upon earth should one single pound of American butter come into Eastern Canada and pay four cents a pound tax, seeing that Canada exports butter largely to the United States? The answer is not very difficult. The alleged American butter which comes into Canada cannot be butter, but must be oleomargarine. Otherwise, why should the consumption of American 'butter' in Eastern Ontario and Quebec have been multiplied by six in four years' time? Surely the efficiency of our dairymen has not decreased during that time. On the contrary, has it not increased to a most remarkable extent? If there is any other than an oleomargarine explanation of this phenomenon we should like to know it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the *Globe* that it is unnecessary to import butter for home consumption into Canada, and also agree that our country is making rapid and substantial progress, that our dairy industry is progressing rapidly; but I disagree with the statement that 145,925 lbs. of butter were entered for consumption in 1886 for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, while the fact is that only 69,007 lbs. were entered in those two Provinces in that year, and the great bulk of that was previous to the passing of the Oleomargarine Bill, because since the 1st of

Mr. TAYLOR.

July, 1886, up to the 1st of January, 1887, there were 5,237 lbs. entered; which proves conclusively that the passing of that Bill has acted as a prohibitory measure, practically. The *Globe* makes another reference. It says:

"And as to the large quantity of American butter which is imported and re-exported—is there any guarantee that this, too, is not oleomargarine? And is it not sent abroad as Canadian butter, to the great damage of the none too good reputation of the real article?"

Well, with that part of the subject I am not prepared to deal, for I am not conversant with the bonding regulations of this country. I do not think, however, that it is possible to import into this country American butter and export it again to the English market as Canadian butter. However, I will let the Minister of Customs deal with that matter, as he is conversant with the regulations concerning importations in bond and exportations, as this charge is directed against the management of his Department. The next point the *Globe* makes proves conclusively in my mind that it has become an out-and-out protectionist as far as the farmers of this country are concerned. I do not know whether it made the statement when the Oleomargarine Bill was before the House, but it says:

"When the Oleomargarine Bill was before the House of Commons last Session we expressed the opinion that there is no way of excluding oleomargarine from this country save by forbidding the importation of butter. There is not a Custom-house officer in the country that can tell oleomargarine from butter. Even the leading dairy scientists have not yet agreed that there is a perfect test between the two articles. We again say that the only way to protect our dairymen from the competition of oleomargarine is by forbidding the importation of butter."

I am glad that since the hon. leader of the Opposition made his Malvern speech, the *Globe* has fallen into line, and is now an out-and-out protectionist in the interest of the farmers of this country, and in order to give protection it goes in for prohibition, and would prohibit an article being brought into this country of which we can manufacture enough to supply the home demand. This may be one way to deal with the question, but it might possibly be called a Retaliatory Bill if we were to prohibit the butter of the American and English farmers. I think the better way would be for the Government to raise the duty on butter to eight or ten cents a pound, and that will effectually prohibit oleomargarine being imported into the country and passed off as butter on the Custom-house officers, as I admit it is nearly impossible to tell a genuine article of oleomargarine from a genuine article of butter. But the *Globe*, when trying to raise a feeling of antagonism between the farmers and manufacturers of this country, says:

"The Government would be fast enough to do this"—

To prohibit butter coming into the country altogether—

"were it a lot of subsidised and tributable manufacturers who were concerned, instead of the farmers."

I wonder the *Globe* does not remember that the leader of the Opposition said in his Malvern speech, that if he was returned to power the manufacturers would have nothing to fear. The *Globe* appears to have forgotten that statement, and it intimates, and in fact insinuates, that with the present Government manufacturers are a favored class to the detriment of the farmers, and it gives a long string of figures purporting to have been taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns as a correct statement, in order to prove its assertion. But the statement it has given is not correct in any particular. I have given, in my opinion, the correct figures as I gather them from the Trade and Navigation Returns; but, in order to verify them, I move the motion now before the House.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. member must know that he is in error with respect to the claim he puts forward for credit as regards the prohibition of the importation of oleomargarine, for there is no doubt as to where the credit for the prohibition should be given. The hon. gentleman introduced a Bill, not to prohibit the importation of oleo-

margarine, but to protect its manufacture in Canada. He proposed to place a duty on the imported article such as would make it profitable to establish the industry in this country, and even informed the House that a company with large capital was to be established in Montreal for the manufacture of the article. The Minister of Inland Revenue had also a Bill imposing duties on that article. I believe I was myself the first to suggest that it would be impossible, if oleomargarine were allowed to be manufactured in the Dominion, to provide that it should not go into consumption here, and that in any case such an article would compete abroad with our home made butter. The idea was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by some hon. members on this side of the House. Finally, on the motion of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who was the first to place the matter in shape for the House to act upon it, the House adopted the plan of prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine, and the Minister's Bill was amended accordingly, and became a prohibitive Bill. As to the figures of the *Globe*, quoted by the hon. member who last addressed the House, I cannot pretend at the moment to say how far the *Globe* may have miscalculated in quoting figures from the public documents. It could certainly have no object in intentionally misrepresenting them, for so many members had copies of the document, and would be gratified to find a flaw in the *Globe's* figures. But there is a general understanding now that the prohibition of oleomargarine is an absolute necessity to the preservation of our butter market in Canada. Whether the prohibition of the importation of butter is such a necessity, there is room for argument; but it does not become hon. gentlemen opposite to urge that there would be anything unfair in such prohibition. The farming class have been taxed for a long time for the support of the manufacturing class, and we would only be asking that protection be extended all round, as was promised when the National Policy was originally introduced. Whether this mode of protection is necessary it is not now the time to consider; but the Minister should give special attention to the task of prohibiting the introduction of oleomargarine into the country. There can be no doubt, that in order to prevent such an importation, much attention will be required, for the two articles are very similar, and nothing short of a chemical or microscopical test will decide the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Some chemists say that will not detect.

Mr. CASEY. I think that a microscopical test is a pretty safe one. At all events, it would not be difficult to have experts appointed. If every sample of supposed oleomargarine is to be sent here to be tested, much trouble will be involved, and in practice it will not be done, the Customs officers passing it on their own responsibility, but if it was referred to some chemist or expert in butter in the town where the entry was attempted to be made, much time and trouble would be saved. It would be impossible, I suppose, to do as was done in some other trades, to have a butter expert appointed as a Customs officer at such places where butter was imported. That would, perhaps, be doing too much for the farmers, but I believe it will prove to be the only effective way of completely prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine. I hope the Minister will use his best efforts to secure the object we have in view.

Motion agreed to.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS IN THE THUNDER BAY DISTRICT.

Mr. DAWSON moved for :

Return of all reports of surveys and explorations made under the direction of the Geological Survey Office, within the past two years, in the Thunder Bay District to the westward of Port Arthur.

He said: Surveys have been going on for some years past to the westward of Port Arthur, under the direction of the

Geological Survey, but we have had no report as yet of what has been discovered in that interesting country. No doubt the Geological Survey sent very able officers and men of great experience there; but what avails all that when we have not received any report? I ask that a return be made of the reports of those gentlemen who were sent into that district. The Geological Survey have discouraged mining enterprises; they have told people who proposed to enter into such enterprises that they would be likely to lose money, and they warned them against the investment. Independent, however, of the survey, explorations have been made during the past few years by other persons, and they have been attended with marked success. To the south-west of Port Arthur and north of Lake Superior, gold mines of immense richness have been discovered. One is now being worked with a large force of men, and with stamps and all the necessary machinery. The same remark applies also to our silver region. Very valuable silver mines have been discovered there of late, not by our Geological Survey, but by other explorers and scientists who went in there on their own account. I may mention one instance. There was a gentleman came from Duluth who possessed a large amount of capital, and he was very much struck and pleased with the appearance of the country. He selected a location which had nothing in particular to recommend it more than any other part of the district, excepting that it had a few promising mineral lodes passing through it. He employed experts and scientific men, and they recommended him to go on with its development. He accordingly went on developing his mine, and expended \$150,000 upon it without its resulting in any return whatever. But such was his confidence in the experts that he continued at the work and at last he has his reward. Within the past three months they have taken out one million dollars' worth of silver from that mine. The place I refer to is the Beaver Mountain mine. Another and similar case was that of the Rabbit Mountain, which, after a little surface exploration, was about abandoned by our own people. A few Americans came in with skilled miners and they determined to sink a shaft. They did so, and in a short time passed through one hundred feet of solid silver and already they have \$400,000 of that metal on or near the surface. Some of our mining and geological experts have been there, but yet we have no report—nothing to show the world at large that such a place exists. And it is not silver alone that will be found there. There are immense operations in iron ore going on in Minnesota just across the boundary line, and last summer they exported from that region to a place called Two Harbors, on Lake Superior, 350,000 tons of iron ore. The iron bearing range of Minnesota undoubtedly passes into our side of the line a little to the north of the silver mines. There have been skilful young men from the Geological Survey there exploring, and they were highly impressed with the value of the country; and yet in three years we have not before this House a single word to show what that country is. It is for this reason that I move for these papers, and I hope they will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

TRACADIE HARBOR, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. WELSH moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, departmental orders, reports and other papers relating to Tracadie harbor, Prince Edward Island.

He said: I think this is a matter which has been under the consideration of the Government for some years past, but I have not heard whether they decided to take any action in regard to it. It is very important for the residents of that place that some action should be taken. At one time it was one of the finest harbors on the north side of

Prince Edward Island; it was a coaling station, and Her Majesty's ships passed in and out frequently. At present it is nearly filled up with sand, for the want of proper care and attention. The people there mostly depend on fishermen, and it is in such a state that even boats can hardly pass in and out. I will read an extract from a speech made by Hon. Senator Haythorne, in which he referred to this harbor:

"In a state of nature Prince Edward Island possessed very many valuable harbors on its north coast which, for many years past, since the settlement of the country, have silted up at their entrances with sand and other debris, and this has been the case with the harbor called Tracadie, concerning which I have given notice. There is a large area of land-locked water there, inside of the harbor, round which reside a numerous and enterprising body of fishermen. The industry of these men is now very much confined to boat-fishing, whereas, in former times, notably during the time of the French occupation, vessels of considerable burden used to frequent the harbor; and not only so, but vessels that had the misfortune to be caught in storms off the coast frequently sought safe refuge in Tracadie harbor from the winds and waves * * *. I think it will cause a good deal of disappointment if nothing is done for this particular harbor. I should like to add that the action of the Government of late years, with reference to several other harbors similarly situated on the coast of Prince Edward Island, has been very successful, that the silting up of the bars has not only been arrested, but they have been very considerably deepened in many instances, and I believe as a rule the works lately constructed have withstood the winds and waves remarkably well. There is, therefore, the greater encouragement to repeat the experiment with regard to Tracadie harbor, and as the harbors east and west of this particular one have been successfully treated, it is hoped that the same will be done with regard to Tracadie."

I may call the attention of the Government to the fact that the people living all along the north shore from St. Peter's to New London Harbor mostly gain their livelihood by fishing, and if this harbor were dredged out it would be a very great benefit to them. I believe there have been surveys made of it, and the people have been led to believe that the matter would be taken up by the Government. I may say, for the satisfaction of the Government, that nine out of ten of the people who live around this harbor are Conservatives; and if by telling the Government this fact I can be the means of getting this matter considered, I am very glad to do it.

Motion agreed to.

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EISENHAUER moved for:

All correspondence between the Government and Nova Scotia Central Railway Company relating to a subsidy for said railway; also the report of the Government engineer sent to examine the work.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Government, and more particularly the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways, to the reason he gave in his place in Parliament, last Session, for not bringing down a measure of relief to the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway then, and also to remind him of the pledge he then gave that the Government would make provision for the road next Session. It will, no doubt, be within the recollection of those hon. gentlemen who sat in this House during last Session, when the Government resolutions providing for subsidies to some thirty odd railways, that the Nictaux and Atlantic road was referred to by Mr. Woodworth, then member for King's. The hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) and Mr. Vail, then member for Digby, advocated a subsidy for this road. It seems, however, that the hon. Minister of Railways was not present when the road was referred to on the 28th of May. I will just read a few extracts to show what occurred in this House last Session with regard to this road. Mr. Woodworth, speaking on the evening of the 28th May, said:

"What did the Government do, this argus-eyed Government, when fifty members of the House of Commons signed a memorial to the
Mr. WELSH.

Government begging them in the name of Heaven to help the western part of the Province of Nova Scotia—the Nictaux and Atlantic road, which is lying there in a state of utter collapse, with the sleepers rotting, an attempt having been made to build this road ever since 1877, the company having received a subsidy from the Local Government which was, however, totally inadequate to complete the undertaking. This argus-eyed Government did not turn their eyes in that direction. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) implored them almost on his knees to listen to this memorial, which graphically portrayed the extent of that road, and its necessity, which gave the report of Martin Murphy, the Provincial Engineer of Nova Scotia, extracts from which showed the absolute necessity of the road and that the counties of Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg had no railway communication with the outside world. I do not mean to say that they have not touched it. I do not know what goes on in that great Saubedrin in the Eastern Block. I do not know what they say or do, or what may be in their minds now. They may bring it down; but the observation of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison) has brought to my notice the fact that these men do not require any representation; when they see a great and necessary work like this, they bring it down. If they do not, I think the western counties of Nova Scotia will speak out with no uncertain sound. I think they will have something to say about this argus-eyed Government."

After Mr. Woodworth finished his speech several other gentlemen advocated the claims of the road. On the following day, the hon. Minister of Railways, who appears, from his remarks, not to have been present when the discussion was going on, said:

"I would like to say that while I was absent last night—not being able to be out very much in the evening—my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Shanly), stated that a certain road in Nova Scotia was of very great importance in that section of the country. I regret, Sir, that I had not been informed of it earlier, so that this road could have been placed on the list of those subsidised by this Bill. I will say, however, that the Government will be prepared to come down with a measure of relief for this road next Session."

I am informed that Mr. Kaulbach did not then stop his efforts on behalf of this road, but continued to urge the Government to grant it aid. In view of the memorial, signed by fifty members of the House last Session, and the discussion which had taken place on the floor of this House previously, it seems very strange that the hon. Minister was ignorant of the claims of this road up to the 29th of May. Now, the question arises, what became of this memorial? Perhaps it was put into one of the pigeon-holes in the hon. gentleman's office; it may possibly be that the hon. gentleman never saw it. I must say I am at a loss to reconcile his statement that he had not been informed of the claims of this road with all these facts to which I have alluded. Now, it seems to me that the Government had no intention of making any provision for the road previous to the vigorous speech of Mr. Woodworth on the 28th of May, in which that gentleman denounced the Government in strong terms for overlooking its claims. I think it was only after Mr. Woodworth gave the Government to understand that those western counties would have something to say about the matter, that they promised to reconsider it favorably this Session. I am sure I need not dwell on the great importance of this road and the claims it has for public aid. Mr. Murphy sets forth its claims very fully, and I find by the *Official Debates* that they were also fully discussed in this House. When we consider that the Government last Session subsidised upwards of thirty different railways, five or six of which are situated in Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, and, so far as I am aware, roads on which not a sod was turned or for the construction of which no company was organised, I think the Nova Scotia Central was fully entitled to consideration. That railway was commenced ten years ago, and up to last year a very large number of bridges and culverts had been built, and the road is well forward. But for the want of aid the company have been obliged to proceed very slowly. I think it is not necessary for me to say much more at present, for I hold that the Government are committed to providing a subsidy for this road. The people of the county I represent expect it, and I am sure the Government can-

not stultify themselves and go back on the promise the Minister of Railways made in Parliament.

Mr. JONES. I think the representation of my hon. friend from Lunenburg will have been very opportune if it reminds the hon. Minister of Railways that such a place as Lunenburg exists in the Province of Nova Scotia, of which he was apparently not aware. However, the railway to which my hon. friend refers is one of very great importance to that section of the country, because it not only intersects a very fine district, but opens up communication between the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and the town of Lunenburg, which is one of the largest and most important towns on the western coast of the Province. If the hon. gentleman refers to the statistics of exports from that place, he will be able to gather an idea of its importance; and as it has no communication with the outside world except by water, I think the hon. gentleman will see that the expectations of the people of Lunenburg are very moderate in asking the Government to facilitate the completion of that road. The Local Government went as far as they could under the circumstances, and, during the time the hon. member for Lunenburg was in the Local House, obtained a grant which was the commencement of that road; but they had not sufficient subsidies to finish it. Looking at the amounts which have been granted in other parts of the Dominion to other roads of no more important character, and, I may say with all due respect, of less important character, I think we had fair grounds for hoping this road would receive Government assistance before this. However, my hon. friend has placed this before the Government, and I trust when the Estimates come down the result of his appeal to the Government will be shown to be successful.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). My constituency is somewhat interested in this road, half of which runs through the county of Annapolis, and there is no doubt that the road, when completed, will be a great benefit to that portion of the Province. It has been a long while on the carpet now in Nova Scotia. We have had two men with two pickaxes, two wheelbarrows and two shovels, about long enough on that road, and now I would like to see it completed. I think it rests with the Dominion Government to complete it, and I am quite convinced it will not be finished until the Dominion Government take hold of it. The letter given to Mr. Kaulbach, the member for Lunenburg, last Session, was circulated with a great deal of freedom throughout the county of Annapolis. That letter was written by the Hon. the Minister of Railways, and the fact ought to be sufficient to satisfy any hon. gentleman that the subsidy will be granted. I have rested in security in the matter, troubling myself but little in it, relying almost exclusively upon the letter given to Mr. Kaulbach last year, and I am quite convinced the Dominion Government will, when the estimates come down, furnish the requisite subsidy to complete the Nova Scotia Central Railway. It can only be completed when the Dominion Government takes hold of it, and I am quite convinced it will do so.

Motion agreed to.

NOVA SCOTIA—BETTER TERMS.

Mr. JONES moved for:

Correspondence between the Government and the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia, relating to the financial condition of that Province.

He said: It is not always a very pleasant duty to parade the poverty of one's own Province, and the position in which it stands, but I have less hesitation in doing so on this occasion, because I shall not be required to use my own arguments in laying before this House, very briefly, a statement of the financial condition of Nova Scotia to-day. I shall be able to show the House, in the language of the hon. the Min-

ister of Justice, which I am sure will receive acceptance on his side of the House, that, under her present financial condition, it is impossible for Nova Scotia to continue the public service as heretofore sustained. At the time of the Union, when Nova Scotia took just grounds of complaint that the financial arrangements made under the terms of Confederation were less favorable to that Province than to the others, an arrangement was made by which the sum of \$1,186,000 was added to the debt which Nova Scotia was allowed to enter Confederation with in 1867. At the time this arrangement was made, hon. gentlemen may remember there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in the Province of Nova Scotia, not only with the terms of the Union, but against Confederation with Canada on any terms; and the Colonial Secretary of that day, in a despatch to Lord Monck, dated 10th June, 1868, requested "that the Government and Parliament of Canada would modify any arrangements respecting taxation or the regulation of trade and fisheries which might prejudice the interests of Nova Scotia." That arrangement continued until the present time. And when the Government changed in Nova Scotia, and the Government was formed of which the present Minister of Justice was the actual head and Attorney General, a representation was made to the Government at Ottawa respecting the position which Nova Scotia then occupied under the Union. In a memorial addressed to the Governor General, dated 7th January, 1878, the Government of the Minister of Justice said that:

"The condition of the local revenue is of such a character and so inadequate to meet our requirements, even upon the scale of closest economy, that it has been decided by the Government that I should lay before you in as comprehensive a form as may be, an abstract of the financial history of the Province since it entered Confederation up to the beginning of the present year, in order that the resources of the local revenue may be fairly and fully understood and the necessity of some readjustment made more apparent than a mere superficial view of the situation is likely to convey.

The memorial goes on to point out the different amounts allowed the Government subsequent to Confederation, to show the grants which the other Provinces enjoyed as compared with Nova Scotia at that time. The Province of Ontario, which had a population of 1,921,000, had \$1.40 per head; Quebec, in 1881, had \$2.10 per head; New Brunswick had a population of 321,000, and \$1.95 per head; Nova Scotia had a population of 440,000 and she only got \$1.18 per head. Ontario thus had for her local purposes 31 cents per head more than Nova Scotia; Quebec had 91 cents more, and New Brunswick 76 cents more. This estimate was made in a subsequent memorial by the subsequent Government, but it is in fact the same calculation which was made by the Government of which the hon. the Minister of Justice was a member. The Government, in their requisition, pointed out to the Dominion Cabinet that, under the present condition of affairs, it was utterly impossible for the Province of Nova Scotia to conduct her public services, and they said that at least \$150,000 would be required to enable her to efficiently maintain her service even with the exercise of the greatest economy. It is true that since that time the income derivable from mines and minerals have somewhat increased, and to that extent it would lessen the difference pointed out by the Local Government of the day as requisite for maintaining their local service, they having about \$50,000 from the estimates of that day, and according to the same calculation, if our expenses did not increase it would only leave about \$150,000 which we were annually going into debt for. Then again the question came up with reference to the amount of interest which was to be allowed us on our debt at the time of Union, and the amounts which were to be added to it subsequently. There was a special reference of this branch of the subject made to the Attorney General, and in this memorial which I hold in my hand from his Government, they go on to say:

"By this Act \$1,544,270 was added to the public debt of this Province, but which, under these terms of the Act quoted above should be circulated and allowed as the sum fixed by the British North America Act were increased from \$32,590,000 to \$73,036,088.84. The interest on \$1,544,270, then, should be allowed from 1867 to 1873 on the same ground that it has been allowed from 1873 till now. If this is correct, the Dominion Government ought to allow the Province of Nova Scotia the sum of \$463,281, being the interest on the above amount for six years at 5 per cent. per annum. Also the interest on \$463,281 from 1873 to 1879, six years, at 5 per cent., \$138,984.30, making a total of \$602,265.30."

Now, this branch of the question was referred to the Attorney General, the present Minister of Justice, for his report, and the Attorney General makes his report under date of the 27th February, 1880. He says:

"The second section of the Act supports to the fullest extent my contention that the increased allowances made in 1869 were made in consequence of the Province having established her right to have received better terms at the time of the Union, because it is still more plain and strong in its language in dealing with the matter of additional subsidy."

The hon. gentleman then goes on in various ways to point out the legal aspect of the case, and the ground why he thought that contention should be sustained, and he says:

"The Statute enacts—

"It was, and is the intention of the Act first above mentioned that the increased subsidy to be allowed to the Province of Nova Scotia under the said Act, should be based upon the said sum of \$9,186,706, as if that sum had been mentioned in the 114th section of the British North America Act, 1867, instead of the said sum of \$8,000,000."

"It would be impossible to give effect to the Statute without considering the larger amount of debts substituted for all purposes for the smaller in the British North America Act of 1867 in the same way, and to as full an extent as if it had been originally inserted therein."

I will not detain the House by going over all the financial arguments which were addressed by that Government and repeated by a subsequent Government under a liberal leader. When the Government in which the Hon. the Minister of Justice was Attorney General went out of power, and a Liberal Administration came into power, they took up the question where their predecessors had left it. They had not, I am sorry to say, made much progress with the Government or obtained any more satisfactory answer as to the position which our Government had assumed when they left office, and therefore our Local Government took the question up again, and both parties in the House, as I think the Hon. the Minister of Justice will bear me out in saying, both Conservatives and Liberals in both branches of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, joined in a representation to the Administration repeating the arguments adduced by their predecessors, entering perhaps more minutely into all the financial details and pointing out to the Government that, under the existing state of affairs, it was a matter of impossibility that the Province of Nova Scotia could continue to maintain her public works without some rearrangement of these financial terms. It is true, and we admit, that for a long time under both Administrations no answer was received from the Central Government, and it would appear, I think, that more courtesy was to be expected from the Dominion Government towards the smaller and less powerful Provinces when they approached them in a question of such magnitude as they then presented for their consideration. The Dominion Government withheld for some considerable time any reply to the memorial of both the Provincial Governments, and when the reply was received, the first reply was combated and disputed most energetically and conclusively by the Local Government of which the present Minister of Justice was a member; so I hold it to be a peculiarly fortunate time, in discussing a matter of such importance, when the Province of Nova Scotia has in the Dominion Cabinet to-day a gentleman of the ability and energy of the hon. the Minister of Justice, who so thoroughly understands the question from our provincial standpoint; and I have no doubt, when the question comes before the Government for its consideration, the hon. gentleman will consistently bear out the position he took when he was in the smaller political atmosphere of the Legislature in our

Mr. JONES.

Province. It is true that a *modus vivendi* was suggested by the Government of the hon. gentleman, that some arrangement might be made looking to the mines and minerals of the Province. It was pointed out that, under the previous Administration, a sum of money had been given to the Province of New Brunswick, \$150,000, in lieu of the export duties which that Province had at the time of the Union, amounting, I think, to about \$60,000, if my memory bears me out. At all events, the Province of New Brunswick was granted \$150,000 in lieu of the export duties, and that has placed that Province in a much more favorable financial position, numerically speaking, than the Province of Nova Scotia enjoys. It was, therefore, suggested, and I think not without reason, that, looking at the action the Government had taken with reference to the Province of New Brunswick, they might adopt a similar position with reference to the mines of Nova Scotia, which pay to the local treasury now a royalty of 10 cents per ton. If that were adopted, and an arrangement made on the same basis, it would give the Province of Nova Scotia somewhere about \$300,000 per annum, and the Government would then hold the royalties which are derivable from the mines and minerals in the Province of Nova Scotia. This is an increasing quantity. It is only \$100,000 at the present time, of course, but our coal mines are practically inexhaustible, and if, as we hope, there is an increased demand from year to year, the Government may very early be recouped for any such expenditure which they might make on such a basis, and I think the suggestion of the Government of which my hon. friend was a member, that some such settlement should be made on such a basis, should be considered by the Government, looking to the position which Nova Scotia occupies at this day. When this question comes up again, I may, perhaps, dwell on it at greater length, but I know it would weary the House to go into the figures now. I have only selected the prominent points at issue between the two Governments, and I think those gentlemen who are called upon to deal with the question will admit that I have placed it fairly before the House, as it was placed by both the Liberal and Conservative Governments in Nova Scotia. I trust that the Administration may find some way to satisfy the people of Nova Scotia without departing from the principles of the British North America Act, and that they may adopt some such methods as they have adopted in the Province of New Brunswick, so that our own Province may have sufficient funds for our own wants.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FLYNN. I desire to say a few words on the subject of the motion introduced this afternoon by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I may say that I do not approach the discussion of the motion in any party spirit. It is a question that cannot be approached in that spirit, for it is one in which every representative from Nova Scotia on both sides of this House must feel a deep interest. If, Sir, the financial condition of Nova Scotia is such as has been represented by memorials, and the addresses sent by both Houses of the Provincial Legislature, and if that financial condition is calculated to produce discontent in Nova Scotia, I hold it is the imperative duty of the Government to examine carefully the matter set forth in the memorials, and, if possible, to adopt some remedy in order to remove that discontent. Now, among the different points raised in opposition to the Union in 1867-68 there was none more prominent than the financial terms of the Union. It was considered then by the anti-union party that the financial terms were unfair and unjust to the people of that Province. I am not now going to advert to the action taken by the Local Government, or to the correspondence that took place between the Local Government and

the Dominion Government on that occasion; I merely say that what I have stated now is borne out by the language used by the Finance Minister of that period, Sir John Rose, then in the Government of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-day. He stated on that occasion that under the financial arrangement of that scheme, it would be impossible for Nova Scotia to carry on the affairs of the Province without resorting to direct taxation. In consequence of the action then taken by the anti-confederate party, the Federal Government submitted a measure for the approval of Parliament known as the better terms. I am not now going to repeat what occurred then, but merely to say that the Government of the day considered that they had a right to meet the complaints of Nova Scotia, that these complaints were just, and that it was the duty of the Government to remedy those complaints. Now, Sir, on that occasion the gentleman who occupies the position of Finance Minister in the Government of to-day, was a member of the House, and I think a member of the Cabinet. However, on that occasion he made a speech, and an eloquent one, as he always does, in the view that the Parliament of Canada had a right to discuss this question, that they had a right to open up this matter, and that they had a right to concede to Nova Scotia better terms than they then enjoyed. The hon. gentleman, in 1869, in addressing the Chair you occupy now, said:

"It had never been supposed that we could suddenly pass from the condition of isolated Provinces and arrange at a single stroke of the pen all the financial questions that would actually arise in the adjustment of the financial terms of the Act of Union. It was intended that subsequently a commission should issue—that the Local Governments should each appoint a commission, and one also jointly—and to these commissioners were to be entrusted the examination of the financial affairs of all the Provinces and the adjustment of the debts on a satisfactory basis."

Again, in that same speech the hon. gentleman said, in alluding to the Conference of Quebec:

"If that was an inflexible arrangement, not to be modified at any time thereafter, then Nova Scotia would be placed in a position very different from what she had been."

I perfectly agree with the statements made by the hon. gentleman then. We know that the resolutions brought down by the Finance Minister of that day were carried in this Parliament, but as he stated himself then the terms conceded were based on a careful analysis of the estimated local expenditure in Nova Scotia for the year 1868-69. But now after the lapse of many years the condition of affairs has greatly changed in that Province, for the expenses in some cases have increased and the receipts have diminished. I will refer to one item alone. On that occasion when Sir John Rose based his calculation on the estimate of 1863-69, the revenue from the Crown lands was \$28,000, but for the last fiscal year it was only \$7,000; in that one item we find a falling off of \$21,000. The amount granted for education in 1869 was \$160,000, and for the last fiscal year it was \$207,000 or an increase of \$47,000. Now, on the one hand, we find a falling off in the receipts from the Crown Lands Department of \$21,000, and an increase in the amount appropriated for education to the extent of \$41,000, making altogether \$67,000 which the Province of Nova Scotia finds on the wrong side of its balance sheet. Now, if we take the \$82,000 which were then granted to Nova Scotia as a part of the better terms, which was only for ten years, and only paid up to 1877, we find a difference of \$150,000. The hon. member for Halifax, this afternoon, in introducing his motion, said that there was some increase in the receipts from the Mines and Public Works Department, that there was an increase in the royalty upon coal, amounting, as he said, to \$50,000. Now, admitting, for the sake of argument, that there is \$50,000 of an increase, if you deduct it from \$150,000, it still leaves \$100,000. The Province of Nova Scotia is

to-day financially in a worse condition than she was in 1869, when Sir John Rose brought down his resolutions on which better terms were founded. I give that as a reason to show that we are actually in a worse position now than we were many years ago, for we know that as the Province increases its requirements become greater, and with the fixed and limited revenue she has it is impossible for the Province to become otherwise than financially embarrassed. We find as evidence of that financial embarrassment that the Provincial Legislature this winter has been compelled, in many important respects, to limit their expenditure. They have been obliged to curtail in very many points. I especially regret that the Government found it necessary to limit its expenditure on one very important point this year—an expenditure that must necessarily, from the inception of the measure in Nova Scotia, have gone on increasing as the Province developed—I allude to the education expenditure. Owing to the straightened circumstances of the Province, owing to the lack of funds, the Government were compelled to limit the expenditure to the sum appropriated last year, a course of action which they fully knew must be unpopular with the people and one viewed with great distaste and disappointment. At all events, the amount was so limited, notwithstanding the needs of the country for a larger amount. I regret, and there is no man in this House who I am sure regrets it more than the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Finance Minister in the present Government, that the Local Government found it necessary for want of means to adopt that course, a course which may interfere with the proper expansion and development of our educational system, which he had the honor to introduce into the Legislature in 1864, a measure which was hailed at that time with some distrust, but which had since received general approbation, the measure giving to the child of every man a free education. I contend that if the financial condition of the Province in 1869 warranted and justified the Dominion Government in introducing a measure for conceding to Nova Scotia better terms, they are equally justified and ought now to grapple with the question and submit to Parliament a measure to improve the financial condition of that Province. If the argument then addressed to this Parliament justified the action then taken, the same arguments apply with equal force and equal weight to-day. The views enunciated by the present Finance Minister on that occasion in the speech to which I have alluded were sound and correct views; and if they were sound then, they are sound to-day, and I trust this motion will receive that consideration at the hands of the Government it justly deserves. This is not said in any party spirit. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Dominion Government by the Local Governments in Nova Scotia on both sides of politics, by one in which the present Minister of Justice was Attorney General, and therefore it cannot assume any party aspect whatever. The Government in which the Minister of Justice was Attorney General found it necessary in 1879 to send a memorial to the Dominion Government. Previous to that time a joint address of both Houses of the Legislature was sent, and in the following December the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Holmes, called the attention of the Government to the memorial, and joint address of both Houses sent in January previous, no reply having been received up to that day. No action was taken by the Dominion Government; and subsequently, when another Government came into power, the Government of Mr. Fielding in 1884, a joint address of both branches of the Legislature was forwarded, and to that no reply was given. It was followed by a letter from the Provincial Secretary in July, 1885, and to this, at last, a reply was given by the Dominion Government. This reply to the memorial of the Nova Scotia Government contained a great many reasons why the Dominion Govern-

ment did not consider it was their duty to grant the demand put forward by the Local Government. I am not going to enter into those reasons, for they have already been fully met and ably answered by a joint address of both branches of the Legislature of that Province; but there was one part of that reply which I think was very unfair and in very bad taste; I allude to that portion of the memorial in which the Dominion Government say to the Local Government:

"Had not the Government of Nova Scotia withdrawn from the credit of the debt account large amounts which they expended in railway extension and other public works, the amount which they would have received last year from the Dominion Government would have been amply sufficient with their local resources, for all provincial purposes."

I think that portion of the reply ought never to have been inserted. If the Local Government could have been charged with extravagance, with waste in the management of public money, then it would have been quite within the scope of the Dominion Government to have shown where this had occurred. But were we in Nova Scotia forever to remain without railways? In 1867 our railway system was scarcely extended to New Glasgow; it was completed, I believe, in the year of Confederation. If, according to the doctrine laid down in this memorial, the Local Government should not build railways, then that portion of the Province which did not enjoy the benefit of railways was to remain without them forever. That is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from that reply, for you would not extend our railways and you say the Local Government should not. The Government said: If you had not expended this money on railways you would have had ample means, with your other resources, to carry on the Government of the Province. The people of eastern Nova Scotia, who had contributed by taxation to the building of railways in other portions of the Province, were dissatisfied, and urged the Government to extend the railways east. We were for nearly fourteen years without a mile of railroad east, and we have now, twenty years after Confederation, only eighty miles of railway in eastern Nova Scotia, and the Island of Cape Breton, with its vast and varied resources; its great mineral wealth and inexhaustible fisheries, is at this hour without a single mile of railway. Still, when the Local Government of Nova Scotia thought in the interest of that section they were wisely expending public money, they were taunted by the Government of the day by saying that if they had not expended this money in the extension of railways they would have enough now to carry on the affairs of the Government of Nova Scotia. I say that they could not have expended their money more wisely or judiciously than by building these railways, which opened up and developed one of the finest agricultural counties of this Province—the county represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice—thereby adding immensely to its material wealth and prosperity. Not only so, but it was by this action of the Local Government, which was charged as being a waste of money, that the Strait of Canso was tapped, thereby making this eighty miles of railway a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway and the whole railway system of this country, and thereby throwing money into the Treasury of the Dominion. So far from this being a reason why the just claims of Nova Scotia should be refused, I think it is a strong argument the other way; and I want no stronger evidence in support of that view than the language used by my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, when, in 1882, as Minister of Railways, he was asking this Parliament to subsidize certain roads, one of them being the Oxford and New Glasgow, in the Province of Nova Scotia. I will quote a short extract from his speech on that occasion:

"I believe it is a wise policy to aid in the construction of these lines. Although these are private enterprises, it is impossible to build these railways in Canada judiciously, in any section of the country, by means of either subsidies from the Local Government or private enterprises,
Mr. FLYNN.

without enriching the Treasury of Canada. Who receives the benefit from all the increased trade which flows from the increased development of the country by the construction of these roads? Certainly the Dominion Treasury. Every mile of road constructed puts a certain sum in the Treasury."

I believe that those views are sound and correct; I believe that by building these eighty miles of railway the Local Government was developing the resources of the country, increasing the trade of the country and enriching the Dominion Treasury. And if by doing so they have not sufficient revenues to-day to carry on their local affairs, to meet their engagements and provide sufficient for their educational and other requirements, I say that when they apply here for better terms, as they have the right to do, it is unfair and unwise to meet that application with the taunt that, "if you had not spent money in developing the country and increasing its trade you would not now be applying for better terms." I think that that part of the reply might well have been spared, in consideration of the language I have quoted from the Finance Minister, who so completely combats that view. There is one fact as to which there can be no two opinions. Whatever the cause may be, there is no doubt of the fact that Nova Scotia at present is unable, with the amount at her disposal, to meet her engagements and provide those things which, by the British North America Act, she is bound to provide. But, Sir, this was not the case before the Union. There was then no Province in this Dominion with a lower tariff or in a more prosperous condition than Nova Scotia, and to-day there is none with less revenue for local purposes than she has. Now, if the statements contained in the addresses of both branches of the Legislature, if the memorials from the different Local Governments be true, then, as I said in the outset, it is the imperative duty of the Government to enquire immediately into these matters and endeavor, if possible, to adopt some measures to relieve the prevailing discontent. It may, perhaps, be said that this would open up the British North America Act, that if you do it for Nova Scotia you must do it for the other Provinces. I admit that it may have that effect. I am not here claiming any right exclusively for Nova Scotia. I claim it for Nova Scotia to-night, and if under that arrangement, which was never considered to be a fixed arrangement or one that could not be opened up, Nova Scotia, after twenty years, finds that she has not the means successfully to carry on her affairs, then I say that you have the same right as you had in 1869 to open up the agreement and grant her better terms. And if Quebec should come here to-morrow and show the same reasons for the Dominion coming to her aid, then my voice would be lifted up in her behalf as it is to-night in behalf of my own Province. And if Ontario—or Prince Edward Island, or any of the other Provinces—finds that it has not sufficient funds to carry on its affairs, or that an injustice was done to it in the first place when the scheme was, as has been stated already, hastily entered into, then I would favor a reconsideration of the relations of such Provinces to the Dominion. If those who founded the Union wished it to be lasting and successful, I hold that wherever they find friction or discontent—no matter from what cause arising—upon the shoulders of these men specially, who claim to be the fathers of the Union, rests the imperative duty of endeavoring to ascertain what remedy can be applied to allay that discontent as speedily as possible. The right hon. gentleman the leader of the Government said on that occasion, let us reconcile the Nova Scotians, for Nova Scotia is the keystone of the Union. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman entertains the same views to-night, but I hope he does, and I hope he will say now as he said then, let us reconcile the Nova Scotians for Nova Scotia is the keystone of the Union. I hope, at all events, that this matter, which is now brought up for the second or third time in this House, will receive the careful consideration of the Government, and if it is neces-

sary that the question must be re opened, that it will be re-opened. I hope that every cause of discontent will be remedied and that the Government will do that justice to Nova Scotia which the people of that Province think she is fairly entitled to.

Motion agreed to.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE IN LONDON.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

Copies of all communications received by the Canadian Government from the Imperial Government, or any of its officers, relative to the Colonial Conference which opened in London on 4th April, 1887, and of all correspondence connected therewith, and of the instructions furnished to the Canadian representatives at the Conference.

He said: I ask for these papers chiefly in order that we may be able to know what has been done or proposed in connection with the great scheme of Imperial Federation. That question has been discussed a good deal of late, chiefly by essayists, especially in British periodical literature, and to some extent by British and Colonial public men. It has, I think, at last come to be almost on the verge of practical as distinguished from theoretical politics when a Colonial Conference has been called to discuss subjects which, if not absolutely all belonging to the question of Imperial Federation in name, at least very directly bear upon the subject. I do not know how, for instance, it would be possible to discuss, on an occasion like that and in such a body, the great question of the military defences of the Empire without bringing up the question of a closer union of the different parts of that Empire. We have the presence in this House, too, of the High Commissioner of Canada, who will be able to give the latest and most accurate information as to the prospects, the scope and the aims of that great question. There is also in this House, although I am sorry I do not see him in his place to-night, the president of the Canadian branch of the Imperial Federation League, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I hope he will take occasion to give the House some of the strong arguments which must have convinced his mind at least of the urgency and importance of this scheme. This is a new Parliament, Sir, and I do hope it will not be quite so timid as other Parliaments have been in discussing questions regarding the relation of Canada to the Empire, or the relation of Canada to the whole world if necessary. The project of Imperial Confederation is of course to bring the different parts of the Empire closer together, because it is nearly always urged by its advocates as an alternative for separation. It is said that if we do not get some closer and more immediate union of the different parts of the Empire, there is reason to fear an inevitable and imminent separation of the Colonies from the Empire. Now, I do not propose to discuss that theory at all. I do not propose to say anything about the suggestion that we must either have closer union or separation, but I would like, for a moment, to consider what sort of closer union it is possible for us to have with the Empire. It must be, I take it, either a commercial union, or a political union, or a military defensive union. We could, I have no doubt, have a commercial union of the different parts of the Empire without either of the other two; but a political union, I think, could not be had without a military defensive one, any more than a military union could be had without a political one; because we could not undertake to unite in any Federal Legislature the Governments of the Colonies and the Mother Country without uniting the armies. Neither could we have a common military and naval force without uniting the Governments that would direct and control it. As to commercial union, if that project was ever a desirable one, those who favor it must understand very distinctly that it is altogether out of the question now; and, if they deplore that fact, they can

easily see that it was the financial policy which Canada adopted in 1879 that rendered a commercial union with the Empire impossible, and they will know without doubt who are to blame for that. The advocates of Imperial Confederation claim that the Canadian Confederation was the first, and a very important step, towards the realisation of the larger scheme; and they say and hope that confederation in Australasia and another in South Africa will still further prepare the way for it. As to the Australasian Confederation, I fancy that has altogether broken down, because neither New Zealand nor New South Wales will have anything to do with it; and I am afraid the South African Confederation idea has also resulted in failure, because it seems to be generally felt among the different proposed members of the federacy that it would have the effect of concentrating the whole power of South Africa in Cape Colony. There is one thing we may depend upon at any rate, and that is, that, whether federated or isolated, all the colonies will hesitate to give up one single iota of their self-governing powers, and I would like to know what scheme of federative legislature could be devised that would have any powers at all unless those powers were yielded up to it by the different states or members of the federacy. Then, when we come to the consideration of an Imperial federative executive power, it seems to me the difficulty is quite as great, if not greater, because I cannot imagine that any colony would be willing to yield up any of the prerogatives of the Crown which it has been permitted to control. Therefore, I think it may be confidently asserted that no colony would yield up its legislative or executive powers sufficiently to constitute a federal, legislative or executive political union. These were some of the reasons that occurred to me as certain to render a commercial or political union out of the question. Then there remains to be considered a military union, a defensive and offensive alliance, a sort of mutual obligation among the states of the federacy to assist each other in war, by land or by sea, whether in wars of conquest, of aggression, or of defence. For example, without a political union, Canada would have no voice in deciding on the merits of any quarrels which might arise in any remote portion of the Empire, and she would have to bear her share in the multitude of small wars which the Empire is always engaged in against the natives of Africa, or India, or in Chinese opium wars, or perhaps in great European implications. True, we are not now entirely free from the danger that arises from incurring wars; we are subject to the evils of war in case England should engage in a struggle with any of the great European powers whose naval armaments are to-day so enormous. Why should we increase our liability to that disaster? I admit there are a great many things much worse than war. I admit that national dishonor is worse than war; I admit that the loss of national liberty is far worse than war; but, at the same time, we should, in every way we can, seek to avoid rendering ourselves liable to war. Our favored position should surely be utilised, at least, to secure permanent and lasting peace to the people of Canada, and while avoiding wars in which the Empire at large might be mixed up, I am sure the people of England and the people of Canada, at any rate, know that if England were so unfortunate as to be hard pressed at any time in a great war, the Canadians would be her first and foremost allies. At the same time, Canada's position does not require her to be a military power, and her people, I am satisfied, will never tolerate any scheme which would draw us into the liability to maintain large military expenditure and activity. Now, where did this agitation for the federation of the Empire begin? It may be traced to England. Not, however, is it to be found in the daily press of Great Britain or among the masses of the people. There are some leading, prominent, patriotic statesmen, on both sides of Imperial politics, who take a deep interest in this

scheme, and it is quite likely that, from their point of view, they may be right; and then there is another class who are always talking a great deal about it, and those are the colonial Englishmen who are residing in London. This latter class is largely responsible for convincing English statesmen that the Colonies are ready for the Imperial Confederation scheme, yet I think it is undeniable that they are the very worst possible guides as to the state of colonial feeling. It is impossible for a Canadian to reside permanently in London without losing his distinctive Canadian sympathies. We all know that. He soon becomes out of touch with Canada, and he looks at Canadian affairs through Imperial spectacles. It is to this unreliable class that British statesmen have been looking, for want of better information, to gather the state of feeling on this subject. I have no fault whatever to find with the selection made of the two gentlemen who represent Canada at that Conference, the Governor of Ontario and Mr. Sandford Fleming; but I cannot help thinking that, at the same time, there was a most extraordinary omission made by the Government, when the very purest type of Canadians, the Canadians in the Province of Quebec, were not represented on this Commission. I can only account for it on the hypothesis that no French Canadian gentleman was willing to go on that mission, because none of them had confidence in a scheme, which they could not help feeling and knowing would be sure to end, if carried out, in depriving them of some of the rights of self-government which they value so highly. We may not be able to take very correct views of Imperial affairs, so very far away from London as we are; but it does look odd to me to see distinguished British statesmen upholding the scheme to extend a federal system to all parts of the Empire, when they are so resolutely bent upon maintaining a legislative union between England and Ireland, although the mass of the Irish people are anxious to try something else, and when they are asking for nothing more startling than the application of the federal principle to the Union between England and Ireland. I wonder would it be a piece of presumption to suggest that the large scheme of Imperial Federation might be very properly postponed until the operation of a similar system shall have been tried in the British Isles themselves? We have had our own experience, too, of our own Canadian Federation for about 20 years, and I think he would be a bold man who would rise up in his place in this House to night and say that in his heart he had no misgiving as to the result. I have confidence that the scheme can be worked out to success, and am rather inclined to think that its partial failure is more due to the mistakes of the operators than to any inherent defects in the machine itself. After all, is it not the mission of Canadian statesmanship to plant the foundations of our own Confederation broad and deep, rather than to pursue the Will o' the Wisp of an impracticable Imperial scheme. Surely, the governing or the assisting in the governing of half a continent as we are all doing here, is enough for any man's ambition, and, as we find from experience every day, it is enough to task the powers and absorb the energies of such public men as a busy people can give to public life. We have no spare men to send away to assist in governing remote dependencies of the Empire, and what is more, I hope that we shall always try to exercise such powers of self-government as we possess and extend them as far as we can, without calling in the assistance of the inhabitants of remote dependencies of the British Crown.

Motion agreed to.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. ELLIS moved for:

Return of the number of foreign vessels, fishing or other, boarded, ordered off, warned or interdicted in any way during the calendar year 1886 by the vessels employed in the fisheries protection service or by any Customs' official, specifying the name of the vessel, of her owner, and of her master, her nationality, port of registry, if any, tonnage, and the number of men employed on her; where and when boarded, by whom, and from what vessel or port, with the special report of the official in each case.

He said: I desire to bring before the House and the public some idea of the action of the fishery fleet during the last year. I think the extent to which operations have been carried on is not fully known to the country at large. It appears from some published reports that up to July 130 vessels had been boarded by the fishery fleet, and during the calendar year 120 cases of complaint had been filed at Washington against the Canadian Government for unnecessary and improper interference with the vessels of the United States. It would seem as if the laws or regulations of the fishery service had been carried out with a rigor and severity that, at any rate, has seriously imperiled our relations with the United States. I would like to call attention to one or two complaints, because they seem to be of a very extreme kind. Some of these complaints refer, for instance, to the entry of vessels into harbors in which they remained for only a few hours and were then ordered out. In some cases they were compelled to pay harbor dues without being allowed to take the ordinary privilege of making a port entry. The master of one vessel complains to his Government that he was not only refused permission to buy bait, but also to take a pilot at Port Amherst. The master of the *Sarah E. Lee* went into Liverpool Harbor, Nova Scotia, and was immediately ordered to sea, although his son was seriously ill with diphtheria. His complaint is that he was not allowed the ordinary courtesies of civilised nations. The *Sarah H. Prior*, while running from Malpeque, lost her large seine at sea, a fishing net said to be worth \$1,000. The net was afterwards picked up by the master of a Halifax vessel, who offered to return it on payment of the ordinary salvage of \$25, which was accepted by the owner, but the collector of the port would not allow the net to be returned, and the voyage was broken up. The captain of the schooner *R. N. Crittenden*, while on the homeward voyage, stopped at Steep Creek, in the Strait of Canso, for water. The Customs officer at that place notified him that if he took water his vessel would be seized. He was compelled to sail without it and to put his men on short allowance for the remainder of the voyage. The worst case appears to be that of the master of the *Mollie Adams*. He says that about the 26th September, he fell in with the Nova Scotia schooner *Neskilita* in a wrecked condition, and took off her crew of seventeen men and fed them for three days, saving, as well, a part of the wrecked vessel's material. He entered his own vessel at Malpeque, and was boarded by the captain of the Dominion cruiser *Critic*, who neither offered to care for the wrecked crew, to feed them, nor to assist them or take them off. The captain of the *Mollie Adams* asked his permission to land the wrecked material. The captain referred him to the collector, the collector referred him back to the captain of the Dominion vessel, and when he went back after him he found the vessel had put to sea. He says:

"The captain of the cutter told me that I could put the saved material on board a Nova Scotia vessel if I went outside the three-mile limit to do it. I endeavored to get some of the people on shore to take the wrecked crew, but no one would do it unless I would be responsible for their board. Finally I gave the crew \$80, enough to pay their passage home on the cars, and also gave them provisions to last them during the journey."

The difficulty in disposing of this crew and getting out of Malpeque Harbor lost him, he says, ten days, his voyage was broken up, and he had to return home. Feeding the wrecked crew left his own provisions short. He called at Port Medway, stated the circumstances, and asked permission to buy half a barrel of flour or biscuit, and this was absolutely refused him. The collector threatened to seize

"The captain of the cutter told me that I could put the saved material on board a Nova Scotia vessel if I went outside the three-mile limit to do it. I endeavored to get some of the people on shore to take the wrecked crew, but no one would do it unless I would be responsible for their board. Finally I gave the crew \$80, enough to pay their passage home on the cars, and also gave them provisions to last them during the journey."

The difficulty in disposing of this crew and getting out of Malpeque Harbor lost him, he says, ten days, his voyage was broken up, and he had to return home. Feeding the wrecked crew left his own provisions short. He called at Port Medway, stated the circumstances, and asked permission to buy half a barrel of flour or biscuit, and this was absolutely refused him. The collector threatened to seize

his vessel if he bought anything. He was 300 miles from home, on an inhospitable coast with every door barred against him, and short of provisions. Although they made the run home in three days, his crew was on short rations for a whole day. Now, I think the country is scarcely aware of the extent to which the operations of the fleet have been carried on, or of the very great number of complaints and the seriousness of the complaints made, because the laws have been so rigidly and it would seem so harshly enforced. Indeed, if the statement made by those men are true, the remark made by the Secretary of the United States Treasury, that the laws were enforced with brutality, would not seem to be, under all the circumstances of the case, too strong. I do not desire, however, to prejudge the case. This is only evidence on one side, but I think it would be advisable to have all the information before us. There has been considerable delay already in reference to the correspondence on this subject between our Government and that of Great Britain which has been promised us, but the promise is unfulfilled yet, although I see in the St. John organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a statement on Tuesday that the correspondence had been laid before Parliament, and a summary of it given in that paper. Now, however, that is not so much what I desire to touch upon as the resolution which I move.

Mr. FOSTER. I regret that I was not in my place in the House so as to have heard what my hon. friend has said in making his motion, having been called away for a little while to attend to those fishery papers, which, I may state here, will be brought down to-morrow. With reference, however, to the motion my hon. friend may press it, for it will be granted, but it was not necessary. The whole of the information which he has asked is already in the hands of the printers, and will be brought down in a special report, which will be laid before the House just as soon as it is ready.

Mr. THOMPSON. As my colleague was not in when the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) addressed himself to this matter, it is only respectful to him that a word or two should be said in explanation of some of the cases to which the hon. gentleman made reference. I regret that I was not able to catch all that the hon. gentleman said, but I certainly understood him to refer to several cases, in respect of which it has been charged by the authorities of the United States that a want of consideration, a want of hospitality, was evinced by the officers of the Customs and the officers of the Fishery Departments on the maritime coast of the Dominion. I also understood the hon. gentleman to say, I was glad to hear the statement, that he was not disposed to prejudge our case from the evidence which appeared on one side. The hon. gentleman, however, was altogether too flattering to that side of the case when he characterised the statements to which he referred as evidence. I presume he gleaned his information from some documents which have been laid before a Legislative Assembly in another part of the continent. The hon. gentleman's selections were made from a number of rambling and inaccurate statements made against the British and Colonial authorities, by persons who received a general invitation to send in all the claims which they could possibly make against our Government, which was supposed to be liable to damages in the end. It has transpired not only from the investigation of these complaints, not only from the investigation conducted by our own officers, but subsequently by the admissions of some of the persons who made these very unvarnished statements to which the hon. gentleman had recourse—it has transpired that those statements are utterly without foundation, were reckless, were oftentimes based upon misapprehension and

a want of knowledge of the circumstances; as, for instance, the statement that these vessels, while not allowed the privileges of a port, were obliged to pay port dues and other charges of that description. That has never been the case in any instance, and the hon. gentleman will find when the papers are brought down, as my colleague states they will be presently, that the assertions which have given him so much uneasiness, made on the part of the authorities on the other side of the question, are not at all of the character which will induce the hon. gentleman to retain those uneasy feelings as to our side of the case; and he will find then that the statement of a distinguished gentleman connected with the Administration of the United States, that the treaty has been administered with brutality, was as preposterous an exaggeration as the English language would permit.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not present when the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) made his statements on this matter, and I am not going to discuss this question anterior to bringing down the papers. I think it is only right that we should have the papers before us before we discuss a matter in which we might be led into accepting impressions or making statements which might be detrimental to our own country. I will merely say that I think that the Government have earned approval in relation to their refusal to allow parties to buy bait as an article of commerce. I will not even discuss that question just now, but simply say this in justification of the attitude which I may assume hereafter, when the papers are brought down. It would be premature to discuss the matter further until these papers are before us; it would be unfair, perhaps, to the Administration, and might injure our own case.

Motion agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS PROTECTING THE FISHERIES.

Mr. ELLIS. In making this motion of which I have given notice, I will take the opportunity of saying that I would be very glad if the Minister of Justice gets out of the difficulty as easily as he anticipates. I have gone over a great deal of the correspondence and a great many of the complaints made, and I am glad to know he is in a position to inform the House as positively and as confidently as he does, that the matter will be ended amicably. I observed only a very short time ago, before the close of the sessions of the Senate of the United States, that a gentleman who was a senator from the State of New York, who had held a position in the Cabinet of President Grant, and might be supposed to know a great deal about the state of feeling in that country, stated with great deliberation that the position at the present moment was a cessation of commercial relations, retaliation or war. Now, if the matter has changed to any extent, as the Minister of Justice thinks it has, we are all glad to know it. I do not absolutely wish to have the papers if they are in the form in which the Minister of Justice says they are; I do not want to make my motion against his desire, but I wish to place the facts before the country. This is the motion of which I gave notice:

Copy of the instructions issued in the year 1887 for the guidance of the masters of vessels engaged in the Fisheries Protection Service.

With regard to that, it appears that last year there was a warning issued to all foreign vessels, whether they were fishing or not, to keep out of our ports. I believe that was withdrawn, but it was a serious matter at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. I think a little reflection will convince my hon. friend that this motion ought not to pass the House at this time. The hon. gentleman made reference to a warning issued last year from the Department of Marine, which was afterwards withdrawn, and which con-

veyed a warning to all foreign vessels whether fishing vessels or not. That was true so far as one particular clause of the warning was concerned; but the whole context of the warning showed plainly what the warning meant. It was a printer's mistake which was discovered within a day or two after the first copy was issued, and those copies were withdrawn and corrected copies substituted. With respect to the instructions for 1887, I think it will strike the minds of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that it would not be conducive either to the carrying out of our protection of the fisheries during the coming season, or to the present negotiations, that they should be brought down to the House and made a subject for debate. They are special confidential instructions, so far as any new ones are introduced for 1887, and I do not think they ought to be brought down.

Motion withdrawn.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the Order being called—motion to rescind the Standing Orders respecting the election at the commencement of every Parliament of a Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—(Mr. Fisher).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow that to stand to another day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What other day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be plenty of opportunity.

Mr. FISHER. Are we likely to have an opportunity, as on Wednesday evening other business is taken up, and on Monday there are very frequently many members absent? It is desirable, of course, to have the motions cleared from the paper. If the hon. gentleman has any particular object in desiring this motion to stand, I will allow it to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Please let it stand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will be better to have some understanding as to when it may be reached. It cannot be conveniently reached unless we come to some understanding.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will allow it to be brought up on Thursday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When and how will you arrange it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be in a good position, and I will undertake for the majority of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have an opportunity of moving it on Thursday.

Motion allowed to stand.

LANDS SOLD BY CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WATSON moved for:

Return of all lands sold in the Province of Manitoba by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company up to the 1st of April, 1887.

He said: My reason for moving for this return is that a large quantity of land has been sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the agreements have not been registered, but that speculators have been allowed to hold the land, which has proved detrimental to the interest of settlement. When an amendment to the Canadian Pacific Railway terms was made last year, a clause was introduced

Mr. ELLIS.

providing that the Company should make a return within a certain number of days of the opening of the Session, of all lands sold by them up to first October of each year; but this return did not apply to lands sold previous to the passing of this Bill. Some municipalities are sending petitions to this House praying that land may be placed in such a shape that taxes can be collected. I think this matter is outside the jurisdiction of this House; but if such a return was made to this House, if the provisions of the Act of last year were carried out, it would enable the municipalities to obtain a list of lands sold during the year, the date of sale and the names of the purchasers, by which they would be able to collect the taxes. For instance, here is the municipality of Argyle in Rock Lake county. They set forth that the Canadian North-West Land Company have 54,240 acres of land upon which local taxes have not been paid, and up to the end of 1886 those lands were assessed, but the taxes remaining unpaid last year amounted to \$4,789.16. These municipalities have been under the impression that all lands held by other parties other than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were liable to taxation, and they have been levying rates but they found it impossible to collect the taxes, because they cannot find out the particulars of each sale. I am sure that if the information asked for in this return is brought down it will be a great convenience and relief to the municipalities. I would like to add to the motion these words "the name of the purchaser and the date of the sale of such lands."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I recollect aright, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are obliged to give a return of all the lands they have sold and the date of sale. I forget at this moment, however, whether they are obliged to do so of their own motion, or simply when called upon, but I am pretty sure that they are not required to give the names of the purchasers, and if so, we cannot force them to do it because it is not in their Act of incorporation.

Mr. WATSON. The Act passed last year requires them to give the name of the purchaser and the lands sold, but the trouble is that it only applies to the year after the Act was passed, and as a large quantity of land was sold previous to that date, the municipalities have no means of getting at the information.

Motion agreed to.

IRREGULARITIES BY MONTREAL COTTON CO.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved for:

Copies of all reports made to the Customs Department by any of its officers or special agents concerning irregularities committed by the Montreal Cotton Company; also, copies of all correspondence between the Department of Customs and any of its officers or special agents, and copies of all correspondence between the said Department or its officers or special agents and the manager or directors of said company in regard to such irregularities.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be highly inconvenient at the present moment to bring down the papers moved by the hon. gentleman, for the reason that the matter is still under investigation. I may mention, however, for the information of the hon. gentleman and the information of the House, that one of the directors of that company wrote me the other day, stating that other irregularities had been discovered and that he would see that a full report was made of all the facts, and I returned the report to the special officer, to which the hon. gentleman has called attention, to Montreal, in order that a further investigation might take place, so that the Department might be in a position to come to a proper decision on the whole case. I may also mention that many of the reports made by special officers contain information which it would not be in the interests of the revenue, or in the interests of the country, to make public. For instance, they may state

how they obtained their information, or they may give the name of the informer, and I think the mere mention of that fact is sufficient to show that, in cases of that kind at least, these reports should not be laid before Parliament. In many cases the Department itself never makes enquiries as to who the informers may be, for the simple reason that all we have to do is to investigate the facts and administer the law as we think it should be administered. I have no doubt that, before the House rises, I will be in a position to give the whole facts in connection with the case to which the hon. gentleman has called the attention of the House, and also the decision of the Department upon it. I trust that with this information the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion, at least for the present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I understand the Minister to say that he will submit to the House, as soon as he can, the information I ask for?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, just as soon as I am put in a position to enable me to come to a decision on the merits of the case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I need not move; the information will be brought down without motion?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman had better make a formal motion without notice. I will inform him when I am ready.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know very little about the matter, but the hon. gentleman knows that it is a subject which has been mentioned in the newspapers, and it seems to me desirable, in the interests of all parties, that the facts should be laid before the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman; the more these things are made public the better.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing how many ice-boats are owned by the Government for crossing at the capes, the number of men employed in the service during the winter of 1887, the number of trips made by said boats, the date of each trip, and the number of passengers who crossed in said boats.—(Mr. Peiry.)

Return of the number of preventive officers appointed on our frontier since the 1st of January, 1886, giving the names of the several parties so appointed, with their residence and salaries.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of receipts and expenditures to date of 1st of May, in the years 1886 and 1887, respectively, together with estimates of each year. Also memorandum of interest to be paid on the 1st of May.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Returns giving the names, occupations, residences and post office addresses of the returning officers at the last elections for the Dominion House of Commons, with their respective ridings.—(Mr. Somerville.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 3rd May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No 48) to incorporate the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No 49) to incorporate the Upper Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

B.C. REPRESENTATION ACT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 50) to amend the Representation Act as respects certain constituencies in British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BAKER. I would ask hon. members to allow me to explain the Bill on the second reading, as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), who will be principally affected by it, is absent, and I should like him to be present when I explain it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any gerrymander in it?

Mr. BAKER. I might state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that it is similar to the Bill which I introduced last year, but which, after dragging on to the end of the Session, was slaughtered among the innocents. I introduce it earlier this year so that it may have a show.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALARIES TO OFFICERS OF PENITENTIARIES.

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

Resolved, That the Governor in Council may fix the salaries to be paid to officers of Penitentiaries within the limits following:—

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

OFFICERS.	From date of appointment		By yearly increases of \$50, to	
	\$	¢	\$	¢
Warden	2,600	3,000
Deputy Warden	1,200	1,500
Chaplains	1,000	1,200
Surgeon	1,400	1,800
Accountant	800	1,200
Warden's Clerk	500	800
Storekeeper	600	900
Steward	600	900
Chief Keeper	700	900
Hospital Overseer	500	800
Schoolmaster	500	700
Engineer	800	1,000
Trade Instructors	500	700
Keepers	500	600
Guards	400	500
Messenger	400	500
Stoker	400	500
Teamsters	300	400
Matron	400	600
Deputy Matron	200	400

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Warden	2,400	2,800
Deputy Warden	1,200	1,500
Chaplains	1,000	1,200
Surgeon	1,000	1,400
Accountant	800	1,100
Warden's Clerk	500	750
Storekeeper	600	900
Steward	600	800
Chief Keeper	700	900
Hospital Overseer	500	750
Schoolmaster	500	700
Engineer	750	900
Trade Instructors	600	700
Keepers	500	600
Guards	400	500
Messenger	400	500
Teamsters	300	400

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY.

OFFICERS.	From date of	By yearly in-	From date of	By yearly in-
	appointment.	creases of	appointment.	creases of
	\$	\$50, to	\$	\$30, to
Warden	2,000	2,400
Deputy Warden	1,100	1,400
Deputy Warden and Chief Keeper, when offices held by one person	1,200	1,500
Chaplains	500	600
Surgeon	1,000	1,200
Accountant	800	1,000
Storekeeper	600	800
Steward	600	800
Storekeeper and Steward, when offices held by one person	800	1,000
Chief Keeper	700	800
Hospital Overseer	500	700
Schoolmaster	500	600
Engineer	750	900
Assistant Engineer	600	700
Trade Instructors	600	700
Keepers	500	600
Guards	400	500
Messenger	400	500
Teamster	300	400

MANITOBA PENITENTIARY.

Warden	2,000	2,400
Deputy Warden and Chief Keeper	900	1,200
Chaplains	500	600
Surgeon	1,000	1,200
Accountant and Storekeeper	800	1,100
Steward	600	800
Hospital Overseer and Schoolmaster	700	900
Engineer	750	1,000
Trade Instructors	600	700
Guards	500	600
Messenger	500	600

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

Warden	2,000	2,400
Deputy Warden and Chief Keeper	900	1,200
Chaplains	500	600
Surgeon	600
Accountant, Storekeeper and Schoolmaster	800	1,000
Steward	600	800
Trade Instructors	600	700
Keepers and Guards	500	600
Messenger	500	600
Teamster	500	600

Resolved, That to any Penitentiary officer whose conduct has been good, who is compelled to retire in consequence of infirmity and who is not entitled to a superannuation allowance—A gratuity or retiring allowance may be given, calculated at the rate of a half month's salary for each year of his service, up to five years, and a month's salary for each year of service in excess of five years, and that such retiring allowance may be increased by one-half the amount thereof if the infirmity which compels such officer to retire from the service is occasioned by any injury received by him in the performance of his duty, without fault or negligence on his part, at the hands of any convict, or in preventing an escape or rescue, or in suppressing a revolt.

Resolved, That if any officer dies in the service leaving a widow or any person who in his lifetime was dependent on him, a gratuity may be paid to such widow, if any, and if not to any person or persons in the lifetime of such officer dependent on him, or to any person or corporation in trust for any such person or persons so dependent on him, but that no such gratuity shall exceed the amount of the salary of such officer for the two months next preceding his death, if he was appointed by the Governor in Council, or for the three months next preceding his death, if he was appointed by the Minister or the Warden; and that such gratuity may be increased by one-half the amount thereof if the death of such officer is occasioned by any injury received by him in the performance of his duty, without fault or negligence on his part, at the hands of any convict or in preventing an escape or rescue, or in suppressing a revolt.

Resolved, That no officer shall be allowed any perquisite except that any officer may, during the will of the Minister of Justice, occupy free of rent any house or quarters, with any grounds attached, which forms part of the Penitentiary property; that the grounds or gardens at-

Mr. THOMPSON.

tached to the residence or quarters of a Warden or Deputy Warden may be kept in order and cultivated by convict labor, but that otherwise no convict labor shall be employed in keeping in order or cultivating any grounds occupied by any officer; and that any officer who wears uniform may be allowed such uniform as the Governor in Council prescribes.

Resolved, That nothing herein contained shall affect the salary of any officer, whose salary, as provided in the Estimates of the present Session, exceeds the maximum prescribed for his class by the foregoing table, but that the salary of such officer shall not be further increased.

Resolved, That the Governor in Council may, subject to the provisions of "The Penitentiary Act" and of any Act amending the same, from time to time, make regulations respecting officers' salaries, gratuities and retiring allowances; the occupation by officers of houses, quarters or grounds which form part of the Penitentiary property; officers' uniforms; the sale to officers of articles manufactured in the Penitentiary shops or grown upon the Penitentiary property; and any matter relating to the establishment, maintenance and management of Penitentiaries.

He said: I may say, by way of preliminary explanation, that the resolutions are to form the basis of a Bill which has for its object the regulation of the perquisites established in the different penitentiaries throughout Canada. These perquisites consist principally of the occupation of houses by the principal officers, the right to keep horses, cows, poultry, and other descriptions of stock, and the right to fuel, light and various other things. It is intended to retain for the officers the perquisites in relation to houses, because it is a convenience to the service that the principal officers especially should have their houses on the penitentiary property; but it is proposed to abolish the other perquisites. The House will probably be asked to commute those perquisites, and future appointments will be made without regard to these at all. It is likewise proposed to establish a different scale of salaries from that which now exists, with the view of having, instead of the discretionary powers which the Governor in Council has to appoint an officer under the present Penitentiary Act, at any salary between a defined minimum and a defined maximum, to provide he shall enter the service at the minimum, proceeding by gradual increase to the maximum.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to an item which appears in the *Citizen* of this morning, which reads as follows:—

"It is rumoured in Conservative parliamentary circles that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, the 18th inst., it will stand adjourned for one week. Thursday, the 19th, is a statutory holiday, and the following Tuesday the anniversary of Her Majesty's birthday. This would enable many members to make a home trip."

It may suit some hon. gentlemen to make a home trip and attend to their private business, but what will become of the members of this House who come from the far West and far East? I sincerely trust that the Government will not yield to such a proposition as to adjourn the House for a week. I understand we are sent here to attend to the business of the country, not to increase the number of holidays. We have holidays enough, and I trust that the statement in this paper is not correct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard of it only last night. A suggestion was made by some gentlemen who said they were in favor of it. It has not been at all brought before the Council, and we have not considered it.

FISHERY PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he hopes to be able to lay on the Table the Fishery papers.

Mr. MITCHELL. Don't press him too hard.

Mr. FOSTER. As I said yesterday, the papers will be laid on the Table to-day.

PUBLIC OFFICERS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. McLellan.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman ought to explain to us, to some extent, the reasons for the change.

Mr. McLELLAN. The only change made is to add to section 22 of the Act in the Revised Statutes the power to take as security from any officer in an office of trust, any deposit that he may have at his credit in the savings bank. The clause, after reciting what is in the general Act, adds :

“Or a conditional assignment of a deposit standing in the name of such public officer in the books of the Post Office or any of the Government savings banks, but in the case of an assignment of a deposit as aforesaid the interest shall be payable to the depositor in like manner as if no such assignment had been made.”

Mr. BLAKE. What I suggested was, not that the hon. gentleman should state what the change in the Bill was, for that is obvious, but what the reasons for the change were.

Mr. McLELLAN. In many cases the officer says he can give just as good security as a guarantee company, as he has money on deposit and wants the Government to take that instead of taking the guarantee company or individual security.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say whether, to his knowledge, this method of obtaining security is adopted in the English or any other governmental system?

Mr. McLELLAN. I am not aware that it is, but it has frequently been pressed upon the Department here. Very often the guarantee companies, when called upon to pay, raise technical objections and delay, and we consider this better security.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any provision in the law as to the extent of the security required?

Mr. McLELLAN. That is regulated by the different Acts of Parliament, and by the duties the officer is called upon to perform.

Mr. BLAKE. What occurred to me was this: if you obtained a private security, you obtained this certainty that there are persons who are competent, respectable people, who have pledged themselves for the good conduct of the officer. So, when you take a guarantee company, that company does not conduct its business on the theory that it will guarantee everybody; it makes, on the contrary, rigid enquiries as to the character, habits, the regulations of the transactions expected, in fact, as to everything concerning those it is proposed to guarantee. Knowing that, we know we have that sort of security, but when you propose simply that a sum of money will always be accepted, there is none of those securities. I have not attached so much importance to the simple *quantum* of the obligations as to the circumstance that people, whether private companies or individuals, are to be found who will run the risk involved in securing individuals. You know what happens sometimes when bail is asked. Bail is obtained by persons by simply depositing with those who gave the bail the amount of the bail. But that is not considered the very best kind of bail, although it is certain the sum of money will be forthcoming. What the law calls for is that security that a person will appear which is involved in another being willing to run the risk of his not appearing. Any security of that kind is, of course, got rid of by the proposal of the hon. gentleman. That was what occurred to me, and that was the reason why I asked him if he was cognisant of the fact that this mode of obtaining security was adopted. While I am on my feet, as I do not desire to trouble the committee again, I would suggest that it might be expedient to alter

the latter part of the clause so as to provide that the interest should be paid to the depositor only until the forfeit is made. As it stands at present, the hon. gentleman will find that the security is very inadequate, because there is an indefinite provision that the interest shall be paid, it may be for all time, no matter what may happen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I go a good way with the hon. gentleman in his remarks, but I think that whole question was argued out when it was considered whether we should require personal security, or the security of a guarantee company. Of course, a guarantee company has to make enquiries of its own, but those enquiries do not come before the Government. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is of very great importance that we should have some security for the character and conduct of the civil servant, the public officer, and that the amount is not of so much importance as the enquiries which precede the giving of the security; but I do not fancy that there can be a better inducement should be held out to them to become respectable members of society,—I use that expression,—to become steady, serious young men, looking out for the future, and preparing for a rainy day. It is of great importance to get these young men to deposit what they can spare of their earnings in the savings banks or other investments, instead of wasting their annual salaries, which is perhaps too much the custom of young men. When a civil servant accumulates a sum of money in this unquestionable security, in the Government savings bank or the Post Office savings bank, sufficient to be a valuable security to the Government, that is a patent proof that the person who has accumulated it has been saving, has been economical, has been steady, and has a view towards the future, so I think this is the most unquestionable kind of security which could be offered.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that this matter was, to some extent, settled by the decision of the question whether the security of the guarantee companies should be accepted or not. As we know, they make enquiries, and the sureties will make enquiries themselves. Therefore, in neither case does it come before the Government. It is the case of the private guarantor who does this on the ground of affection, or relationship, or friendship, or of the guarantee company who do it for business. If this is intended as a reward for economy and prudence on the part of the young men who are entering the service, and to encourage them to look forward to the happy day when they will be able to get their bonds released, and if this is to be an incentive to them to be economical, I am glad to know that at his advanced period of life the hon. gentleman possesses such a sanguine temperament. It reminds me, however, of the proposition he made once before, that he would probably induce the poor Indian to exchange his rifles for shotguns.

Mr. McLELLAN. According to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, I propose to add to the last part of the clause “until the forfeiture of the security.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In answer to the remark of the hon. gentleman opposite that my sanguine disposition led me to think that this measure would be beneficial to the young men of the Civil Service, and that it was like my suggestion to persuade the Indians to give up the use of Winchester rifles by exchanging them for fowling-pieces, I may say that I was not then aware that it was a special instruction of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was, or perhaps was not, a member, that the Indians should be supplied with Winchester rifles. This Bill, however, saves the civil servant what he has now to pay to the

guarantee company; he gets a satisfactory security, and it costs him nothing.

Bill reported, and amendment agreed to.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) to amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. POPE. This is a very short, and I hope a very innocent little Bill. The object of the Bill is to facilitate the quick passage of trains on long roads, or running between principal towns, which require as much despatch as possible, and carrying mails and passengers, not freight. Under the law as it now stands, every train is bound to come to a stop before it crosses any other track. A similar Act has been adopted in many of the States. It has been adopted on the Michigan Central, and parties are asking for its adoption in Canada. We have found the greatest possible difficulty on a long run, in the case of a number of railways, to make time, and the more stations there are the more time is lost, and new stations are being added as the necessity arises. We hope by this arrangement to facilitate the passage of mail and passenger trains from Halifax to St. John and Quebec. The provisions in the second clause are such as I can hardly explain to the House, but it has been urged on me by different railway companies, who say there is a difference of opinion between magistrates and others as to what constitutes a proper fastening for the hurdle gates. A hurdle gate is used on all railways in Lower Canada, and generally elsewhere.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman say in how many cases on the Intercolonial he expects this to be brought into operation, and at what points?

Mr. POPE. Two or three points, I think, and perhaps more.

Mr. BLAKE. What points are they?

Mr. POPE. There is a crossing on the road from Halifax running to Pictou, and there are other important points that will probably need a little alteration.

Mr. BLAKE. Which are they?

Mr. POPE. The railway from St. John into Moncton. I only mention now that branch of the Intercolonial, where I would be very glad to make the alteration.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friends near me say there is no case of an intersecting railway on the latter, so that this is an Act of Parliament for the Halifax and Pictou crossing.

Mr. POPE. Or any other that may occur.

Mr. BLAKE. I want to know what others did occur?

Mr. POPE. I say this one where it is important; others will occur, they must occur. There are many more than that crossing, but they are so small that I cannot mention them now.

Mr. BLAKE. If they are too small to be mentioned, they are hardly large enough to make an Act of Parliament about. The hon. gentleman, in the first clause, speaks about a "device;" has he got a device?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And has applied it?

Mr. POPE. Not yet.

Mr. BLAKE. But he is satisfied that it is all right?

Mr. POPE. I am satisfied from the report of the engineer, after having examined it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this Bill specifically confined to Government railways, or is it proposed to extend it to others?

Mr. POPE. It is to be applicable to all railways when it is necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it has actually been applied in the case of the Michigan Central.

Mr. POPE. And some other roads as well; and the Canada Southern Railway is asking to apply it in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to publish the provisions which are made? I see the plan is most elastic in its character. The Minister is to have power, from time to time, to make a written order saying what is to be done, then to revoke or modify, and make regulations. He has already told us that he does not propose to apply the Act except in the case of express trains.

Mr. POPE. Only passenger and mail trains. Trains running between large cities and on long lines ought to be delayed as little as possible.

Bill reported.

BANFF NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 16) respecting the Banff National Park. He said: The other day, I was asked for information in respect to the companies and individuals having reservations in the park. I may say that before the reservation was made at all, certain limits were sold at public competition within what is now the large reserve. There were disposed of to the Eau Claire and Bow River Lumber Company, 28½ square miles; to the Hon. J. G. Ross, 43 square miles; to the Eau Claire and Bow River Lumber Company again, two lots of 1 and 26½ square miles, respectively.

Mr. CASEY. What is the extent of these limits?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). One was twenty-eight and a half square miles, another forty-three, another one, and another twenty-six and a half, in all about ninety miles.

Mr. MITCHELL. Within this limit?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not altogether within it, and not within the region of the springs.

Mr. MITCHELL. Were these lands granted absolutely?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, they are only yearly leases. To the one that comes nearest the springs, no license has been issued, although an Order in Council was passed three or four years ago. A permit was, however, granted. For that one the licensee paid \$81 per square mile. Then there were certain coal areas granted, also within the general reservation, although not within what is, properly speaking, the springs portion. These were all granted before there was any question of reservation whatever. The area is 1,155 acres and the amount paid for it was \$14,437; the lands were all within the anthracite coal area and the average price paid was about \$12.50 per acre. They are, however, not within what is properly the springs area but are on the opposite side of Bow River. There are only two settlers we know of, and they are persons who bought out the rights of squatters early in 1885 or in the latter portion of 1884. They have not yet been dealt with, and the question remains as to how we should deal with them. They are also on the other side of Bow River and on the other side of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a considerable distance from the springs themselves; but it is quite open to the Department to compensate these settlers in some way for the improvements they have made, if it is thought undesirable to allow them to remain there as permanent settlers. They took their lands before they were reserved as coal lands. In the first instance, there was a comparatively small area

reserved by Order in Council; that included only where the springs themselves are. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and other gentlemen who have visited the ground, will readily understand that the area originally reserved was on the springs side of Bow River, and just where the springs themselves are; but we propose under this Bill to reserve a very much larger area, with a view of making the reserve include Devil's Head Lake. The question was asked the other day as to how this would affect the Canadian Pacific Railway lands. The general boundary extends about half-way up, but as the Canadian Pacific Railway are only entitled to their lands when survey has taken place, and as no survey has been made there, and as the company is co-operating with the Government in this matter, no difficulty is likely to arise.

Mr. CASEY. As to the area of ninety-eight square miles of timber limits, how does it lie with respect to the rest of the reservation?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the timber limits, I may say as to one of them it almost covers the springs themselves. A license has not, however, been issued to that one, and it is a matter of negotiation to prevent the springs or any part of them being included. The licenses are only from year to year, and, no doubt, arrangements will be made to secure such property as is necessary to preserve the forest for the park.

Mr. MITCHELL. No license should be granted respecting any land or property within the limits supposed to be retained for the park, and we should reserve intact the natural forests. For my part, I propose to give the Government very great licence in a matter of this kind—far more in this matter than in any general matter of administration. It is one of those subjects very few persons understand. From what I have seen of that section of country I think it requires a personal examination in order to judge and appreciate what is necessary in creating a national park, which we expect will be productive of very great benefit to those troubled with diseases of various kinds. I am, therefore, willing to give the Government very great licence in the Bill before the House.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister, in addition to the statement he has made, was also to have brought down to the House some plan or statement showing the amount of money proposed to be expended by the Government on the park, and he was likewise to state what leases had been made for the springs or any part of them, or for the ground and on what terms. If the hon. gentleman will refer to *Hansard* of two or three days ago, he will see that I called his attention specially to all those points.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). With respect to the first point, I think that when the Estimates come up it will be a better time, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to say, to deal with the question of expenditure. The expenditure may be large or small as the House may determine. In the meantime, Mr. Stewart, who is superintendent, has constructed roads to the upper springs and through the park itself; he has thrown a bridge across Bow River and is putting across a light iron bridge of a permanent character, and is improving what is called the Cave Spring by making a tunnel entrance to it. But the expenditures outside of that on the Devil's Head Lake road, which is being built, are matters which may be determined from time to time as Parliament may be pleased to vote. The expenditure up to the present time amounts to between \$35,000 or \$40,000, covering the construction of roads, survey of the park and general

improvements. As to leases: no leases have actually been given for the springs, because the question as to how the water is to be conducted to the hotel is engaging the attention of the superintendent, and at present the principle we propose to adopt is that followed at Arkansas, viz., that everyone using the water shall pay so much per tub, the character of the bathing-houses being under the superintendent. I think \$15 a year per tub was what was fixed by Order in Council to be paid by those using the waters.

Mr. CASEY. I have here a statement of the amount expended on this so-called park, already. I find that under the Governor General's warrant dated September 7th, there was paid \$10,000 for surveys, roads, bridges, &c.; on November 17th, \$5,000; on April 14th, the day after the House met, \$31,000, making a total, not of \$35,000 or \$40,000, but \$46,000, spent on this park without the authority of Parliament, and by far the greater portion of it spent after the House met, and before the Government brought down a Bill to ask authority to reserve the park. I think that such unconstitutional dealing with the public funds, when the House is in Session and could have been asked for the funds, the spending of this money in anticipation of the fact that the House would decide to make this reservation on the terms proposed by the Government—I say I think that such dealing with the public money is not calculated to make us entrust the Government with very much power in respect to the management of the reservation itself. Now, Sir, in regard to the first clause, the map appears to show that the timber berths are altogether at one end of the reservation, and that being the case I do not see any reason at all why these timber berths, not being surrounded by other territory which is required to be included in the reservation, should be put in the reservation at all, unless it is intended to stop the cutting of timber upon them. If the hon. gentleman says, "I have included it in the reservation for the purpose of stopping the cutting of timber and preserving it as a national park," that is all right. But that is not the language of the Bill, because he takes power to make regulations for the cutting of timber on these very berths. The effect, therefore, of this is simply to take these limits out from under the operation of the ordinary law covering the cutting of timber on Crown lands, and the issuing of timber licenses, and to leave the issuing of these licenses, their term, and everything of that kind, entirely in the hands of the Minister, and I think that is a power the House would not give him, if it fairly understood what is meant. The statement of the bonuses paid for these timber limits shows that they must be very valuable. I think the hon. gentleman mentioned a sum as large as \$80 or \$100 and over per square mile, on what he says was a yearly license to cut timber. If that is the case these must be very valuable timber berths, and they should not be left to the uncontrolled management of any individual. Again, Sir, as to the coal lands, of which he has told us 1,155 acres are under license. He says this is the anthracite deposit. Well, that anthracite deposit at the base of the Rockies, we were led to understand, was, perhaps, the most valuable coal deposit in the whole North-West—of superior quality and almost unlimited in quantity; and yet all that belt is brought within the limits of this reservation and is to be worked under mining licenses. I do not see any reason at all, why this coal district should be exempted from the operation of the ordinary laws regarding mining licenses. If the Minister intends to let anthracite coal be worked at all, he should exclude that mining land from the reserve, and leave it under the control of the ordinary mining laws. If he does not intend it to be worked, then he should not take power to make regulations for the mining of the coal. In short, we come again to the contradiction of terms which I pointed out before—that the Minister

is professedly making this reservation for the purposes of a public park, but he is really taking power to himself to allow cattle to be grazed, timber to be cut, and coal to be mined, but without regard to the operation of the ordinary laws with regard to mining, grazing and timber cutting. I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the real object of including the coal, timber and grazing lands in the reserve is to obtain, not a reserve for the purposes of a public park, but a reserve for Government supporters; it is to obtain a reserve of lands which the Government may deal with, uncontrolled by the ordinary Acts of Parliament, and for which they will not have to account to Parliament in the ordinary way. If it is not so, if the Minister wishes to avoid that suspicion, he should either make it a part of his Bill that mining, grazing or timber cutting should not go on upon the reserve, or else he should exclude those parts of the reserve in which these operations are intended to go on from the operation of this Act altogether. Either he should take them out altogether or, if he puts them in, he should stop these operations upon the reserve, and make it a public park, as the Bill states it was intended to do.

Mr. ELLIS. I think the whole plan of this measure is very objectionable. I do not think the country wants such a park, or that it is able to pay for it. The Minister has already incurred an expenditure of nearly \$50,000 without the authority of law; the work upon the park is scarcely begun, and he is committing us to an unlimited expenditure in future. I do not see, Sir, that the country, in view of the state of its finances, in view of the fact that it has had large deficits for the last few years, is in a position to take this matter up, because it is impossible to say what the expenditure will be which we are called upon to make.

Mr. HESSON. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down speak against the action of the Government in reference to this park. I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman had paid a visit to that country he would have made a different statement as to the necessity for this park and the advisability of reserving it for the benefit of the public. I do not say that the Government should take too much power by way of regulation, but I do say that any person visiting that part of the country can see the necessity of some person being in control—some person having such powers as are provided for in the Bill, because circumstances may arise there for which you could hardly make provision in advance by an Act of Parliament. I had the pleasure of visiting those springs last October. I spent some time there very pleasantly indeed, and I am glad to see the Government making such an effort to provide for Canada a place of resort which, I have no doubt, will be sufficiently pleasant and valuable, as a place for invalids and pleasure-seekers, as to induce those in search of health or recreation to spend the money in their own country, which hitherto they have been in the habit of spending abroad. I was much delighted with the drives made on the mountain side and the river bank, and I was also surprised when I learned from the engineer in charge how small a sum the work had cost at that time. If it has since cost a considerable sum more, I have no doubt, from the rate of progress which was being made then by the person in charge, that there will be satisfactory results from the expenditure of the money. I can quite understand that to accomplish a work of this kind would involve considerable expense for the necessary labor. But the benefit that Canada may hope to derive from these springs is altogether of a kind that we cannot fully realise to-day. When I was there I saw invalids carried down to the springs in chairs by friendly hands, and when I returned from the Pacific coast I saw these same people able to walk down themselves, and they were basking in the sunshine on the mountain side. I was delighted to hear that the Gov-

Mr. CASEY.

ernment purpose keeping the springs free, so that invalids, or those in wealthy circumstances, who desire a summer recreation, can have their homes there; that the baths will be free for the poorest, and that it was for the poor and the humble, and those most in need of them that they made the drives, and scooped out of the solid rock the basins where baths are now taken. Nature had provided an underground chamber, where persons who had the courage, could go and bathe. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) has been in that bath, and I have been in it myself; and I would advise the hon. member for Bothwell to go there also and take a bath, and he will come back in good humor, well pleased with his country, and disposed to admit that the Government are undertaking a good work. I am sure that the people of Canada, after realising the value of the water there, will never regret that the Government have reserved it for the free use of the people of Canada, and will feel that a little expenditure for that purpose is a wise expenditure after all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The baths may be all that our friend has so eloquently described them, and the park may be an exceedingly valuable institution; but in most English-speaking communities it has always hitherto been understood that before public money is spent by Ministers of the Crown, the authority of Parliament should be obtained for it. There are certain exceptions very rigidly guarded, or intended to be rigidly guarded; but I do not think there is anything in the Act of Parliament which authorises the issue of the Governor General's warrants which justifies the expenditure of \$46,000 of public money on this public park without the authority of Parliament. It would have been time enough to have spent that money after the authority of Parliament had been obtained for the creation of the park. That was the point taken by my hon. friend behind me, which, in his enthusiasm for these healing waters, the hon. member seems to have forgotten altogether. Whatever may be the merits of the park, I do not think anybody can get up here and contend that this expenditure comes under the terms of the Act of Parliament by virtue of which Governor General's warrants are supposed to be issued. I do not think this money has been properly spent, even if Parliament should find afterwards that the park is a desirable thing to institute. That is a point on which I think this committee would do well to ask for some further explanation.

Mr. CASEY. The haze of poetry thrown over this subject by the hon. member for North Perth has led us to forget the promise made by the Minister when we last discussed the question. He promised to explain these expenditures to us—what had been done, and what it was intended to do. He has explained in very vague terms one or two things that had been done; he explained that a road and a bridge had been built, and that another bridge was building. Surely these did not cost \$46,000. The hon. member for North Perth said he was surprised to hear how little the improvements cost up to last October, when he was there. After Parliament met there was an unconstitutional grant of \$31,000 more, which could not have been for the improvements up to last fall. The hon. Minister should tell us what this is for. He has given us a hint that a small part will be expended in bringing water from the baths to the hotel. The hon. member for North Perth gives us to understand that the baths will be free, while the Minister says that he is going to sell the privilege to use the water, at the rate of \$15 per bath-tub, to certain favored persons who are to locate near the springs. We would like to know which is correct—whether there is to be a Government institution for persons who will go there *in forma pauperis* to ask for free baths, or whether its privileges are to be paid for by the guests in the hotels belonging to Government pets. If there are to be free baths, no one will use

the baths in the hotel, and that would spoil the whole object of the Bill. On the other hand, if they are not free, instead of preserving these springs for the use of the public, the Government propose to preserve them for the use of such speculators as they choose to put in control of them. That is what we believe of the whole Bill—it is a speculators' Bill, one to enable the Government to go into a speculation with some of their friends. We know that they allowed one of their friends, Dr. Orton, a late member of this House, with Dr. Brett, to put up a hotel at these springs. We were told that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were also putting up a hotel. We have not been told whether anybody else is to build, or whether anyone else has been refused permission to do so, or whether the privilege of doing so will go by favor. I fear it will be the latter. Kissing goes by favor, the old proverb says, and I suppose it will be so with the right to build at these springs. We believe the object of this Bill is not to keep them for the benefit of the public, but to shut them up from the public and put them into the hands of speculators. That is the impression the public will have. What I particularly ask for now is an explanation of the expenditure of this \$46,000. What has been done with it so far, and what is intended to be done with the rest?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have already explained that the expenditure up to this time has been for building roads and bridges.

Mr. CASEY. How many miles of road?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The road from the springs is three miles long running up the side of the mountain, and if the hon. gentleman knows anything of road building, he will know that that cannot be done for a very small amount of money. I have the opinion of a practical man, Mr. Van Horne, who is a good authority, that it is the cheapest piece of road he has ever seen in his life. As to the \$31,000, that is for work partly completed and partly going on.

Mr. CASEY. What is the work?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Building a light carriage bridge across the Bow River. The bridge there last year was a mere temporary bridge to enable a carriage to pass over. Arrangements have been made for that work, and a contract made in connection with it. The work has been done by day's work under the superintendence of Mr. Stewart, and I think those who go there will say that the work is more economically and better done than if it were done under the ordinary system of contract. Then there is the work connected with the bringing down of the water from these springs to the hotels. As to the insinuation of the hon. gentleman, it is unworthy of him, and does not deserve an answer.

Mr. CASEY. It is all very well to answer an imputation sustained by evidence in that manner, but the country will know what such an evasion means. The imputation I have made will not be answered, because the hon. gentleman cannot answer it. The Bill bears on its face the evidence of a job, all the more on account of the hon. gentleman's pretended contempt of the accusation. The hon. gentleman says it is only the money given last fall which was used building the road to the High Springs, three miles of road, \$15,000, and that the \$31,000 is to be used partly for the bridge and partly for something else which he did not explain at all.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may tell the hon. gentleman that it is the question of the reservation of the park which we are now discussing. When we come to the Estimates, I will give the fullest particulars as to each item of expenditure.

Mr. CASEY. I am referring to money which has been unconstitutionally spent outside of the Estimates on the

park, before we agreed to make it a park or to give the hon. gentleman a Bill at all, and we have the right to know what was done with the money. The hon. gentleman should have been ready to give us the fullest details, and he promised to give us those details when we last discussed the subject. There is another matter the hon. gentleman did not tell us about. He said the Government were laying out a town site and that applications had been put in for 15,000 lots, and he also told us that the lots had not been surveyed in sections. On the map I find the site is laid out in sections; I find it is all laid out in squares. The hon. gentleman says no, then the map is wrong. There are several townships laid out which cover all the timber and coal land included in the park and the springs themselves.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There are no sections on that map.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman trust his eyes if I hand it to him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a difference between squares and sections.

Mr. CASEY. This is a regular township—townships 25 and 26, ranges 11 and 12.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Townships are not sections.

Mr. CASEY. Township, range, and section are all laid down on this map. Perhaps they have been laid down on the map without being laid down on the ground. The very part where the coal lands are has been laid down in sections, but the hon. gentleman tells us the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is going into a speculation with the Government, and, therefore, will not object to giving up their sections. That is what we have been thinking. They are going in snags on the profits, as well as certain private speculators, and the reservation is partly for the railway company and partly for private individuals. Now, we have had already a great mass of inconsistencies and contradictory statements with regard to this matter, and it is, perhaps, hardly worth while to challenge any more statements, but the hon. the Minister has not told us what he estimated would be the total cost of putting this in shape. Of course we cannot expect details of that until we can get the Estimates, but we should have the details of what has already been expended. I ask for an approximate estimate of the total cost of putting the park in shape, and that is what the hon. gentleman promised us.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the ground itself, I understand that in a former discussion it was stated that the claims of the Canadian Pacific Railway to lands along the line terminated in a point east of this reservation. Today I understand the hon. gentleman to qualify that statement by saying the Canadian Pacific Railway is co-operating with the Government in the enterprise, and consequently there would be no difficulty; but we would like to know whether the assurance of the Government is dependent on the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has no claim, or upon the hope that having a claim they will not adversely state it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The first reservation made of the park by Order in Council was all west of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The line that has generally been assumed is the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway land; when I spoke I had that in my mind. The larger area which is now proposed to be reserved under the report of Mr. Stewart, who is in charge of the works there, goes eastward of that boundary, and, of course, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had the right and did take the odd sections in it, which are no part of the springs, there would be no expenditure on that portion.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman entered into any negotiations with the company as to the surrender of any claims they may have to these lands?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No.

Mr. BLAKE. So that at present a large portion of what we propose to reserve is really subject to the right of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take alternate sections?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The only question is whether the land is fairly fit for settlement, and this, being all mountainous land, is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The option lies with the company, and if they chose to consider it fit for settlement the law would not sustain the hon. gentleman in refusing to accept their decision upon that point. We ought to know whether this land that he proposes to reserve is ours alone, or ours and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's. I would point out also this fact, which he stated to-day, that 1,100 acres of anthracite coal-mining lands are in very close proximity to the springs, will, if the mines are worked, produce an undesirable settlement of an undesirable class of population, having reference to the especial objects of this reservation. No doubt miners in themselves are useful and industrious members of the community, but the establishment of a mining town so close to the springs might interfere with the object the hon. gentleman is aiming at. I would like to know, in addition to what is proposed to be done with the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether any attempts have been made to sink shafts or in any way to develop these coal lands, and whether the Government consider they have it in their power to resume these either by treaty or by taking them, as in such case they fairly might, at their fair value?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). These coal lands are on the other side of the Bow River, about three miles distant, and, strictly speaking, are not in the park at all. I believe one of the companies has been doing some work on them, but how far successfully I really cannot say. It would not be proper for me to say anything, because anything I have heard is simply rumor.

Mr. MITCHELL. The park is entirely reserved on the north-west side of Bow River, the coal lands are on the other side, and therefore the one will not interfere with the other. True, these coal operations may be carried on to a large extent, and I hope they will be, because it is in the interest of the country they should be developed and become one of our most important industries. If these deposits are there, and I believe they are, it might not be a very desirable thing, in the vicinity of a health-giving institution such as a great park like that, with the springs which will be so desirable for invalids, to have them located in that vicinity; but there they are, and we have to deal with them as we find them. What I realise about the matter from my personal observation is that there are those springs, which are, in my opinion, of vast importance to this country, and which, if properly attended to, developed, cultivated and cared for, will be a place of great resort not alone to people out of health, but, if the park is properly attended to, to the general public. People travelling through will all desire to remain over there for a day or two, and it is our duty to encourage that place as far as possible. There should be few restrictions and few limitations introduced into the area which it is proposed to reserve for the park. If there be any persons who have claims there, we should accept the fact that they are there, or we should endeavor to purchase them out. I think we should give a great deal of license to the Government in a matter of this kind. I do not generally have much confidence in the Government, but in this case I would let the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

geniuses of the Department of the Interior show what they can do, whether they can develop a great tract in that section of the country; and, from what we have seen in the past of the inventive genius of the Minister of the Interior, and the enterprise he has brought to bear in his own private interests, and the attention he has given to public affairs, I have no doubt he will make it a point to make that park a great spot for public resort, and that he will leave his success in this matter as one of the records of his public life when he departs from the Government. I am not anxious to see a change of Government. I do not suppose there will be one this year; but I think we shall have it before a year or two. I hope that, while he has the power to do it, the hon. gentleman will make this a success.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has already answered, with reference to a very large section of the territory which it is proposed to make into a park, that it is dependent on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, with reference to the springs themselves, there were for a long time statements appearing in the public press as to some persons claiming property in these springs by right of discovery, or by other titles which are generally set up to precious spots vested in the Crown. I think another ex-member of Parliament—not the one referred to by the hon. gentleman as a prospective hotel-keeper—but another ex-member of Parliament set up a claim to certain rights of property in these springs. I desire to ask whether any such claim is now made, or whether it has been settled, and if the Department is able to state whether there is now any outstanding claim which is of validity.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no outstanding claim in reference to these springs. The Government have refused to recognise any right of discovery in regard to them, but there were people who had made some discoveries or improvements in connection with them, and it was a matter of honesty that they should be dealt with. Mr. Pearce made an investigation on the spot in regard to these claims, and took a considerable amount of evidence; and if any hon. gentleman desires to move for the papers, they will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I gather from what the hon. gentleman says that nothing has yet been done in reference to these claims.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There has been only the payment to one claimant.

Mr. BLAKE. Who was that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). A thousand dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not unreasonable that, on this first clause by which we are proposing to appropriate this property, we should learn our title to the property. As to the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has made, that the discussion of the Estimates was the proper place and time for dealing with these expenditures, I do not differ from that statement, nor as to the estimates the hon. gentleman proposes to bring down to us, but there has been already a large expenditure, an expenditure of \$46,000, for which the hon. gentleman does not propose to estimate.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That will come in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but the money is spent and gone, and we know the character of the discussion which takes place on a matter of that kind. It seems to me not unreasonable that when, before obtaining any authority for the

creation of a park at all or the expenditure of a dollar upon it, the Government expended the sum of \$46,000, we should have some general notion of what the scheme of the Government is with reference to the expenditure, because, if you begin, without having authority to spend a dollar, by spending \$46,000 in a few months, for which you have to ask the authority of Parliament afterwards, if that is the beginning, what is the middle and what is the end to be? It is reasonable to suppose that the Government formed some sort of estimate, some sort of conjecture as to the nature, the character, and the extent of the expenditure which they proposed to make. I agree that it may be extremely difficult to estimate within \$5,000 or \$10,000, if you go into an expenditure of a great amount on a matter of this kind, what the expenditure is to be; but we might have some idea, in a general way, of what the expenditure is to be when we are asked to foot the bill. Are we going to expend \$100,000 or \$150,000 more, or what? To what extent are we going to commit ourselves in the future? We ought to know something about this, if we are to be told that Parliament practically agreed to go to any reasonable extent based upon the theories on which the Government acted before they came down and approached the House for authority at all. It, therefore, appears to me that we are still wanting in one of those elements which we ought to have before any of this expenditure is proposed. As to the general area, I would be very sorry, from the very scanty information that we have on the subject, that, even with the great desire to create a park as a permanent object of attraction, and to preserve in all their purity and with all their conveniences the springs themselves, it should be suggested for a moment that the economic minerals which are actually found in that part of the country should have any prevention placed in the way of their working; but, while that is so with reference to the timber, I should suppose that nothing would be more important than that, at the earliest practicable moment, arrangements should be made to prevent the cutting down of a single stick by persons who may be doing it for purposes of commerce. I do not suppose that anything which the hon. gentleman may propose to do, involving the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, will be likely to compensate for the loss of the pine and the smaller timber which in the course of ages may grow into valuable forests in this place. In rocky places we know the difficulty of growth and the practical impossibility of replacing what is cut down, whether it be from necessity or for personal convenience. So, if there be no great commercial necessity that any further timber should be cut on the premises, I think that all those considerations which alone justify the creation of the park will justify steps being taken to prevent its being despoiled of the timber. As to the expenditure to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, it may be proper that that work should have been performed by day's work; I do not know; but the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) points out that the Public Works Act forbids it being done by day's work; and it is evident that a great deal of it must have been done by tender. For instance, I do not suppose that the bridge, the iron bridge to which the hon. gentleman has referred, was made by day's work, whether it was put up by day's work or not. I am sure it is gratifying to know that the hon. gentleman has found out that it is much cheaper to do this by day's work than by contract. I know that, at certain epochs and seasons, in the immediate neighborhood of the building in which we are now assembled, it was so considered, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to pause before he comes to the conclusion that what may be very desirable and cheap in the neighborhood of this building can be done in that way as cheaply in the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. HESSON. There are persons who are not settled with yet at these springs, persons who were the real discov-

erers of these springs. They were young men from the county of Perth, and I believe they are more particularly constituents of my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow). These young men, the McArdle brothers, have been something like four years in possession there, one of them, I believe, sitting with his rifle to protect that famous property which they had discovered, while the other poor fellow was away hunting grub. They have been struggling there for four years, and the Government have gone so far as to appoint Commissioners, who have made a report. I presume the best way, as suggested by the Minister, is to ask for that report. No doubt the hon. Minister knows best what should be done, but I think something should be done at once to compensate these poor fellows who have been struggling for the last four years to hold the fort. They have rights, no doubt, and the Government do not think it necessary to eject them. They feel that they ought to be protected, and I have no doubt the Government will do something for them. They are not very wealthy, and they went into the mountains as pioneers to make discoveries, and I believe they had a contract for getting out ties for the railway when they made the discovery. Now it turns out that one Woodworth, who was not so poor as these young men, has been compensated for something he appears to have done in the matter. It may be that he was entitled to it, no doubt he was; but these young men who have been there for years have not received a dollar, and they ought to be provided for in some way, and very speedily. I think I am in a position to say a word on their behalf, for they have written to me several times about the matter since I have returned from the mountains. I trust that the Minister will put something in the Estimates to compensate these men, for I think they are entitled to it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman told us, if I understood him aright, that it was only an additional part of the reservation, which it was subsequently determined to take in, which came within the railway belt; I suppose he meant that part which includes Devil's Head Lake. I find, by the map laid on the Table, that the western boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt passes west of both the plots of ground for coal-mining, and follows the boundary of the town site; but whether it includes the springs I do not know, because he has not marked the springs on this map, and I cannot get anybody to mark the exact site of the springs for me. But, at all events, the railway belt goes up to the boundary of the town site, which town the hon. Minister told us was being built on the opposite side of the river from the springs, and, therefore, must come in the immediate neighborhood of the springs. That is on the map. The hon. gentleman shakes his head—probably he knows more than the surveyor of his Department. There can be no dispute in the matter. The western boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt follows the boundary of the town site, going around the two sides of the section which is laid out for it, and includes all the land north of Bow River, east of the points where the curve occurs in the railway. Then, the claims of the Canadian Pacific Railway come right up to the town site. Now, as to the matter of the probable cost of the park, it is no use to affect a dignified silence in regard to that point. We have a distinct right to ask for information as to the probable cost before we make the reservation, and if the Minister continues to refuse to give us information in regard to the probable cost, we must infer either that he has made no estimate, that he is asking us to incur an expense which he does not know anything about, or else that he believes it would be so considerable that the House would refuse to grant it.

Mr. KIRK. This is a question that ought to interest every member of this House, and the Government ought to inform the House what is likely to be the cost of the undertaking. Hon. members from this side of the House have a right to

demand an answer on that point. I notice that already upwards of \$46,000 have been expended on this enterprise. Now, I am opposed to this enterprise altogether. I cannot see for the life of me why the Government should undertake to prepare hotels for tourists. I do not see that the Government should go into the hotel business at all. Why should they go into the business of preparing public parks as a resort—for whom? Not for the people of Canada, not for the people who pay the taxes, but for the wealthy people of the cities of the Dominion and the cities of other countries. Who are the people who will be called upon to pay the money to erect this hotel, this pleasure park, and the baths for these wealthy people? Why, the workingmen, the fishermen, the farmers of this country; these are the people who must put their hands in their pockets, some of whom can scarcely earn enough to keep soul and body together, in order to contribute to the comfort and convenience of the wealthy people of this continent, and perhaps of the other, too. I protest against the whole scheme, and I hope the Government have not gone so far that they cannot withdraw and leave the matter for private enterprise. If the Government have grounds up there which can be made into convenient parks for public resorts for the wealthy people, let them leave to individuals the business of doing so. There are many other places in this Dominion which could be turned into convenient public resorts; just as healthful baths could be prepared in other parts of the Dominion as in the North-West among the Rocky Mountains; and if the Government begin to do this kind of thing in that part of the country, they will be called upon to do so in other parts of the country as well, and where will it stop? I protest against the whole thing, and I say the Government should leave the whole matter in the hands of private speculators and to private enterprise.

Mr. TROW. I have visited famous springs on various parts of this continent, and I question whether there is any other place more deserving of expenditure than the one now under discussion. I had the pleasure on one occasion of baptising my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in these celebrated springs. I think, however, it would be advisable, before the Government make much more expenditure, to analyse the waters and ascertain their curative properties. There is no such scenery anywhere else on the continent, and I believe a limited expenditure is called for on this park. The Government have not been lavish, so far, at all events. When I visited the park I recommended to the Minister of the Interior that the Government should do something of this kind. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has seen the springs at all, but I took the first opportunity of informing him of the scenery in that locality. The scenery is delightful. It surpasses the Alps. For miles around the tops of the mountains are covered with perpetual snow, and there is a beautiful navigable river to add to the charms of the place. There are no agricultural lands in the locality, so that no person could claim the right of a squatter. There is no land to cultivate except the valley on each side of the river, which is very limited. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) does not seem, from his statement, to understand the geography of the country. The coal lands are entirely separate from the springs, and are distant, nearly three miles, and there is a considerable distance from the springs to the side of the mountains on the other side of the railway to the coal mines, which are partially developed at several points. I approve of the expenditure, and I now know capitalists who would undertake to give the Government 1000 per cent. on all their expenditures if the Government would give them possession of the land, including the springs and coal lands.

Mr. KIRK. Let them give it.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) understood me to say that the springs and the coal

Mr. KIRK.

mines were together, he was mistaken. I was simply referring to coal lands.

Mr. JONES. The principle involved in the question before the House has not received attention except from the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), and that is the appropriation of public money for such a purpose. It is well known that we in this country have given the Canadian Pacific Railway Company an enormous amount, 70 or 80 millions, to construct their railway for the people of the North-West, and for the development of the country in that direction. If anything more is required to attract settlers and visitors to that portion of the Dominion, the expenditure should be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who are going to derive the chief benefit from people visiting that country. Again, I cannot see on what grounds of public policy a Government can undertake to expend public money in a remote part of the Dominion, because it is a remote part, particularly as regards the people of the east, and the expenditure will doubtless amount to a large sum before it is finished. We have obtained no idea yet of the amount required for the completion of the work, and I cannot see upon what principle a Government can ask this House to sanction such an appropriation of public money. As stated by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), the taxpayers of the Dominion will not look with favor on such an appropriation. I protest in the strongest possible language against public money being spent for such a purpose at the present time. The financial condition of the country is not in such a prosperous state that we can afford to throw away money on such an object. We have had large deficiencies; there is depression existing in many parts of the Dominion; in the eastern section, at all events, there is very great depression, and the taxes that have to be borne by the taxpayers are a very great burden upon them; and, therefore, the people of the Dominion will look with much apprehension at the inauguration of a policy such as this, looking forward to a large expenditure. I trust the Government will hesitate before they inaugurate a policy such as is indicated by the Bill of the Minister of Interior to-day. The explanations made by hon. gentlemen who have spoken may apply with great force from their standpoint, but I throw them entirely on one side, because I take exception to the expenditure on any grounds whatever. If those springs are there, and are as valuable as pointed out by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and can be disposed of to speculators for a very large sum, I do not see why the Government are not disposed to accept the offer. The springs will still be there, the purchaser cannot remove them, the people of the Dominion in that section, or whoever may visit the locality, will have the same benefit from them as if they were owned by the Government. We know very well that private enterprise always manages such undertakings much more economically and systematically than does the Government. We, unfortunately, have had too much experience of governmental expenditure in this country in the hotel line as well as in other directions, and therefore I hope this expenditure will not be undertaken. I enter my protest most strongly against the principle of the expenditure. It certainly seems an outrageous departure from the constitutional authority of this House and this Parliament that the Government should have used the authority which they possess under the Governor General's warrant for the appropriation of forty or fifty thousand dollars for an object not of any immediate and pressing character. The authority given the Government under the Act is, that where circumstances arise not foreseen by the Government, and where there is a public necessity for action by the Executive, the Government may act under the Governor General's warrant. But if hon. gentlemen opposite can on their own motion spend forty or fifty thousand dollars on a matter of

this kind, they may spend a hundred thousand dollars for some other purpose equally undesirable, in my judgment, in some other part of the country. Therefore, on both grounds, I enter my protest against this expenditure, and I shall be very sorry if it is endorsed by this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has said that he hopes the Government will hesitate before going on with this expenditure. The Government will not hesitate—they have not hesitated, and with the approbation of this House they will continue in that policy. The hon. gentleman has said that we have spent a great deal of money in helping the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build the railway—millions, he said—and, therefore, as they will be principally benefited, they should be called upon to complete the whole undertaking. The hon. gentleman evidently did not hear the speech of the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). No doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be only too glad to take the land and make 1000 per cent. out of it.

An hon. MEMBER. Sell it to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then there would be another cry raised, that here was another instance of the favoritism of the Government towards the Canadian Pacific Railway by giving them a monopoly of all those magnificent curative waters. There is really only one way of making that portion of the country what it ought to be, and that is by the scheme of the Government, undertaken with a full knowledge of their responsibility; and I am glad to find it is supported by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have visited the place and understand its value, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). It is a place of ideal beauty. The hon. member for South Perth has not at all exaggerated it. I do not suppose in any portion of the world there can be found a spot, taken altogether, which combines so many attractions and which promises in as great a degree not only large pecuniary advantage to the Dominion, but much prestige to the whole country by attracting the population, not only on this continent, but of Europe to this place. It has all the qualifications necessary to make it a great place of resort. In the first place, its sulphur and magnesia waters possess beyond a doubt as great curative properties as either the White Sulphur Springs of Virginia or the sulphur springs of Arkansas. Besides, the scenery is magnificent and the climate is genial. So mild is the climate in winter in that portion of the country, though it is well up in the mountains and well towards the north, caused by the Chinook winds, that Dr. Brett told me that during the winter before, the only winter he spent there, the thermometer was only once down to three degrees below zero. The hon. gentleman has made an attack upon Dr. Brett and Dr. Orton. Well, Dr. Orton was a very respected member of this House when he was here. He is now pushing his fortunes in the North-West, those fortunes having been seriously injured, as have those of many other hon. gentlemen who have been parliamentarians, by his devotion to the public service rather than to his own interests. These gentlemen have put up a sanitarium, and I think it was said when I was there that they could take care of forty patients. Dr. Brett told me in August last that such were the understood qualities of the winter climate that he had already rented every one of his forty rooms for the whole winter to people coming from the south, on account of the mildness of the climate. There is beautiful scenery, there are the curative properties of the water, there is a genial climate, there is prairie sport and there is mountain sport; and I have no doubt that that will become a great watering-place, and that there will be a large town on the south side of Bow River, where the Government have laid out a town plot. I

think the Government will be fully remunerated for any expenditure they have made there. Now, my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, took steps, as soon as he possibly could, to prevent the intrusion of speculators and squatters upon this large plot of land so magnificently situated for a park. A town or towns will grow there—because I have no doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway will lay out a town plot there, though it is altogether away from the twenty thousand acres which lie on a rising mountain, and are surrounded by mountains in every direction. My hon. friend has stated that a considerable number of lots have already been sold, and I have no doubt that, *ex necessitate*, there will grow up a very considerable town at that place. Then there will be the rental of the waters; that is a perennial source of revenue, and if carefully managed it will more than many times recuperate or recoup the Government for any present expenditure.

Mr. MITCHELL. Recuperate, too, I hope.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, recuperate the patients and recoup the Treasury. In corroboration of what my hon. friend behind me said, I may state that I saw several patients during the short time I was there who told me their stories of the remarkably curative effects of these waters in their own cases. Now, the Government had to put an end to the rush of speculators to that portion of the country. Everybody knows—the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows—that when the squatter gets in he at once gets or assumes to get a claim; he claims compensation for removing him, and it was of importance, in order that these people should be kept out, that a reserve should be made at once, and that as much attention as possible should be paid to the protection of the timber in the general line of the park. Then it is of some importance—the Government thought it was of great importance—that all this section of the country should be brought at once into usefulness, that people should be encouraged to come there, that hotels should be built, that bath-houses should be erected for sanitary purposes, and in order to prevent squatters going in, the reservation was made. Mr. Stewart who was employed—and as far as I could judge his selection by my hon. friend was a happy one—has laid out the Mountain Park with a great deal of taste. I am not very æsthetical in my judgment—at least, I have no confidence in my own judgment of what is sublime or beautiful, but I have heard a great many travellers, and others who have visited that portion of the country, declare that the design of the park is charming, that the drives are beautiful, and the laying out of the ground generally, all that could be wished for. Now, it was important to do that at once. People were flocking there, and when I visited the place last August there were ranges of tents that the people brought there so that they might use the waters. The sooner the town was built the better—the sooner that the waters were brought into use the better for the sake of bringing the people there, and therefore the Government, having a full sense of their responsibility, and believing that the object was so clearly a beneficial one in every possible way, and having the certainty that the Treasury would be fully recouped for their expenditure, commenced last year to lay out the grounds and bring them into play for all the purposes required as soon as possible. They knew they would have to account to Parliament for this expenditure. But it seemed to me that the expenditure is so advantageous to that part of the country, that, with the certainty that there will be a considerable population, transitory or permanent, flocking in there, the certainty that there will be a town grow up in the vicinity of these waters, by the laying out of this park, the Government undertook to run the risk of Parliament disapproving of the expenditure. I am quite sure that if hon. gentlemen opposite would visit that part of the country they would, without a single exception, declare that the

Government were wise in reserving this park, and that the sooner the work of bringing it into play was completed the better.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been greatly struck in the course of this debate, and more so, perhaps, by the last speech than by any other, with the wonderful properties of this water. These springs are certainly the most extraordinary springs I ever heard of. It is not only the description which hon. gentlemen have given of their curative properties, but it is the effect that the water has had on themselves. We see these effects. They produce an immense exaltation of sentiment, a wonderful development of the poetical faculty, and union and concord between gentlemen who ordinarily think very differently on almost every other topic. Why, the county of Perth, for the first time since I have known it, seems to be united. My hon. friend from the north riding (Mr. Hesson) and my hon. friend from the south riding (Mr. Trow) shake hands across the Banff Springs, and each one of them drops into poetry on the subject. And not merely are they poetical, not merely is there an expansion of mind and an elevation of feeling, but there is a regardlessness of base pecuniary considerations that shows not merely that the springs may be of use to those who are lucky enough to be able to pay their fares on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that there should be an appropriation to bring them to every man's door. One hon. gentleman on this side said that if we wanted to sell them we could get one thousand per cent on the expenditure, and the First Minister has just repeated the statement. Now one thousand per cent. on our expenditure would be just \$4,600,000, and springs that can produce in the Parliament of Canada that statement, seriously made on one side and emphasised by the leader of the Government on the other, are certainly springs that the nation should keep to itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that, among their other effects, these springs have had the result of blinding the First Minister to the very plain terms of the Act of Parliament under which alone the Governor General's warrant can issue. Those terms are clear and precise. One reason only is assigned by Parliament for justifying the Government in meddling with the public money, before it is voted by Parliament, and that is when an entirely unforeseen urgency occurs, and it is illustrated by the words "such as an accident to a public building requiring repairs." The argument of the First Minister may be a very good argument for voting money for the purpose of developing and improving this property, if we decided on erecting a national park; but I submit that it was not a sound argument to justify him or his Government in taking a considerable sum of money out of the public Treasury and appropriating it to a purpose for which there could be no urgency. There may have been an urgency for reserving the site; but there was no such urgency as the Act of Parliament contemplates, for spending that sum of money in the month of July or August. Surely the Government must have known of these springs a considerable time before. Two of my hon. friends, some time prior to that expenditure, called the attention of the Government to the desirability of preserving this property for public use. The House sat until the 1st of June last year, and the Government could easily have taken a provisional vote. They did not, however, but chose to have recourse to the process of taking money by a Governor General's warrant, and I contend that there has been nothing stated by the First Minister to justify in the least degree the use of that power for such a purpose. I intend to call attention to the use or abuse made of that power at a later period; but I will just read for the benefit of the First Minister, who is not perhaps as familiar with the Audit Act as is desirable, the conditions under which a Governor General's warrant is issued:

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"If when Parliament is not in Session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor General in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, &c."

Now, I submit that if this expenditure of \$46,000 for the Banff Springs comes under the terms of that Act, there is no use whatever in our attempting to put any restrictions on the power of the Government of Canada to take money out of the Treasury and expend it according to their own will and pleasure. Just as good reasons could be given for the expenditure of \$40,000 or \$400,000 for that matter, in any part of the Dominion where they chose to expend it. I think the power has been grossly abused, whether it is a desirable thing to have the park or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the unauthorised and unwarranted expenditure the Government has made on this park is deserving of the very serious consideration of the House. This is a question wholly apart from the merits of the undertaking. The establishment of the park may be wisely proposed in the public interest, and the expenditure on it may be a national advantage; but that is a question apart from the propriety of the Government undertaking to spend money without the sanction of Parliament. We know the position the hon. leader of the Government took in 1875, with reference to the expenditure proposed by my hon. friend from East York on the telegraph line along the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend was authorised by an Act of Parliament to build a line of telegraph along the railway. It was found necessary, before certain portions of the line of railway were absolutely located, and in the furtherance of the work of survey and exploration, to establish a telegraph line. Parliament had made the necessary appropriations, but because the words "along the line of railway," were used, and because the telegraph line did not in every instance follow the line of railway, the hon. gentleman declared that the expenditure was an illegal, unauthorised and unconstitutional expenditure. I have his words on that subject, and while they were not warranted by the question then under discussion, they are warranted by the question now before us. The hon. gentleman said:

"These contracts were therefore illegal, and if the hon. gentleman spent a single farthing on them the Government would be putting their hands into the public Treasury without the authority of the law, and would be guilty of a great illegality. This House would be bound to do what had been done in the case of the Churchward contract, in order to vindicate the rights of Parliament, and declare all these contracts absolutely void and illegal, without any binding effect or obligatory force whatever."

That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman with reference to an expenditure upon a telegraph line that was authorised, but taken upon the ground that the telegraph line did not follow a line of railway that had been actually located. Now the hon. gentleman comes down to Parliament and proposes to ask us to sanction an act which is a gross violation of the rights of this House. If there is any matter which peculiarly concerns the House of Commons, it is its absolute control over the money required by the Crown for public purposes. The hon. gentleman first decides that a public park is necessary. Now, I say he ought not to have so decided until he had parliamentary sanction. The first step cannot be legally taken towards the establishment of that park until Parliament has made the necessary appropriations. It is the fact of parliamentary sanction being required for such appropriations that gives Parliament efficient control over public affairs; and it would be converting this House into a mere registering body of the wishes of the Administration, if we for a moment consented to the principle that the Government shall make appropriations for public

purposes, as they see proper, and then, after the money has been expended, come down to the House and asks us to decide as to the propriety of establishing such undertakings and spending large sums of money upon them. It does seem to me that this House would be wanting in its duty to the people, as the great trustees of this country, if they permitted this expense to pass unquestioned. What necessity was there for it? If this park was absolutely necessary, the hon. gentleman ought to have known of that when we were here last year; and if he did not know of it, what was the necessity of making this expenditure before the sanction of Parliament was obtained? The hon. gentleman knows there is no such pressing necessity. It may be a very good thing to establish such a park, but it is a better thing to obey the law. Obedience in this matter is better than that superior statesmanship and energy which the Government have exhibited in this instance. It was their duty to comply with the law. We are here sitting as a deliberative and legislative body, seeking to establish laws for the government of the country, and those occupying the highest position are those who give this extraordinary example to the people of setting the law at defiance. The hon. gentleman has shown the estimate which he placed on the independence of Parliament and the respect he has for Parliament; he has shown the estimate he placed on the maintenance of parliamentary authority, by the expenditure of a very large sum without parliamentary sanction, and by asking the House, after the money is expended, to approve of what the Government have done. Why, there are instances where such approval may be necessary. There are instances of some great and unforeseen calamity having happened, of some great emergency having arisen, which demanded prompt action for the maintenance of the state or the existence of some of the institutions of the state. In such a case, the supreme necessity becomes a part of the law, and a justification for the course which the Government may think proper to take; but there is no such supreme necessity in this case. The only necessity in this case was that a certain number of the friends of the Government, a certain number of those who were the camp followers of the Administration, undertook to appropriate a part of the public domain without the expenditure of a dollar, a certain number who were watching the springs, perhaps, as an hon. gentleman on the other side has said, with their guns, for years, as Rizpah watched the corpses of her dead sons—these gentlemen had undertaken to protect the public property, against what? Against the avaricious disposition exhibited by their rivals in the Government camp; and here we have a large expenditure made—for what? Why, to enable the Government to deal with these parties and pay them certain sums out of the public Treasury, for a necessity which had no existence in fact and no existence in law, which existed only in the minds of those parties in consequence of the support they had been giving the Administration. We have not had full daylight let in upon the whole transaction, but enough has been disclosed by a member of the Treasury benches to give us some idea of the actual situation, and how the affair stood before any action was taken, and why action was taken before Parliament met. So, in order to satisfy the demands of rival competitors for the possession of property which did not belong to them, and with the view of reconciling their differences and getting rid of them, the Government made the expenditure of \$46,000, contrary to law, without the shadow of foundation in law, without any authority whatever beyond that which they expected to obtain from an obedient majority in this House. I say except from the support they expect to obtain from that obedient majority, the Government had no possible sanction or authority for what they have done. In my opinion, the House would be negligent of its duty and indifferent to its high trust, if it permitted

the conduct of the Government in this matter to pass without censure.

Mr. DAVIN. At the risk of being irreverent, I will characterise the remarks I have heard from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as parliamentary pedantry.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What?

Mr. DAVIN. Parliamentary pedantry.

An hon. MEMBER. Say it loud and say it slow.

Mr. DAVIN. I will say it as loud and as slowly as the tympanum or dulness of the hon. gentleman makes it necessary. It is a pity, I think, that the hon. member for Bothwell has not visited the Banff Springs. If he had visited them and utilised them, I have no doubt whatever we should here witness an amelioration in the hon. gentleman's general demeanour and even in regard to his oratory, if that be possible, which would be of great advantage to the party of which he is a distinguished member and to this House. Now, if we take the sub-clause quoted by the hon. member for South Oxford what do we find? The hon. gentleman read:

"If, when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good."

The hon. gentleman stopped there, but if the hon. member for South Oxford, who travelled some time ago to the North-West—I happened to have had the pleasure of being in his company as far as Calgary, and I do not think he got off at Banff—had seen what is to be seen at Banff; if he had seen the miniature Switzerland to be found there, with sanitary and æsthetic attractions such as are not to be found in any part of the world, I do not think that he would have got up here and said that to have brought—if nothing more had been done—this scene of beauty and health one year or a year and a-half earlier into such a condition that it could be utilised by the general public, was not fulfilling the conditions laid down in the Act as warranting this expenditure. But if we read further we find that:

"Then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent."

What amount of responsibility would the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) leave a Minister? He says that to obey the law is better than high statesmanship. Well, if to obey the law, in slavish adherence to the letter, is better than to act in accordance with the spirit of the law and in high statesmanship, all I can say is: God save Canada from such political pedantry. I confess the hon. member for Bothwell always seems to me to take what might be called the most politically depraved view of a question. I use, of course, the language in a strictly parliamentary sense. A great poet tells us that "the mills of the gods grind slowly but they grind exceeding small;" but if they can do anything slower or smaller than our own Mills they must be miracles of the prolix in grinding and the infinitesimal grit. I was very glad to see the effect that the discussion of this very interesting part of Canada had upon the very distinguished leader of the Opposition. It is always a great pleasure to me to hear that hon. gentleman debate, but it was almost new in my experience of parliamentary life—and I have had some experience before of this life when I was able to observe it from another place—to see the display of humor we were favored with from that quarter, and the display is due entirely to the Banff Springs. As a North-West man, I claim the whole credit of that for

the Banff Springs. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), instead of passing by Banff and going on to some other place in the mountains, should have got off there and should have got boiled as some other Reform members did. I do not know whether they are in the House now, because I know that some changes have taken place, but when I was coming from Banff, I met two members of the Reform party, and I was telling them that I had the honor and privilege of travelling westward with the hon. member for South Oxford, and was quoting to them his well known views. There is nothing private about that, because they are the same views that he has since expressed in reference to the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. These gentlemen, fresh from Banff Springs, said: We have been to the Banff Springs, we have been to Victoria, and all that sort of objection will have to be given up. I do not know whether they are in the House now, but if they are, I hope they continue to hold that view, and that they will rise in their place and say that they abandon that miserable plank in the platform of the Reform party, that the construction of that line so rapidly was improper, which has been the means of bringing into existence this very Banff. Without the Canadian Pacific Railway, the springs would be there, but they could not be utilised by the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The springs would be there, but the people would not.

Mr. DAVIN. As the right hon. gentleman says, the springs would be there, but, so far from being a valuable possession, so far from being the means of health and recreation for the people of Canada, they would have no practical existence but for that railway. I consider that the Minister of the Interior, instead of being condemned by this Parliament for the course he has taken, ought to have, as he undoubtedly will have, his action endorsed, and endorsed with a will, because, if we are to have Ministers with the responsibility of Ministers, they should be prepared to act in emergencies of this kind; they are capable of being brought before this Parliament if they have done wrong. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) talks as if there was no check whatever. If any wrong has been done, bring forward your motion and condemn the Minister, but the proper thing, in my opinion—and I have been there—I have seen the results of what has already been done, and I can foresee the results of what is to be done—the proper thing is to thoroughly endorse the Minister of the Interior as an active Minister who has confidence in the North-West, and confidence especially in that portion of the North-West, and who believes in action. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a sort of duodecimo Mephistopheles, if I may make a mixed figure. I mean that he is the embodiment in this House of the spirit that denies. Mephistopheles was the vast embodiment of the spirit that denies, according to the great German poet. The hon. member for Bothwell is one whose speeches I read with more pleasure than I hear. I fully acknowledge their ability; I like to read his speeches; and, probably, after he has taken the Banff Springs, I may like to hear them; but in this House he is the embodiment of the spirit that denies, and in that he is typical of the party to which he belongs. They have no faith in the North-West, and they appear to have little faith in Canada; and their whole attitude, especially the attitude of the hon. member for Bothwell, is an attitude of criticism, an attitude of want of faith. If they had their way, the Minister of the Interior would sit with his hands folded in his office and do nothing for that great country, instead of being alive and active, visiting the country, doing what is necessary for its needs, and seeing that Banff Springs or any other place in that country, which can be exploited for the benefit of the people of Canada and the people of the North-West, shall be developed.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was all through the North-West, and was at Banff Springs. I walked over every mile of road that has been built there. I have been trying to think since this discussion commenced, and I really cannot see where the \$46,000 has gone. There are, perhaps, from three to four miles of road built, possibly more. I do not think it would cost more than \$1,000 a mile to grub out. I am satisfied it would not cost more than an ordinary railway track through a bush, and you can get that grubbed and cleared for \$1,000 a mile. I know that the portion from Dr. Brett's to the mill is the most difficult part. In the other roads there is no cutting, but simply grubbing out. I admit that the timber is growing very thick, and that it takes considerable time for, perhaps, a considerable number of hands to work to cut that out. Still I do not see where the \$46,000 has gone. Of course, there is the bridge, but it is a mere floating bridge of unsquared timber and might be constructed in a short time. I understand that there is a reserve out of the \$46,000 to build the bridge which it is now intended to build. I do not know what the amount of that reserve is, but if nothing has been done there since I saw the place in September last, I cannot for the life of me see where the rest of the \$46,000 has gone. I am quite prepared to endorse the action of the Government in reserving the place as a park, but I believe the greatest possible care should be taken by the Government to see that money is not uselessly spent or thrown away. I am prepared to endorse to a large extent the remarks of my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces. I believe we should not indulge in more expenditure in the North-West than is absolutely necessary. I do not know that any necessity exists for any other expenditure there. There is a good road to the springs, and, unless it be for the bridge, I do not see where any further expenditure is required. I should like to know how much is reserved for that bridge. There must be a large sum reserved out of that \$46,000, or else there has been an immense sum squandered on those roads. Of course I know that wages are very high there. Men get \$2 and \$2.25 a day on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and possibly the engineer has had to pay a large sum to the men whom he employed for the work which has been done; but, admitting that wages of that kind were paid, admitting that an outside figure was paid, I contend that for the roads already built not more than from \$4,000 to \$5,000 could have been actually spent. Then there may be some money for surveys, and I know it is a very rough section to survey, and that there is a great difficulty because the timber grows so exceedingly close that in order to survey it you would have to cut out a road every way you desired to run a line. But the surveys and the roads altogether cannot possibly have swallowed up one-third of the \$46,000, and I think that the House should know where the balance has gone. I would like also to know whether the arrangement with Dr. Brett and Dr. Orton permits them to conduct the water from the springs to their hotel free of charge. The hotel is built a mile and a half or two miles from the principal spring, and I should like to know if they have the right, without paying any further charge, to conduct the water to their hotels through the pipes by which they intended to conduct it. With reference to the other springs, and I was at every one of them, I think it is desirable that they should be reserved, but they should be turned to good purpose and should be regulated in a such a way that the country would reap a return from them. We have already expended an enormous amount of money in the North-West more than \$15,000,000 in addition to what we have spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we should cry a halt in regard to this sort of thing, or show more probability of recouping the Dominion for what has been already expended. Let the Government call a halt with regard to this matter until such time as they have evidence that we are

going to realise some benefit from the amount we have invested.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member from the wild west who delighted us a few moments ago, has enlightened us as well as delighted us upon one point. Many of his old acquaintances in the wild east down here used to suppose that the flights of fancy, the gems of poesy and the flowers of rhetoric that appeared in the *Regina Leader*, were caused by the inspiration of genius. Now, Sir, we know better. He has told us it was not genius at all that dictated those articles in his paper, it was Banff. Another point that he made was that my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), was bound up in a very small compass, that he was the incarnation of a person whom he calls, in his revised edition, Mephistopheles. Well, whatever my friend from Bothwell may be the incarnation of, in whatever size of binding he is put up, we are satisfied now that my hon. friend from the wild west—he will excuse me if I cannot remember his constituency at this moment—

Mr. DAVIN. I will excuse any amount of ignorance.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the hon. gentleman for excusing my ignorance. I would remark that he has satisfied us of one thing, at all events, that whatever my hon. friend from Bothwell may be the incarnation of, my hon. friend from the wild west is the incarnation of the Banff Springs, namely, gush and gas. Well, Sir, leaving this gushing subject for a moment, I wish to refer to one point made by the hon. leader of the House, which bears out our contention in this matter. He said that the Canadian Pacific Railway would only be too glad to get hold of these lands, that we had said that the railway ought to improve the land, that they would be only too glad to get hold of it, and that they would make large profits out of it. Now, Sir, we never said the land should be given to the railway company. What we said was that the railway ought to be at the expense of putting improvements upon the reservation. We were agreed there should be a reservation, but we believe the railway should pay the expenses. And why? Because it is the railway, second to the private speculators, who will get locations on the reservation itself, who are going to make the profit out of it, and here is where the Minister's remark came in. He told us that these springs would be thronged, not only by people from Canada, but by people from Europe. Now, how are the people from Canada or Europe going to get there? Over the Canadian Pacific Railway. Who is going to make a profit out of carrying them? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and these are the people who ought to pay the expense of fixing up the park. Why, Sir, there was a little railway down in my county, called the London and Port Stanley Railway, about 24 miles long altogether, and it fixed up a park of its own at a watering place called Port Stanley, a park much more expensive in proportion to the length and the wealth of the railway, than the Banff reservation would be in proportion to the length and wealth of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and they found it one of the best speculations in the world. They spent thousands of dollars in fitting up the park, in bringing people to it, and they made money out of it after all. So, I say the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should do the same thing with the Banff reservation. All the Government should do is to reserve the land from settlement and prevent the destruction of its natural features, and call upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay the expense of improving the park. My hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), talked as if it was going to be a boon for poor people suffering from disease. It has not been explained to us by the Minister of the Interior how it was going to be a boon, and his leader has made it plain that the speculators are going to be allowed to charge for the water. Nobody can go there

without paying for the water and without paying for going over the Canadian Pacific Railway, unless he happens to be a particular friend of the Government or of the railway. Now, my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was puzzled to know what had become of the money. I think the Minister of the Interior sufficiently explained that when he told us that the work on the park was done by day's work previous to the elections, and when you have to expend money by day's work previous to an election, the wonder is, not that so much money was spent, but that they managed to limit it to \$46,000. Hon. members know how money is expended before an election, and the rat holes in which the money runs. There is one point more on which I expect to hear from the Minister of the Interior. Has he enquired into the manner of conducting the great American parks, and has he an idea upon which this is modelled? I understand the Yosemite is a public reservation, and there is also one at the Yellowstone Valley. Has the Minister made enquiries as to how these reservations were established, how they are managed, and what the Government of the country has done in regard to them? I think—I have no doubt of the fact—that he must have made such enquiries, and I hope he will now give us, briefly, the substance of his information on that subject.

Mr. COCKBURN. It was not my intention to take any part in the debate, inasmuch as I have never had the advantage of being in the North-West, or of having seen Banff. I only wish to draw attention to one point which has arisen in this debate. We have seen the eloquent leader of Her Majesty's Opposition relaxing for a moment the severity of his looks to draw attention to the remarkably exhilarating effects which the drinking of the water has had upon the right hon. Minister who leads this House. Well, Sir, it seems to me that the very description given by the Prime Minister of the exhilarating effects of the water, has had a most remarkable effect upon the leader of the Opposition himself, inasmuch as it has led him to calculate that the interest on \$46,000, at 1000 per cent., would be \$4,600,000, instead of being, as it is, \$460,000. If the hon. gentleman is to be no more accurate in his calculations, should he ever, in the lapse of ages, come across the floor, and occupy these Treasury benches, I can only hope, as a young member, that he will not trust himself, or be entrusted, with the finances of the Dominion.

Mr. MALLORY. I have no doubt that the park of which we have heard so much to-night is deserving of all the commendation that has been bestowed upon it, on account of the healing qualities of the waters of which we have heard from hon. members; and had we before us a report concerning those healing qualities from some scientific observer, if the Minister had sent some scientific expert to these springs to examine their healing properties, who had reported to the Government; if the Government of the day were able to lay before us this afternoon a plan of the park that they propose to lay aside for the use of the public of this great country of ours; if they were able to tell us what the expense of this thing is likely to be, then we would be in a position, I think, to take action upon the Bill now before us. But inasmuch as they have not seen fit, before going into the scheme, to consult Parliament in any way about it; inasmuch as they have not seen fit to lay before us estimates of the probable cost of the laying out and buying up of this park, as well as a report on the healing qualities of these springs, I think we are not in a fair position to take any action upon this scheme now. We should consider the matter very carefully before we entrust the present Ministry, or any other Ministry, with power to expend the money of the country in a scheme of this kind. I think the Ministry have been greatly at fault in the course they have taken, because there was no urgency in this matter at all. I

believe that, independent of some personal consideration, there was no urgency for action, and the moneys of this country ought not to have been expended in any way without first consulting this House. We ought to be consulted in every respect with regard to the expenditure of public money, and I believe that the Minister has failed to discharge the duties which he owes to this country, not only in this, but possibly in other respects, in that he has not consulted the House, when he knew perfectly that there was no urgency with regard to the expenditure of this money. I believe the First Minister has given us a clue to the whole matter, because when he referred in such pathetic tones to one of his supporters who has not now a place in the House, he told us casually that that gentleman was probably not so comfortably situated as he had been, as the result of his filial duty to his party, and the great zeal he had displayed for his country; and I believe the great anxiety of the present Government to lay out this great park—and I have no objection to reserving that land as a public park—and expend the public money thereon as rapidly as they have done, has not been in the interest of this country, but in the interest of some parties who formerly had seats in this House. I have no objection to the Government setting aside this land as a public park; I believe that in doing so, they are discharging a public duty, I believe this land ought to be set aside as a public park for the use of the country; but I believe, with the public debt hanging over us that exists, with our annual expenditure rapidly increasing, in view of the deficiencies that have occurred during the last couple of years, it is the duty of the representatives of the people to watch carefully any proposal to place in the hands of the Government powers such as they are asking, and when they have committed a public offence (and I believe they have committed a public offence in this case) by expending public money not absolutely necessary in the interest of the country without consulting Parliament, I trust this House will not be a party to an action of this character. I trust the Government will set aside this land for public use, as they have stated; but I hold they ought not to include in this park any coal lands, the development of which may be necessary in the interest of the country. If there are any coal lands the development of which is really in the public interest, then they should not be placed under the absolute control of any Minister of the Crown, but they should come within the ordinary law with respect to such lands.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I hope that the House considers that it is only quite recently the curative properties of the Banff Springs really became known, hon. members will find sufficient justification for the Minister of the Interior, and for the Government, in the expenditure they have undertaken on that park without waiting for the sanction of Parliament. The justification, I think, is to be found in the fact that many sufferers have been relieved, that people have gone there cripples and severe sufferers and have returned restored to health. That, in my opinion, ought to be sufficient justification. But it is very evident that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and other gentlemen who have spoken of the expenditure, and found fault with the outlay made at Banff Park, have not taken the trouble to visit that country, and had those hon. gentlemen visited the North-West and seen what a magnificent country we have when you get beyond the prairies to the mountains, they would have returned and, as the hon. members for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) have done, expressed themselves in every respect satisfied with what they saw there. It has been said that the expenditure should be made at the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Perhaps I, as an interested party, should not say much on that subject, but I may mention that the Canadian Pacific Railway

Mr. MALLORY.

Company are now expending, and will have expended by the first of July or by August, at all events, at least \$100,000 in building an hotel for the accommodation of those visiting the springs, not as a matter of profit, but with the view, when it has been made a success, of giving it over on the most reasonable terms possible to those who will manage it properly and make it a place of resort equal to any on the continent. Anyone who has gone to Banff, and from the plateau on which the hotel is to be built, has looked down on the fall immediately below, a fall of eighty feet or more with a large volume of water, who has looked on the reaches of the Bow River, and, on turning round beheld the mountains towering heavenward, and not felt himself elevated and proud that all this is part of the Dominion, cannot be a true Canadian. I should like very much that the hon. gentleman for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and all those who have some peculiar ideas of their own down there would go to the North-West, and we would then hear very little more of secession or any desire to secure other connection than that with the Dominion, and if they would go beyond Banff to the Pacific they would find that every inch of ground was a picture either of grandeur or of beauty, such as is not to be found elsewhere. I give this, not as my own opinion, because I have not crossed the continent over the other Pacific lines, but I could give the names of many Americans, who will not be supposed to be over-partial to Canada, who have been over the Canadian route and who have seen everything else that is grand on the whole continent, as well as in Europe and the eastern countries, Japan and elsewhere, and they say that for an equal extent of country they have seen nothing to compare with it. I do hope those hon. gentlemen who have not seen the North-West and the mountain district will go there without loss of time, and I am sure they will return to this House and rejoice that we have such a country and a Government that are desirous of making it what it ought to be. One word more with respect to the Banff Park. I see there is an alternative in the Bill, either to sell or to lease. I trust that the leasing system will be adopted, so that the Government will have full and thorough control of it, and thus be able to impose conditions which will prevent the introduction of much that is to be found in such places, and which it is not desirable should prevail.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are going to do with respect to the lands there. It will be pleasing to hear from so good an authority, whether the company will waive their claim or not. I think the hon. gentleman was not present when this point was mentioned.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I was not present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; but the hon. gentleman might perhaps inform us.

Committee rose.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING THE FISHERIES.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to lay on the Table of the House Correspondence relative to the Fishery Question from 1885 to 1887, and I desire at the same time to say that, although at my request the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) withdrew his motion last night for a copy of the instructions given to the fishery officers for 1887, yet after having carefully considered those instructions, which are merely supplementary to those of last year, I decided to bring them down, and they will be found embodied in the report.

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

After Recess.
BANFF NATIONAL PARK.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. In the debate which took place this afternoon some of my hon. friends on this side of the House appeared to me to mingle in this discussion two questions, which, in my opinion, should be kept entirely apart, that is the financial question and the sanitary question. Now, I have visited a great many of these remedial springs in various parts of the United States. Take, for instance, the hot springs of Arkansas, which are the most noted in the United States. These springs were claimed by three different claimants, each claiming to have a title to them, and for thirty-seven years they litigated about their rights, and for thirty-seven years they were claimed, at the point of the musket, by three different claimants, and the poor unfortunate creatures who went there to get relief were mulcted in heavy charges for the privilege of bathing in these springs. Now, I believe that the hon. gentlemen are entirely wrong when they tell me that a great sanitary establishment like that, one of nature's great remedies, should be left to private enterprise. I may say with regard to the springs at Arkansas that, during those thirty-seven years of litigation, it was discovered and decided by the courts that neither one nor the other of three claimants had a right to the springs, but that the right was vested in the Government; and when that right was recognised the matter was taken in hand and dealt with in such a manner as, I presume, the Minister of the Interior will deal with the Banff Springs. The Government took charge of the whole of them, and let them out to twenty or thirty persons who were prepared to go in and make investments, to build bath-houses, put up hotels, and provide the necessary accommodation. These people were bound to provide a certain size of pipe at a certain fixed rate, and the result is that if to-day they had twenty times the facilities connected with those springs that they now possess they could let them make an enormous sum of money. Within the last few years the United States, knowing the value of these springs, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in building a hospital on a magnificent site overlooking the springs, which is looked upon as the great sanitary institution by the army and navy of the United States, where soldiers or sailors who have served their country, and have become invalided from one cause or another, can find relief from disease and a comfortable home; and in that way it has been a great benefit to the country. That hospital is maintained at a large expense, and it is universally approved of by the statesmen and people of that great country. What I should like to see would be to have these springs recognised in future as a great sanitary establishment, not only for the disabled, sick or wounded among our soldiers or sailors, but by the whole of the people of this country, who have spent a large amount of money for the construction of a railway through that western country, and for whom every comfort and accommodation of this kind should be provided. These springs should not be under the control of private individuals, who could tax visitors to any extent they liked. In the case of the Arkansas Springs, when the Government laid out these pipes to supply the bath-houses, they made it a condition with the people there that no greater charge should be made than twenty cents a bath to anybody and everybody, and the poorest individual that visits them can get the baths at that rate. What is the state of things in Banff? When I was there I saw a couple of men sitting there with muskets, ready to defend them against the claims of a gentleman who was formerly a member of this House. I say that if these springs had got into the hands of private individuals—and they were very nearly getting into private hands—there would have been a grand monopoly there; they would have been a perfect failure, owing to the want of capital on the

part of the men who would control them, and that would result in extraordinary charges and the lack of proper facilities and accommodation for visitors.

Mr. CASEY. There is nothing in the Bill to regulate the charges.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend says there is nothing in the Bill to regulate the charges, but the Government of the day is responsible to the people of this country, and I know there is intelligence enough in the Department of the Interior to make such regulations as will commend themselves to the public and lead them to believe that they are reasonable and just. What I would desire to see result from this legislation is not only the establishment of these facilities for the general public, but that in the early future an immense hospital may be established there, on our own soil and reached by our own railway, where the diseased, the sick and the suffering from whatever cause might resort for relief. I am not a scientist myself and cannot tell what the properties of the water are, but I may say that I spent one hour in the springs with my friend Mr. Trow, and spent it so comfortably that I would like to have spent a whole day there. But this I can say, that the springs of Arkansas cannot begin to compare with those of Banff in their strength and power for the relief of the diseased and suffering. My hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) spoke about the impropriety of the Government spending any money for parks. Well, that is one of the very things that I approve of in this transaction. The land in that part of the country is valueless for agricultural purposes, but it is immensely valuable in its attractions, its scenery, and the health-giving properties of its atmosphere. I believe the Government have done a wise and a just thing in securing an immense tract of this country, so as to make that park attractive, not only for the people of to-day, but so that those who come after us will find that they are not hampered by limited accommodations, or cumbered by individual or personal rights in spots of the surrounding territory. I believe that future generations will commend the men who have taken on themselves the responsibility of taking the matter up in time and assuming this extent of territory before it was interfered with by personal or individual interests, and who will endeavor to make it as attractive a resort as possible. It is said that private individuals have rights there and are building hotels, but I think it is to the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they are willing to spend many thousands of dollars in building a hotel there, and who will find fault with them for doing it? Do they interfere with the rights of the park? I presume that any rights they have will be given to them under proper restrictions; and I say it is a relief to the Government to know that men of that calibre have the enterprise—and I am proud to say they have the capital—to assist in making it a credit not only to Canada, but to the continent of America. I would, therefore, ask our friends on this side to discover from the consideration of this Bill the purely financial question, with regard to the issue of the Governor's warrants, as that is a matter which can be discussed at a subsequent period of the Session, and I ask them to look upon the question in the meantime upon its merits. Let us deal with this question as a sanitary one, and one which is likely to give reputation and character to the public men of Canada, in dealing with the interests of the poorer classes of the community. I think it would not be well to place restrictions upon the Minister of the Interior in providing regulations for the management of the park, because it would be impossible for us to define what those regulations should be, and it would be both impolitic and injudicious to come to Parliament and ask authority for every change that might

require to be made in the regulations with regard to the disposal of those water rates. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend to withdraw the fiscal objection to this Bill, to deal with it purely from a sanitary point of view, and allow the Minister of the Interior to see how he can spread himself in making the Banff park a success and a credit to the country.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has spoken eloquently in favor of the proposition to establish a national park. I have not understood, from any remarks that have fallen from any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that the policy of reserving this tract of land has been called in question. I think I have heard almost every gentleman who has spoken rather approving of that policy. Nor have they confined their objection to what the hon. member for Northumberland has called the fiscal question. There has been a question more important than that raised—a question which I supposed the hon. gentleman, from his long experience in parliamentary life, would have been one of the first to express a very emphatic opinion upon. It has been charged by the hon. member for South Huron, who supported the hon. member for Bothwell, that the Government have, in defiance of constitutional usage, and in direct opposition to a positive Act of Parliament, appropriated a very large sum of money for building up this park. Now, Sir, it may or may not be judicious for us, after we have the proper information, before us, to vote this sum of money. What is contended for is this—and it is a proposition that has my most cordial support—that it is dangerous in the extreme to allow the Government to expend large sums of public money without having first received the sanction of Parliament. Parliament in its wisdom has already laid down the lines within which Government may expend the public money without parliamentary sanction; and the question the House ought to consider is simply this; whether this expenditure is within the lines laid down in the Statute. I heard my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) deliver a very flowery speech this afternoon about the medicinal character of the water, the salubrity of the air, the beauty of the scenery, and all that sort of thing. Well, as to the medicinal character of the water, I have failed to hear from the Minister that he has had any analysis made of it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That has been said two or three times. If the hon. gentleman looks at my report he will find that Mr. Sugden Evans analysed the water.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I have not read the report; but the medicinal character of the water, the salubrity of the air, and the beauty of the scenery have not been improved by the expenditure of \$46,000 of public money. They remain the same, and hon. gentlemen may talk as they please, but this broad fact will remain, the expenditure of this large sum is not in the interest of the public at large, and cannot be for the benefit of the poor. It is entirely for the benefit of the wealthy. My hon. friend from Northumberland can afford to spend hundreds of dollars for the benefit of his health in going hundreds of miles from the centres of population to visit this place; but how can a poor man go, whether he lives in Ontario, Quebec, or the Maritime Provinces? I do not wish to make this a sectional matter by any means; but this illegal and unconstitutional expenditure is an act which this new Parliament should at the very earliest moment place itself on record against. I think it would be a lamentable thing if we should sit here silent and endorse that action. What is the use of having an Act of Parliament at all? We know that there is nothing the English House of Commons guards more jealously than its control over the expenditure of public money by the Government; and the same jealousy should exist, and has existed here, and Parliament has embodied that jealousy in a statute. Can hon. gentlemen contend that they have

acted within either the letter or the spirit of that Act? No one has so contended or can so contend. The money has been illegally and unconstitutionally spent, and with the knowledge of the fact that a new Parliament was about to meet. The hon. gentleman, if he intended to expend that money, should have come before this Parliament, laid his plan before us, showed what the total expenditure was going to be; and then, if after examining our financial condition we thought it was justifiable, we could have given him authority to expend it. My hon. friend from Northumberland talks about the United States. Why, Sir, is there any parallel to be drawn between the United States and this Dominion with reference to the expenditure of public money? No one knows better than he does that the United States Government have such a large surplus that they do not know how to expend it, and it is quite right and proper that that Government should expend money in the improvement of the Arkansas Springs to which he has referred. I have no doubt that they did it legally and constitutionally, nor have I any doubt that they are able to afford it. But there are two questions that we ought to decide. In the first place, has this money been expended unconstitutionally? If it has, I say the House ought to censure that expenditure. In the next place, before we vote a dollar of it, we ought to be satisfied, from information from the Department, what the total expenditure is going to be, and whether the financial condition of this Dominion is such as to justify it. I would like the hon. gentleman, who has spent \$46,000 unnecessarily and illegally on this park, to stand on any public hustings of Canada, and defend his action before the people who are feeling the taxation of the country so severely. It is all very well to talk about the medicinal qualities of the water and the beauty of the scenery. There are many things we would like to have in this country if we could afford them; but, in homely language, we have to cut our coat according to our cloth, and I doubt whether the people either in this end of the Dominion or the maritime end will sanction what seems to me an unnecessary expenditure of public money. We are at the present time passing through almost a financial crisis. We have an abnormal deficit, the largest we have ever had, and from what I can gather we are on the eve of the announcement of another deficit not quite so large; and is this the time the hon. gentleman should choose to engage in an expenditure, the limits of which he cannot state to this House? We are now on the down track, giving the hon. gentleman *carte blanche*, and if the hon. gentleman's conduct receives the approval of this House, if we sit in silence and ratify his unconstitutional act, what can we expect in the future? In the part of the country I come from it is almost impossible to wring out a cent from the Government for necessary public works, without which the people cannot carry on their business. Oh, but, we are told, you are to have a Banff national park 3,000 miles away. That is not a satisfactory answer to the tax-payer; and although you may carry away hon. members in this House, when you come down to the level of common sense, your act is unconstitutional, the expenditure is uncalled for, and it would be politically criminal on the part of this House to allow this thing to go on. I reserve any expression of opinion as to whether it would be desirable in the future to expend money on this national park. It may or may not be so; but I say at the present time, in our present financial condition, we are not justified in expending a large sum of money for any such purpose. I oppose it on these grounds, and I condemn in the strongest language the unconstitutional conduct and violation of statute law which have been exhibited in this expenditure of \$46,000 without the approval of Parliament.

Mr. BURDETT. As a new member, before being called upon to justify the unauthorised expenditure of public

money, I think we ought to have reasonable explanation of what disposition is to be made of the money, and how much is likely to be required. While I am ready to support any Government in any reasonable expenditure which may be necessary for opening up the country either east or west, and making railway or other improvements to induce people to come into the country, I am not prepared to vote *carte blanche* to any Government, either Liberal or Tory, without knowing what the approximate cost of the undertaking will be. If this is to be a new pool of Siloam, let us keep it. We may have those springs and the medicinal benefit therefrom without this national park attached. There are two distinct propositions involved in this measure. I do not see that it is requisite for a man, after visiting the springs to travel over territory, admittedly 260 square miles in area in order to ascertain whether he is fully restored to health or not. We may have the springs in their entirety without the national park. Neither am I disposed to oppose setting apart a portion of our domain for a national park. I think that ought to have been done in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario long ago. I think that a portion of the waste lands and timber limits in each Province ought to have been set aside for the purpose of assisting agriculture, protecting our streams, avoiding freshets supplying springs, and for many other reasons and objects fully discussed, advocated and admitted in the State of New York, in reference to the Adirondack Mountains. But before I feel disposed to vote for the expenditure of money in this direction, I would like to ascertain whether the Government owns this land which they are disposed to set apart for a park. Who has the fee of the soil? If the Government own this land I might be disposed to stretch a point and give them the power to turn it into a national park, but what is the fact? Why we have here hon. gentlemen advocating on behalf of some men—on behalf of what might be called shot-gun proprietors—their rights, and others say they have rights, and the Canadian Pacific Railway contend they also have rights to the soil. Has any disposition been made of all these claims? Have the Government decided on any fixed way of settling these rights? Have the Government or their officers been able, by any means, to secure these rights by paying a fair price for the lands disputed? Have the Government any assurance that there are no settlers on the land, or that if there are settlers, they will sell their rights at reasonable prices? Or will we have to face the probability that, after the Government has made the place valuable, these people will insist upon being paid fancy prices for the land. What I understand by a national park is a territory set apart exclusively for the public, a territory free from settlers, free from corporations, free from monopolists of all characters and kinds. I understand the burning question in the Senate of the United States with reference to the Yellowstone Park was as to whether a charter should be given to a railway to run through the park. People are prevented from taking timber from the Yellowstone Park, they are prevented exploring it for minerals; it has been made absolutely a game preserve, so that all the animals that frequent that part of the country may be free from the hunter at all seasons of the year. I can understand and appreciate that. Does the Government, however, propose to turn our park into a coal-mining corporation, or a lumbering corporation, or a hotel-keeping corporation? Is the latter to be run on the Scott Act principle? Or what sort of a hotel is it to be? We would like to know, and I fancy the Government would be very much divided on that question as they are on many others. I desire to have some information on these points. The moment you allow proprietorship over any portion of the land, by lengthened leases or otherwise, you remove the element of a national park from the district. Allow coal miners

and hunters and lumberers to frequent and work it, and it ceases to be a national park; and they would certainly destroy the game, and the fish, and the scenery, and all the beauties we have heard so much of. I cannot understand why there is not territory enough there to enable the Government to select a portion of the country over which there is no proprietorship except that of the Government itself. We are told a great deal of the medicinal qualities of the springs, and I hope these have not been exaggerated, but I find there has been no such haste in establishing parks in Ontario and Quebec, where I have always understood we had the finest scenery in the world. We have for instance Niagara Falls, than which nothing can be more picturesque and grand, but I never heard of any effort being made to establish a park there until the Ontario Government became alive to its necessity, and at great public expense are trying to establish a park in that justly celebrated region. I would like to know authoritatively whether this is intended to be a sanatorium to cure the afflicted of mankind. We are told that it is intended to heal cripples, but I hope by cripples are not meant the political cripples, whose pockets have been depleted by serving the interests of their party. I hope they are not the style of cripples who are to be restored to health after having been washed in these waters of the fountain of life, as it has been called. Not more than one in a thousand of people can visit this place, and when we are asked to vote supplies for this purpose, we ought to have some reasonable ground to justify our action. So far, I have heard none. It also appears to me that the Government ought to be able to approximate very nearly the actual expenditure required for this work. It does not seem to me there is anything novel in constructing a road, building a bridge or railway, or in erecting an hotel—there is nothing so novel or unknown in these structures as to prevent the Government calculating to a certainty what the cost will be, before asking us to vote the money. If they will make it clear the expenditure is within our limited means, and that these springs have the valuable character assigned to them, let the Government make and keep this as a national park exclusively, and not a park which may partly become a mining or a lumbering district. I do not believe in placing the power of leasing the park in the hands of any Government. No Government is so pure and disinterested as to ask for a particular power, without having a great desire to use it. Powers are not asked simply for pastime or pleasure, but they are asked in order that they may be used, and no doubt if unlimited power is given over this domain to any Minister, it will be used for the purposes of that Minister or of his party, to some extent. I do not blame any political party in using honestly the privileges and rights pertaining to their position, for the benefit of their friends, provided they keep first the public service in view. But I want to guard against the unauthorised expenditure of public money, or the expenditure of public money on a park or for any other purpose, before we have an approximate idea of what the cost will be, and before we know that the land will be kept exclusively for the purpose intended and for no other purpose or reason whatever. If these were the only coal fields or timber limits to be found in the North-West, there might be some excuse for the Government reserving the right to sell or use them, but there are ample mines and timber limits elsewhere which the Government can dispose of. I am prepared to give some assistance to the Government to build the park, but I must first know whether we are going to get the worth of our money. We have lived and prospered and enjoyed a fair portion of health without the Banff Springs. The name is almost enough to destroy any springs, and I would suggest that we should give them some respectable name at any rate. These are the reasons for my objections to this expenditure at this time.

Mr. CASEY. I simply wish to read a paragraph containing the hon. Minister's promise to give us certain information he has refused to-night. During the debate on the first stage of the Bill I find the following reported in *Hansard*:—

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister of Interior to say that, before he proceeds to discuss this in committee, he will supply an estimate of the cost, and also bring down to us a list of the persons having leases, a memorandum showing the extent of property under lease and the nature of the leases passed?"

"Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Certainly."

That was a definite promise to bring down an estimate of the cost and to state the nature of all the leases. Now, the hon. Minister has stated the nature of some of the leases; he has told us in regard to the timber leases and the mining permits, but he has told us nothing of the nature of the leases given to Dr. Orton and Dr. Brett, and any other parts of the Government who may have obtained locations there; and he has absolutely refused, in the face of repeated challenges, to give us an estimate of the cost, which, on 29th April, he definitely promised to give us before taking this step with the Bill. I now challenge the hon. gentleman again, and ask if he will give us this information, or if he will maintain his attitude of mock dignity and refuse to be questioned on this very peculiar transaction.

Mr. TROW. The argument of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) seemed to me to be not logical. He states that we have lived alongside the falls of Niagara for fifty years without undertaking to form a public park. Had the Province of Ontario or the Dominion Government purchased that land fifty years ago from the original proprietors, we might have had that as a park much cheaper than we can get it under present circumstances. I understand that on the Canadian side the owners are now asking not less than \$10,000 an acre for their lands, and on the American side the State of New York is probably paying at least double that in some instances for the lands which they have procured for that public park. The Government here have taken the initiative while the lands are possessed by the Crown and they can utilise them as they think proper. We do not say that there is any job intended. The present expenditure seems to me not to be too lavish. When I was there a year or so ago, there was nothing to be had but a little pork and beans which you could purchase for dinner for a dollar. I have heard that the healing properties of these waters are unsurpassed and that they have done immense good, and scores of people are going and will go there, and those waters will increase in sanitary value when the necessary accommodations are constructed. I consider this is very desirable. We could not expect to attract our own people when there was no accommodation, and anyone who is afflicted certainly requires some accommodation; but there were no men of capital who would undertake to supply it in that remote region without having some railway communication, and some attempt to ascertain what the properties of the springs were, and without the locality being thoroughly surveyed and laid out. In the meantime, it is for the Government to say what steps they will take to improve it further. I do not say they are justified in expending \$200,000 or \$300,000 more, as my hon. friend has suggested, but I suppose their object is to open roads and make the place attractive. As I understand from the Minister of the Interior, a considerable portion of this amount is still unexpended, being intended for this bridge across the Bow River. It must be a very expensive structure, because the river is very wide at that point, and, if it is to be an iron structure, of course it will be very expensive to bring the material there, to a region so remote from the place of manufacture.

Mr. IVES. I think it does credit to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that, while there is apparently an organised attempt on the part of his colleagues on that side to waste the day on this exceedingly trivial matter, and to

make a little political capital out of it, he and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) have defended the action of the Government. I think we on this side of the House would be willing to leave the defence of the course of the Government to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. It does him infinite credit that he has taken the line he has taken in this debate. When we see the United States, to which the hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of referring on all occasions, taking the course they have taken in regard to the establishment of a national park in Dakota, and the Province of Ontario taking the steps they have to create a provincial park of recreation at Niagara, I think the abstract question of whether it is desirable or not that a national reserve should be made near the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains, is, beyond all question, settled by the people of this country in favor of such a reserve; and, if I am not mistaken, I have heard several hon. gentlemen opposite, on previous occasions when this matter has been under discussion, express their approval of a reserve being made in the west for a national park. I am quite sure that I have heard that principle approved of. Well, the reserve has been made in a sort of a way, and the initiatory steps have been taken to make this property attractive to tourists and the public generally, and a good deal has been said about it both by newspapers on this continent and by the press on the other continent, and it has attracted a good deal of public attention. As I understand the question as it is now presented, the Government is taking absolute steps to do what they have in a sort of a way done heretofore. The public have approved of this. The public have settled on the fact that a park is to be reserved there. It is approved of generally by every one, and the question is, has the expenditure so far been inordinate? I think we may safely take the testimony of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), who says the amount of expenditure has not been more than it should have been. He seems to think that the expenditure has been a wise expenditure, and I should suppose that hon. gentlemen, after their experience in the past few months, would find that this sort of small talk does not go very far with the people. I cannot understand the object, five years from a general election, in wasting the whole afternoon, and for one hon. gentleman to stand on his feet at least a dozen times to address the House on this question, and to badger the Minister, when he must know from past experience that these little talks on little questions amount to an exceedingly small affair when they come to be laid before the people of the country. We have had in the past hundreds of afternoons wasted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the hope of making political capital, but when the day of reckoning came, when the time came to go to the people for a verdict, they had not time to refer to the matter at all, and they must appreciate the fact that it was all lost time. It is too early in the day, five years from a general election and in a hopeless minority in the House, to try to make capital out of this, and I should think it would be better to try to make capital out of something that would be remembered for one year at least and would be approved by the common sense of the people whenever we go to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that any of us who have observed the course of the hon. gentleman, and listened to him in past Parliaments, will be surprised to find that he has not the slightest appreciation whatever of the value of an important constitutional principle which may be involved when there is to be a raid on the Treasury. He has spoken as we expected him to speak, and as we expect to have him speak. Whenever anything cannot logically be defended from the statutes, we know that the hon. gentleman will always be ready to defend it with his

vote. In this instance the question is two-fold. The first question is, whether it is desirable to reserve property for a national park, as to which, on certain conditions, we are agreed. The second question is, whether the Government had the right, under the statute, to appropriate the money they did appropriate by Governor General's warrant, as to which we are entirely disagreed. And I may add, that the Minister of the Interior did certainly promise, as the *Hansard* shows, to bring down an estimate of the cost when we went into committee. I have not heard the hon. gentleman bring down any such estimate, nor have I heard him deny the accuracy of the report in the *Hansard*, which my hon. friend has just read. More than that, the hon. gentleman at that time informed the House that this property was not covered by the claims of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was a natural mistake, perhaps, but to-day the hon. gentleman has to come and tell us that of this property which is proposed to be reserved as a national park, a considerable quantity, how much he does not appear to know, belongs to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald A. Smith) might have shed some light upon the subject, and to him I put the question before the House rose; but he is not in his place, so that he cannot give me this information. It would appear that this national park is to be a thing of shreds and patches, to borrow a favorite phrase of the First Minister. A part of it has gone from us in the shape of coal lands, as to which I must say that unless those coal lands are the only ones of equal value situated in the North-West, I have doubts as to the wisdom of their remaining in private hands in the centre of the park. Then we find that leases have been made, and I did not notice that the Minister of the Interior gave us any information in detail as to the leases of the sanitarium. He stated, he admitted, that some of these portions of land had been leased to Dr. Brett—I think the name was, but I did not hear him give any details of these leases. He gave details of the timber limit leases, and one or two other matters, but not of the mode in which these portions which belong to the sanitarium had been leased, which it is of some consequence for us to know. With these lands, in addition to the coal lands and the timber limits, which may be cancelled, the hon. gentleman admits that there is this unknown quantity in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I must say that I think if we are to have a national park, I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) that we ought to have the whole of it, we ought to control the whole of it, we ought not to sell it, and I believe, as was suggested by several gentlemen on both sides of the House, it ought to be leased on short terms, as is done in the case of the Yellowstone Park, but we ought not to part with control, for any length of time, of property which it is proposed to reserve for the benefit of the people. Now, I think if the Minister will look at his own statement he will see that we are quite in our right in saying that he distinctly gave us to understand that he would give us an estimate, and that is all that he has been asked for in the first instance, at any rate from this side of the House.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I confess to some disappointment that a question of this kind should be made a subject of party controversy in this House. The establishment of a national park is surely one of those questions that we might discuss on both sides of the House without the slightest reference to party, certainly without imputation of corrupt motives which came, at least from one of the hon. gentlemen on that side. That accusation was so broadly put, so insultingly put, that I declined to answer any further questions of that hon. gentleman, although I recognise his right as a member of Parliament to ask any question he pleases. The question, however, that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has put in relation to the expenditure and the general statements made as to the expendi-

tures to which the scheme might give rise, imply to some extent, at any rate, an estimate as to the future. The expenditures which have been made up to now, very largely, if not entirely, meet the necessities of the park until now, but in the meantime it is absolutely necessary—I am not dealing with the constitutional question which the hon. gentleman raised, and to which I will refer in a moment—but it was absolutely necessary, if we were going to make this park of use at all, that certain works should be prosecuted in connection with it, that certain roads should be built, and a bridge across the Bow River, that a thorough survey of the park should take place, and that works for the conduct of the water down to the different points should be undertaken. The cave spring, which everyone who has seen it recognises as a natural curiosity, as well as of wonderful curative properties, should be made in such a way that people could get into it without the necessity of going down the ladder, which my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and my hon. friends from South Perth (Mr. Trow) and North Perth (Mr. Hesson), I believe, have descended on one or two occasions. All these works were necessary to put the park in a position to use at all. But those works completed, leave the question of what further works may be undertaken one entirely of convenience. My own conviction is that it would be unwise and unnecessary to make any considerable expenditure during the next year beyond that which may be necessary for the completion of the works already commenced, and I think when hon. gentlemen see the estimates for the works next year, they will find that that principle has been carried out. I cannot give the hon. gentlemen the details, although I think I will be able to do so when we come to discuss the Supplementary Estimates—and these items will be in the Supplementary Estimates—but I cannot at this moment give him the exact details which have gone to make up every item of this expenditure. Some \$10,000 expenditure has been made in connection with a topographical survey of the whole park, and for the early road building that was undertaken. The further money was obtained in order that the work might go on early in the spring, and be ready for this summer, when tourists will go to that part of the country. That was the motive for that expenditure being made, for the Governor General's warrant being obtained for that \$31,000; and, I think, as I said before, it will be found that that expenditure will nearly complete those necessary works, which, if we are to have a park at all, if we are to utilise those springs, were necessary to be undertaken in the meantime. But beyond this the question of expenditure is purely one of convenience, that Parliament may decide upon from time to time, as it thinks proper. Then the hon. gentleman says it is discovered that the Canadian Pacific Railway line, the line agreed upon as the western boundary of the territory from which their grant will be taken, extends up into this reservation. It does not extend to the hot springs; the hot springs are in no way touched by the reserve. The Devil's Head Lake, for instance, is within that portion of the territory which is east of the boundary from which the grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be given. But, if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to assert their right to this property—because after all, it is a question of agreement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the appropriation of these lands—they cannot select and reject at will—if they were to do that we would simply find, as to that part of the park that it reduced our park to that extent, but did not in the slightest degree affect the question of expenditure, because, beyond a small portion of road extending some three miles eastward of the boundary to the Devil's Head Lake, there has been no expenditure in connection with the national park proper, on what may be regarded as an area that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might possibly ask for, although I do not believe they will.

Then the hon. gentleman from South Oxford referred to the coal land, and takes the ground—which I think, perhaps has a good deal in it—that unless these coal lands are the only anthracite coal areas in that district, we ought to make some arrangement for buying them out. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that these people have paid \$14,000 for 1,100 acres of coal lands. They got this land when this was all coal area, and before there was any question of it being a national park at all, before the making it into a national park was in contemplation. But I cannot quite understand how the hon. gentleman can reconcile himself with his friends, who oppose any expenditure whatever in connection with the national park, when he suggests that we should actually enter into negotiations with these people who have bought these lands at large prices, and who, evidently, considered them valuable. They have made some expenditure, I do not know to what extent, but they have taken some coal out of the mines—he thinks we should enter into negotiations to buy these coal areas back. We may have the power under this Bill to regulate the manner by which the mining shall be carried on—the surroundings and everything of that kind—but to undertake to purchase it back again would be a very serious matter indeed. In relation to the timber question I may say, as I said this afternoon, that if we can arrange to exchange these limits for others, or in some other way release the park altogether from the presence of those leases, that course may hereafter be considered necessary. The hon. gentleman says I have made no statement as to the terms of the leases to persons who have erected hotels. Dr. Brett in company with some of his friends has erected an hotel at a cost, I am told, of between \$30,000 and \$40,000. A suggestion is made that some ex-member of Parliament was interested in that expenditure. All I can say is this: I do not think it can be held to be a ground of complaint against Dr. Orton that he has joined with another gentleman to spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 for the erection of an hotel in that park, if it shall turn out, as I can assure hon. gentlemen it will turn out, that he will get no concession or advantage not given to any one else erecting an hotel, for the privilege will be given to whoever is willing to erect an hotel there, having regard to the general areas set apart for that particular purpose. These terms were not agreed upon for this reason: I thought it very much better to wait for a while and study a little more what rental we should exact; but there is a condition in the permission given to Dr. Brett for his building, that he shall pay whatever rental may be hereafter determined, and that rental shall be paid from the commencement—that is for the land on which the hotel is situated and two or three acres round about used for pleasure grounds. The same course will be pursued in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's hotel; they will have to pay the same rental. In order to have no difficulty as to the possession of the springs themselves and the water flowing from them, if hon. gentlemen will look at the report of the Department of the Interior they will find that as far back as the 30th June of last year an Order in Council was passed as the result of the report made by Mr. Hall, Secretary of the Department, in respect of the management of the Arkansas Springs, in which we laid down the terms on which persons could get the use of the water of the Banff Springs. Those terms are the terms in existence to-day, and whatever person may go there and erect an hotel will be compelled to pay for the water on those terms. The question behind that, respecting the power the Government proposes to obtain under this Bill, to decide as to what shall be charged to the public per bath and matters of that kind, are subjects of consideration at this moment. Then as to the town site on the other side of Bow River, which has been laid out, and the cost of survey of which is part of the expenditure made. We have offers in two ways, either to sell or lease the town

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

lots. The plans have only been got out within the last day or two, but my own feeling is strongly in favor of leasing in order to retain absolute control of the character of the buildings erected and the general conduct of affairs near the park, the object being if possible to make the park a model as to the general character of its surroundings, and that can only be secured by leasing rather than by selling lots to parties who, under those circumstances, might put up such buildings as they thought proper. I venture to think—of course I may be wrong—that within a year or two hon. gentlemen will find that instead of this national park being a burthen to the country, we will be deriving revenue from those leases and from the springs that will quite compensate us, and will certainly pay liberal interest on all expenditures we have made in connection with it. It is not altogether a one-sided matter. My anticipation is, that we shall not only have a park with these advantageous surroundings but that the result of dealing with the property as is proposed will be to furnish a revenue quite sufficient to defray the expense of supervision and management, and also pay a liberal interest on all the expenditure we have made in connection with it. As to the expenditure for the future, the suggestion is made that the park will cost \$200,000 or \$300,000; but there is no intention to make such an expenditure, and in the meantime we are simply making a small expenditure for the purpose of carrying out those improvements which were necessary to bring the park into a condition to be of use and advantage. That is not the only park that we have ventured by Order in Council to reserve. We have reserved others, but have made no expenditure on them, for the simple reason that they required no expenditure to bring them into use, in the meantime at all events. We had no less than four forest reservations through the mountains, and my impression is that they will prove advantageous not simply as large groves of fine forest trees in parks of which we ought to be proud, but they will be of advantage to the country in regard to its salubrity, and so far as the grazing areas are concerned these groves will retain the moisture and prove of great utility. One word as to the constitutional question raised. I accept to the fullest extent the general view laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is undesirable for the Government to expend money without the consent of Parliament. Parliament ought to have, and in fact has control over every expenditure. But there is just this point in connection with the matter: I looked upon it—I may have been wrong, and it is evident I was wrong—but I held conversations with some hon. gentlemen opposite, with public men and others outside of the House on both sides of politics, and I never heard a suggestion from any one until it was made in the House to-day, that it was not an exceedingly wise act to reserve this national park and to utilise at the earliest possible moment the results which must flow from its reservation and improvement. We are living in a time when even a period of twelve months is a matter of consequence. The Canadian Pacific Railway had just been completed. Last year when Parliament was in session I confess that so far as I was concerned I knew comparatively little about the park, although I had been at Banff. Our object was to obtain the report of the gentleman placed in charge of the works there. He was selected because he was considered eminently qualified for work of that kind. He is a civil engineer and a clever landscape architect, and he has proved by the work done to be quite equal to the promises I had of him when appointed to the position. The expenditure I admit has grown, for the idea at first was that probably \$5,000 or \$6,000 might have been sufficient. But this Parliament the Session came on late. If Parliament had been called in January we would have been able to obtain the vote of Parliament for the \$31,000, the amount of the latest warrant used in connection with the bridge and other works of that kind, and have secured their

completion in time for the tourist travel of this year. I thought it was a matter of great consequence that almost contemporaneously with the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway we should have this great attraction in a condition that would cause the road itself and the country itself to be talked about abroad. For that reason, therefore, the Government took the responsibility, not believing for a moment that there would be any suggestion of party motives in the matter—because there is really no room for anything of that kind—they took the responsibility of expending this money, trusting to the vote of Parliament, when Parliament met, to endorse it. I do not think it is necessary that I should say any more, but I thought it desirable to make this general reply to some of the remarks that were made on the other side.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has chosen to complain that I made imputations against him which he characterised as insulting, and he says that, for that reason, he refuses to answer any further questions from me. Well, Sir, I have seen a great deal of this conduct on the part of Ministers at different times—this putting on of an air of dignity and refusing to answer questions, because of imputations of jobbery or something of that sort, or because suspicions of that character were expressed. But the Ministers who have taken that course have always been very young Ministers, who have not been more than a year or two in office, who are very fresh, and who are oppressed with a great sense of their own dignity, and the result of their taking that course has invariably been to make themselves ridiculous, as the hon. gentleman has made himself on this occasion. The result of his general reply is that he would have saved a good deal of time, if he had made these remarks before, because it was in order to get some of the information contained in that general reply that we have been discussing this matter for hours, and the reply itself had to be couched in apologetic tones, instead of being a mere explanation, as it would have been earlier. I will only touch on one ground of his explanation just now. It was that he had been encouraged to expend this money unconstitutionally, as he admits, by the fact that gentlemen on this side had almost unanimously expressed their approbation of making this reservation. Let it be said finally, and be remembered once and for all, that the questions of the reservation and the present Bill have no connection at all. We are, I believe, unanimously in favor of making a reservation. The question is, whether money shall be spent on it, how much money shall be spent, and how it shall be managed. If the Minister has couched his Bill in such language that, without an explanation from him, it savors of a job, and even with his explanation has a little of that flavor about it, it is his fault and not ours; it is owing to the peculiar construction of this Bill that the opposition of which he speaks has been given to it. I was not prepared to make any opposition to it until I read the Bill when it was introduced the other day, and found that it was such a Bill that we could not decently allow it to pass without full discussion and explanation.

Mr. PLATT. The expenditure of public money when it is for the general advantage of the tax-payers of Canada, or the universal advantage of those who have to supply the money for the public chest, cannot well be objected to; but wherever an expenditure is asked for, the result of which is that it will be to the benefit of the few while the many have to pay the piper, I think then objection may well be taken. I think, Sir, that the establishment of public parks, where they are necessary to the public health or the public advantage, and where every citizen who adds his mite to the amount of money necessary for the completion of such parks reaps his share of the benefit, it may be well enough. But in the project which we are now discussing I take it for granted that of every thousand dollars expended

on the Banff park, as it is called, nine hundred and ninety-nine of those dollars will be paid by tax-payers who will never see Banff park, or derive any benefit from it whatever. Upon those grounds I object altogether to the expenditure of public money for such a purpose. It is simply an extension of the principle, which has been a growing one in this country of ours, of taxing the poor tax-payers of Canada to pay for the luxuries of the rich. It may be all very well for the hon. member for South Perth, the hon. member for North Perth, and the hon. member for Northumberland to visit those springs and bathe in their medicinal waters, but it would also be well enough if those gentlemen would pay for those luxuries, and not tax them upon those who will probably never see the springs or hear of them, except through the newspapers. Now, whether or not this may be a political job, whether or not there may be this or the other political influence which may benefit financially from this expenditure of public money, I look upon it as a job against the tax-payers of the Dominion, a job which is calculated to benefit those who are rich and able to spend their own money to go to that distant region, and that this park will be maintained for the advantage of that class by those who are unable, and who probably always will be unable, to receive any advantage from it. For that reason I object entirely to the expenditure of public money for any such purpose, without the people of Canada having an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. It may be said that what the opinion of this Parliament is, should be the opinion of the country. But, as I understand it, the money has been expended on this park without the consent of Parliament. I am sure, Sir, that, no matter what may be the vote of Parliament upon this question, the money will be expended without the consent of the tax-payers of this country, and on their behalf I raise my voice against the expenditure of money from which they will receive no benefit or advantage.

On section 4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think a limit of time ought to be fixed for these leases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an objection to fixing a limit. As I understand, a portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas, and I believe the plan of the architect lays these out, to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome buildings upon them. These buildings will have to be subject to the approval of the Government, to prevent any monstrosities being put there to destroy the general beauty of the park. We cannot say what length of time we can get people to take leases for in order to induce them to put up handsome buildings. Twenty-one years are suggested as sufficient, but people will not build handsome houses on 21-year leases. If there is to be a limit at all, there must be the right of renewal. I think the hon. gentleman and the House may trust any Government with the settlement of that question in the interest of the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest a further amendment, that is, that all the regulations made by the Governor in Council ought to be submitted to Parliament within a certain number of days after the opening of each Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to that. We will make it fifteen days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that in addition to ordinary habitations the Bill provides for buildings for the purposes of trade and industry. Such buildings will not come under the principles he has laid down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that there are portions of this large tract of land in which useful buildings can be erected without interfering with the beauty of the main portions of the park. It is of the most varied description, broken by glens, valleys and undulations of every kind, and there may be places where the property may be used for industrial purposes without interfering with the beauty of the park as a whole.

Mr. PLATT. The First Minister tells us that there are certain portions of this park which will be leased to wealthy people. I would like to ask if there are any little corners which will be leased to those who are not wealthy. Is it for the wealthy alone that this park is to be established? If so, let us go in and spend enough money to make it something worth while. I would like to ask the Minister whether there will be houses of entertainment. Shall we not have a theatre? Can we not have card tables, and everything else necessary to provide a jolly good time for the rich people of this country at the expense of the poor people. If that is to be the character of this park, let us know it, and give us passes on the railway so that we can go out there. It appears that this place is intended to be made a very nice health resort for the wealthy people of this country. I plead for those who ought to receive an equal benefit with those who have influence with the powers that be, and who may have something to do with Banff Park hereafter.

Committee rose and reported.

SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE N.-W. T.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 17) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Senate of Canada.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KENNY. I rise for the purpose of saying a few words in reference to some remarks made on Friday by my hon. colleague, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and if my remarks are not pertinent to the Bill before the House, if they have no more relation to the two gentlemen in the North-West Territories than to the two gentlemen of Verona, I hope the remarks of my hon. colleague made the other night will be allowed to plead my excuse. I listened with mingled feelings of surprise and regret to the remarkable, I am almost tempted to say, violent speech made in this House on that occasion by my hon. colleague. I was surprised to hear him say that I owed my position in this House to the fact that 400 civil servants had been coerced and threatened into voting for me. I regret that the hon. gentleman, before he made so sweeping an assertion, did not take the trouble himself to personally investigate such a charge; for if he had done so, I am satisfied he never would have made a statement so entirely inaccurate and misleading. But as the statement was so positively and publicly made, I consider that it is due to my constituents, and due especially to my fellow-citizens of Halifax and myself, that my denial of that charge should be equally public and equally positive. As I listened to the somewhat excited address of my hon. colleague on that occasion, I fancied he was seeking for some excuse to give the hon. gentlemen who surround him on the other side, for the very unexpected collapse of their friends and allies, the secession party in the Province of Nova Scotia. I imagined that the hon. gentleman was trying to excuse to his friends the very inaccurate and very misleading statements which were sent from Halifax during the late campaign to the Grit party in Ontario, as to the sentiments of the people of Nova Scotia on Dominion issues. The most misleading statements were sent from that Province; state-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT:

ments which, when they were republished in the Liberal-Conservative papers of Nova Scotia, were subjects of laughter and ridicule. These statements, I am told, were repeated by hon. gentlemen opposite, innocently repeated by them, on several platforms throughout the Province of Ontario, and I believe that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—whom I do not see in his place—it is the first time I have ever felt it my duty to mention this hon. gentleman's name, and I pause for a moment to pay my tribute of respect, as a new member, to that hon. gentleman, and my recognition of the important and highly honorable position which he occupies in this House—I find that hon. gentleman was misled by these statements. I hold in my hand an extract from the *Toronto Globe*. I find that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), at a meeting held in the city of London just before the elections, made this statement:

"My correspondent tells me Halifax is sure, and that we are sure of sixteen seats, at least, in Nova Scotia."

Now, I am quite certain that the hon. member for West Durham, when he made that statement, believed it to be true, but the person in Nova Scotia who, on the eve of the general elections, would believe that it was possible for the repeal party, the secession party, to secure sixteen constituencies in the Province must have been party blind, and the most reckless man among them, no matter what he might say or telegraph, I am certain, would not have bet five cents on such a statement. I wish to give the House another instance, and I will not delay it more than a moment, of the very ridiculous statement that emanated from Halifax about that time. I find in the *Toronto Globe* communication from its correspondent in Halifax, dated 9th February, the statement that—

"Nova Scotian Tories are grief-stricken and killed"—

Mind, Sir, this is 9th February—

"Turn where they will the same ghastly spectacle of inevitable defeat stares them in the face, and no corner offers refuge in which to hide their despair. Not a single county in the whole Province holds out the slightest hope of victory. There is hardly a single district in any constituency which they can boast of carrying."

If my hon. colleague felt it was incumbent on him to explain to the hon. gentlemen who surrounded him such statements as these, I do not wonder he was excited when he made the effort. The hon. gentleman said, in the course of his remarks, that he had great expectations his party would be successful in carrying the Province of Nova Scotia, and viewing it from his standpoint, viewing it from the standpoint of the secession party of Nova Scotia, of which he is so conspicuous an ornament, I do not wonder that he had very great expectations. The hon. gentleman made this mistake, however, a mistake which has been made out of Nova Scotia as well as in it. He did not recognise the great difference which the people make between Dominion and Local elections. He did not reckon that important factor in his political calculations. The hon. gentleman says that I owe my election to the fact that these 400 unfortunate civil servants were coerced into voting for me. I have never taken the trouble to count how many civil servants have votes in the constituency I represent, but I am quite certain that not half that number ever voted for me. In his reference to the civil servants, my hon. colleague made special reference to the number of the people who are employed in the railway department. In doing so he may have intended to allude to the fact that during the prosecution of my canvass, I visited the railway works and shops. I was asked to do so by the men who worked there, because it had been industriously circulated by the emissaries of my hon. colleague that I had accepted the nomination unwillingly, that I did not care whether they voted for me or not, and I was told this im-

pression could be removed only by a personal visit. But another reason was given for my visiting these workshops. I was told by the men who had worked there for some years, that in days gone by, in those halcyon days when better terms were not considered, when there was no occasion to raise a repeal cry, when my hon. colleague was the Minister of Militia of this country, he had visited the railway workshops, and that the men had a perfect right to expect from so humble an individual as myself the same amount of attention that had been paid to them by a Crown Minister. Now, as to coercion being exercised over the railway men, I never heard of it, I had no knowledge of it, and I do not believe it existed. As regards these civil servants to whom my hon. colleague referred, they were the most disturbing element we had in our election. The emissaries of my hon. colleague paid these civil servants very special attention. They cajoled them into believing that the Government would be upset, and then they threatened them with the loss of their positions if they did not vote for them. While one set of emissaries were threatening these men with the loss of their positions, another set were going round the Province promising every Dominion office, from the highest to the lowest, to some ardent supporter of repeal. They promised them all a dozen times over. It is well established in Halifax that a large number of these civil servants did not vote at all. I suppose no one can know how anyone votes under the ballot system, but it is currently believed that a very large number of civil servants voted for my hon. colleague; and I should find no fault with them for that, if they thought they were conscientiously serving their country by so doing, because I hold, and I have ever held, that a civil servant has a perfect right to vote in the manner he thinks will best serve the country, provided he does so in a proper and becoming manner; but I have a very different opinion of the men who canvassed and worked against the Government they served, and did so in a most offensive manner. I think those men take their political lives in their hands, and must be prepared to abide the consequences. As to the coercion of the railway men, I did hear of an instance of it. I heard in the country parts of the county of a case where some of the laborers, some of the trackmen employed along the Intercolonial Railway, had come to my friends to say they were very anxious to vote for Stairs and Kenny, but they were afraid to do so because they were told by the emissaries of my colleague that the Government was going to be upset and they would lose their positions if they voted for Stairs and Kenny. I heard of that instance of coercion. For such an instance as that I do not for a moment hold my hon. colleague responsible. No matter what the legal aspect of the case may be, it would be unfair for me to attempt to say that I hold that hon. gentleman responsible for that. In a constituency so large as ours, with some 11,000 electors—and over 8,000 votes were polled—I do not for a moment pretend to hold the hon. gentleman responsible for such a case as that. I merely state its existence, because I have the most undoubted and positive proof of it. It would be abject folly to attempt to coerce a class of men so sturdy, so intelligent, and so honest as the men employed about the railway departments of Halifax. They are a highly respectable and intelligent set of men, and it is a downright insult to their intelligence to tell them, under our ballot system, that they can be coerced into voting for one man or the other. They vote as they please. As regard these 400 civil servants who were coerced in voting for me, there is no man in the county of Halifax who knows better than my hon. colleague that, if 400 civil servants had been coerced into voting for the Government candidates, he would not have been here to-day. So much for the reference which my hon. colleague was pleased to make to the civil servants and the question of their coercion. But he was also pleased to refer to the fact that certain members of the

Government who were in Nova Scotia prosecuting their canvass had made reference to certain subsidies to some railways. My hon. colleague did not particularise any roads. I do not know, of course, to what roads he alludes, or to how many roads, but I had the pleasure of attending one or two very important meetings which were held in the city of Halifax during that election campaign, which meetings were addressed by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and on those occasions the only roads which I remember any reference being made to were the Short Line road from Oxford to New Glasgow, the Cape Breton Railway, and that road in western Nova Scotia county commonly called the Gap, which connects Pictou with Annapolis. Those are the only three roads I remember any reference being made to in that election campaign. I do not speak positively; I am speaking from memory; I may be mistaken. As regards these three roads, I believe that this Parliament had provided for their completion. I believe and I know that the people of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton have been clamoring for the completion of those roads for years. If I am not mistaken, my hon. colleague's friends, the Local Government of Nova Scotia, had by legislation expressed their desire that these roads should be completed. I am quite sure that, if these Cabinet Ministers came down to Nova Scotia and had not made arrangements for the completion of those roads, my hon. colleague would have been the very first man in Nova Scotia to assail them for their neglect of the most vital interests of the Province. In Nova Scotia, we take the liveliest interest in the development of our railway system, and instead of censuring the Government for aiding that development, I believe that the vast majority of the people of that Province feel deeply grateful to the Government of the day for having made arrangements for the completion of those important roads in which we in Nova Scotia are so deeply interested. I repeat my expression of opinion that in reference to the civil servants and in reference to the effects that these railway subsidies may have had in influencing the electors of Nova Scotia, these stories are all after-thoughts, for I find that after all these civil servants had been carefully counted and carefully canvassed by my hon. colleague and his friends; after the effect of these railway subsidies had been carefully estimated and gauged, my hon. colleague had not the slightest misgivings as to the result of the elections in Nova Scotia. For I find in the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, of the 14th February, there is a report of a speech delivered by my hon. colleague in the city of Halifax a few days previous. I think it was delivered in the north end of the city, in College Hall, and I think that it was one of the most important speeches made by him during the campaign, and, Sir, in reference to myself, the hon. gentleman was pleased to say:

"It would be a dire misfortune to this community, and a very disagreeable position for myself if I had, I will not say the pleasure—of Mr. Kenny's company to Ottawa. But, gentlemen, I do not apprehend any such calamity. Mr. Kenny knows very well he has no chance in Halifax."

Now, Sir, that was the expression of my colleague's opinion as to the fate of parties in the constituency of Halifax, after all the civil servants had been carefully canvassed, and after any effect that the agitation of the railway subsidies may have had upon the people of that constituency, had been carefully calculated. But, Sir, I find that my hon. colleague was equally positive as regards, not only the constituency of Halifax, but the whole Province of Nova Scotia, for he goes on to say:

"On this occasion, while a general election is going on all over the country, it is of the utmost importance that the metropolitan county of the Province should speak with no uncertain sound. (Cheers.) We are hearing from all over the Province, and the accounts we receive are of the most cheering character. We find that from all parts of the country where the standard of the party has been raised the people are flocking

around it. (Cheers.) And we find that in the other Provinces the people are fighting a winning battle. I received a letter from Mr. Blake last week, in which he tells me that the prospects of the Liberal party in the west were never so bright—(cheers)—and we know that in the Province of Quebec, where our friends are in power, it is expected that the Macdonald Government will not be able to elect more than ten or twelve out of the sixty-five members for that Province. (Applause.) If such should be the case, and if, as we believe, we shall have a handsome majority in Ontario, and we have the Local Government of Ontario with us; if we have a handsome majority in Quebec, and we have the Local Government in Quebec also with us; and if we have a majority from New Brunswick, we have also a majority of the Local Government there; and if we have the Province of Nova Scotia returning, as I believe we shall, eighteen Liberal members to the Dominion, and the Local Government here with us, where is the man that would be bold enough to stand up and say that he should stay the course of Liberal sentiment throughout this country? (Prolonged cheers.)"

Now, Sir, I mention this to show that my hon. colleague, a very few days before the election—because hon. gentlemen will bear with me when I repeat the date on which that article appeared, the 14th of February, only a week before the elections—when my hon. colleague spoke thus, he had no misgivings as to the coercion of civil servants or the effects of railway subsidies, although he had ample time to estimate both. But, Sir, the sanguine expectations which my colleague had formed were not confined to himself. They were shared by every member of his party in the city of Halifax. Why, Sir, I was repeatedly told, good-naturedly told, by many of the friends of my hon. colleague, that the majority against me was to be from 700 to 1,000. The fact was, Mr. Chairman, that these gentlemen were calculating on the majority which they had in the month of June. In the month of June previously the Local elections took place. The Local Government, the repeal Government, with the assistance of my hon. colleague, organised the Province thoroughly, and they kept their organisation up for the impending Dominion elections. The whole power of the Local Government was used against the Liberal-Conservative party in the Dominion elections, as the fourteen representatives of that party on this side of the House were made to know and feel. The appeal in June of the repeal party had been eminently successful, and nowhere more so than in the county of Halifax. They had carried the county by a majority of between 1,000 and 1,200, and they expected a similar majority in the Dominion elections, and therefore it was that these gentlemen, not having estimated, as I said before, the fact that the people of Canada to-day, as has been shown not only in Nova Scotia, but in the other Provinces of the Dominion, will vote on one side in Local politics and the other side in Dominion politics. My hon. colleague and his friends had not justly estimated they had not, in fact, gauged accurately the public sentiment of their Province. But my hon. colleague was not the only one of his party who had formed these very sanguine expectations. They were shared, as I said before, by members of his party generally. On the very day of the elections in the city of Halifax, extensive preparations were made for a grand open air celebration. The large space on the eastern front of the provincial building was carefully strewn with ashes, a platform was improvised by the removal of a temporary porch—a platform from which my hon. colleague, in June, in the local elections, had addressed a monster gathering of his friends, and this was to be repeated from the same platform in February. Well, Sir, it was a lovely night. I am sure my hon. colleague remembers it well.

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. KENNY. The fates were most propitious. The atmospheric and climatic conditions were most favorable to an open air demonstration, all nature seemed joyous and happy, yet, Sir, no speaker came upon that platform, there was no monster gathering, the torches were not lighted, the band was never heard. In fact, gentlemen, all the magnificent preparations were wasted, save the ashes. They served appropriately to remind my hon. colleague and his

Mr. KENNY.

friends, if indeed, under the circumstances, they required any reminder, that the days of abstinence and mortification had set in. That next day was veritably Ash Wednesday. I said that my colleague had not a monopoly of the brilliant expectations. I will say to him that during the twenty years we have happened to be arrayed in different political camps, he has not had a monopoly of the defeats. I have had my ups and downs as a political man during those twenty years, but I hope I was always able to take my licking, as an hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House said the other day, like a man and was able to bear defeat with a patient shrug. I must say this: I never found anything was gained by abusing my opponents after the election was over, or by beating the air to find vain excuses because my party had not got as many votes as the other side. I might add that I always felt that losing an election was no excuse for my losing my temper. My hon. colleague has not yet discovered the true inwardness of the vote of the people of Nova Scotia in February last, and I will tell him how I read it. The true meaning of that vote is, that on sober second thoughts the people had decided to reverse their vote recorded in June last in favor of repeal and to stand loyally by the Union, believing the Government of the day would carefully enquire into the financial condition of the Province and adjust any disability that it may labor under. The vote meant in the most tangible way, in which it could be expressed, the hearty approval of the people of Nova Scotia with the Government of the day and their policy. The vote was not only the expression of the opinion of the people of the confidence, and I may say of the attachment, of the people of Nova Scotia to the great Liberal-Conservative party of this Dominion; but it was more than that, it was the pledge of our people that, as in the past, so in the future, we would continue our support to that party so long as it remained true to its great and grand tradition of ever seeking the greatest good of the greatest number.

Mr. JONES. My hon. friend seems to have taken exception to some remarks which fell from me on a previous occasion, and he seems disposed to blame me for having brought up the discussion to which he made reference. If he will bear in mind the course of the debate during that afternoon he will remember that it was the leader of the Government who assailed hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for having intimidated the public servants of the country during the last election; and while the hon. gentleman was amusing his audience with some of his jokes, which we had heard before—for it was necessary, perhaps, to keep them in good humor, because the evening before he had given them a very disagreeable dose to swallow in the Queen's county election matter—we listened with the greatest forbearance to what the hon. gentleman said, and the attacks he made on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. During the course of my reply I pointed out the position we occupied in Nova Scotia during the last election, and I stated then, as I repeat now, that my hon. friend and colleague—and I call him my friend—owes his seat in this House to night to the fact that he had about 400 or 500 of the Civil Service employés of the Government to vote *en masse* for him at that election.

Mr. KENNY. I deny it.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman has made a case out to-night with a great deal of plausibility, but he has not referred to some of the statements I made on that occasion. It will be borne in mind that on the occasion to which he has referred I brought a charge against the administration of the railway department of the Government of their having exercised undue influence over the men in their employ, of having sent men from Halifax to Moncton who were supposed to be in sympathy with our party, of having sent them an emphatic order with a railway pass, which I saw, direct-

ing those men to report at Moncton the next day. The same course was followed at Moncton, the men being directed to report at Halifax. The same thing was done at Truro directing them to report either at Moncton or Halifax; so that in point of fact every man in the railway service of the Dominion at Halifax or along the line of the Intercolonial supposed to have any sympathy whatever with the Liberal party was directed to move out of his own county for that day, which had the effect, as a matter of course, of causing him to lose his vote. I denounced that then, and I denounce it now, as an unwarrantable interference with the rights of people who had a right to the franchise under the Act given them by Parliament. I say that so long as people had the right to the franchise given them by the Government of the day, they had a right to exercise that vote according to the dictates of their conscience, either for or against the Government. And so far from endeavoring, either myself or by my friends, to intimidate or to influence those people during that election campaign, the reverse is the fact, and, with the permission of the House, I will read an extract from a speech which I delivered on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and if he has the whole speech he will find it is in the following words:—

"Now we have been told in this election that the expectation of Messrs. Daly and Stairs, or whoever may come out in the Tory interest, is that they are going to receive the votes of the railway employés and of the other Government employés in the departments at Halifax. I expressed my views strongly on that question the other night. I think these people should not be interfered with by either political party. They are the servants of the country, paid out of the revenues of the country. They are as much our servants as they are theirs, and they will probably be our servants, according to Mr. Daly's own views after the 22nd of next month. (Great applause.) But if we were in power to-day, I would say to those gentlemen: while you have a vote, if you honestly believe that the Tory party is the party for the Dominion, and for the city of Halifax, vote for them; but on the other hand if you believe honestly that the policy of the Liberal party is the policy in the true interests of the country, then exercise your rights as free men—exercise the right your franchise gives you, and vote for the party you think most in the interest of the country. I am told it has been said to these people that if they vote for the Tory candidate and do not say anything about it, it will never be known who they voted for, and when a change comes they will say they voted for the Grits and they will be kept on. You see they are calculating on the Tories going out and the Grits going in; of course they will know who they voted for, they had the right to vote for the man of their choice, and no one can or ought to know whom they vote for, because that is a privilege given them by the Ballot Act, which was intended for the protection of men in such circumstances. Therefore I say to these men, without knowing what their inclinations may be, to act as free men and vote for the men who, they think, will best serve the public interests of the country."

That was the declaration I made to the Civil Service of the country at the commencement of the campaign, and I did so because, from positive information I had received, I knew what threats had been made. I do not say that the hon. gentleman made them, but his friends did, and he admits himself that he interviewed these people. But I say, without charging him with making the threat, that I do make the charge of my own knowledge, that his friends went to those people and said: You must vote for us, or if not, you must accept the consequences if our Government is sustained. I knew many men, who under ordinary circumstances, would have supported us—men who were left in their places when we were in power, because we never molested them. When Mr. Brydges came into the management of the road there was not a man disturbed on the Intercolonial Railway during the time Mr. Mackenzie was in office; and when a manager was required for the North Street Station in Halifax, Mr. Brydges came to me and said: "I want a station master for North Street, do you know anyone here who will answer?" I said: "No doubt there are many people in Halifax who think they can run the Intercolonial Railway, but I do not know anyone; do you know of any suitable man yourself?" He said: "There is a gentleman at Rivière du Loup by the name of Macdonald, but he is a Conservative." I said: "I don't care what he is; if he is a good man, bring him down

and put him in as station master." He did so, and he has been there ever since, without interference by our Government when we were in power. During the whole time our Government was in power there were not five men of our side of politics placed on the Intercolonial Railway in the city of Halifax. There were two men who went into the department as clerks, but the moment the change came their salaries were cut down, simply because we put them there. They left immediately, and one of them has been in my employ since, and he is one of the best men that ever was upon that road. I mention these facts to show that we had men on that road who, under ordinary circumstances, would sympathise naturally with us, considering the fair manner in which we treated them. We never molested them, and if they were entitled to promotion, Mr. Brydges promoted them, and I never interfered with them directly or indirectly. Those men are still on the road, and, therefore, I say it was natural to suppose that there were many of them remaining there from old times, who would have remembered with some sense of justice the fair treatment accorded to them by the Mackenzie Administration, and would under ordinary circumstances have voted for myself, or given a split vote, as the case might be. I asked no man; I never was near them from the beginning to the end, but I knew there were 400 or 500 votes in the various departments, and I knew that there was coercion brought to bear on these men in every branch. A short time before the election, when it was not known when the elections would come on, a number of men were working at the deep water terminus. They had their wages cut down, but the moment the writs came out for the election, the wages of every one of them were advanced up to the rate they had received before. In addition to the number of people engaged in the Civil Service, they sent a lot of men down to the old penitentiary to whitewash, repaint, and clean up that old building, which had been abandoned as a penitentiary ever since the penitentiary was removed to Dorchester ten or twelve years ago. They were put on simply that they might be employed on that occasion and their votes secured. The hon. gentleman talks about their interference. Why, during the last Local election in Nova Scotia what did we see? An order came down to the Custom house in Halifax, from the department at Ottawa, to a young man in the Custom house there, whose name I will give the Minister if he asks for it, whose summer holidays had just expired. He had just returned to his duty after having been fishing down along the coast, at a place where he generally spent his vacation, and it was supposed that he had some influence in that locality. The order came from the Customs Department at Ottawa to say: Give that young man a fortnight more holidays, and he was sent down by the Tory election committee in Halifax, and his pockets were filled with fishing bounty cheques, to be taken up and down the shore and distributed among the fishermen. He spent a fortnight there, when he should have been in the Custom house, and that was done by the order of the Government. Now, looking at these things, one almost wonders at the innocence of my hon. friend. Of course he knows nothing about these things. He has a very happy faculty of remembering some things and forgetting others, but I have no doubt, when I bring these facts to the remembrance of my hon. friend he will recall the circumstances very well. The hon. gentleman says we were sure of sixteen seats; that we made a great boast of it, and that we were very much disappointed at our gathering at the provincial building on the eve of the 22nd. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman is entirely inaccurate in his description of the great preparations which were made, and I suppose it arises from the fact that the hon. gentleman was not there. He was not invited, of course; but I can say that we did meet that evening as usual; that we did speak as usual, and we did anticipate that we had

carried Halifax county triumphantly, until the later returns came in, which indicated that my hon. friend would probably be ahead of my colleague, Mr. Fuller. I am sorry to disturb the picture which he so eloquently drew, but he will, perhaps, remember that it was the eve of our penitential service, that the next day we entered on our forty days' abstinence, and I can only say that our abstinence was not affected in any way by the result of the election, or by what passed previously or subsequently to that day. The hon. gentleman says that I was disappointed in the result of the election in Halifax. I tell him frankly that I was, although I was not as much surprised as some people were, probably because when I went around the county I ascertained one fact. I did not spend two days in the city. I found we had a corrupt revising barrister—I will not say a corrupt revising barrister, to the extent that those words might mean, because those who know Mr. Eaton, and I do not know him personally very much, do not blame him so much as they blame the men who surrounded him, and especially the man who was appointed as his clerk. That man was the permanent secretary of the Tory party in Halifax. I am not accusing Mr. Eaton of all the irregularities, although as a matter of course he was responsible on account of his position. Most people are rather disposed to blame the clerks and the people he had about him. What was the fact? Why, Sir, we proved the right of men to be put on the lists; their right was admitted by Mr. Eaton; but when the final list came out, I found as many as five, ten, or fifteen names omitted in every polling district, and we had seventy-five polling districts in Halifax county. When I ascertained that, I told our friends: "Gentlemen, when you come to take that fact into account, and estimate that you have from 400 to 500 Dominion officials to vote against you, which you had not in the June elections, you must expect a smaller majority," and I told my colleague that if we won 200, it would be as much as we could expect. I got 150, while my colleague did not come quite up to that figure. That is the way the elections in Halifax were run. My hon. friend says the Local elections were carried by 1,000 or 1,200 in June before. I admit that; but the hon. gentleman, to be perfectly candid, should have told the House that I polled 200 more votes than Mr. Fielding, the Premier of the Province, polled in June previous, when he had 1,000 majority. The hon. gentleman says he was not aware of any promises having been made by the various Ministers who visited Nova Scotia. I said in a general way the other night that the Ministers who visited New Scotia previous to and during the elections, had made promises there of railway subsidies, which they stated it was the policy of the Administration to grant. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to mention some of them? I will mention the Short Line Railway from Pictou to Oxford. I have here a Minute of Council which the Minister of Finance, the Postmaster General and the member for Pictou distributed all over those counties—they were picked up in bushels—pledging the Government to make that a public work, and I am glad to see by the Order Paper that they are going to carry out their promise and vote an additional \$500,000 for that road. That is only in fulfilment of promises made by members of the Government during that campaign.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Corrupt promises.

Mr. JONES. They may not be corrupt in a legal sense; but when Ministers go to a Province or a community, and promise to spend public money in works in which the people are largely interested, I think this House will agree with me that such promises will be a very important factor in securing the election of their friends. Then the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Putnam) carried his county in the same way; they promised assistance for the Hants Central Railway from Truro to Windsor. I attended several meet-

Mr. JONES,

ings in that county, and wherever I went I was met with that one statement that they had the word of the different Ministers and the word of the hon. member for Hants, who sits in this House to-night, that if this Government were returned that road would be carried out. Then, there was a road in Colchester from Brookfield to Stewiacke. I am not condemning these expenditures, because if the public money is to be spent in such large amounts out in the west, I do not see why we should not have some of it down by the sea. Then, the late member for Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) went home armed with a Minute of Council to the effect that the Government were going to put in a gap between Annapolis and Digby, so as to secure a through line from Halifax to Yarmouth. They thought that might defeat Mr. Vail in Digby. The hon. gentleman could hardly occupy the prominent position he does without being aware of all these circumstances. For the last ten years, no matter who represented Halifax, my hon. friend and colleague was the real recognised leader of the party there. He was the man who directed the policy of the party in the elections, and I think the party are under obligations to him, because he was a very wise and judicious counsellor. I have often met that hon. gentleman, and although we differ on public questions, I hope we shall retain in future as in the past our personal friendship and regard. But I do not think the hon. gentleman has said anything to-night which will disprove any statement I made. I said to the hon. gentleman that he had one supporter in this House, I believe a judicious supporter. I regret that he is here, and I look upon it as a misfortune that any man should sit on that side of the House and support this Government; but if any gentleman is to come from Halifax to support them, there is no man I would rather see here to-night than my hon. friend. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman was indebted to the Civil Service of Halifax for the seat he occupies in this House.

Mr. KENNY. No.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman may say no, but with all due deference to him I know that there are 400 or 500 men on the railway, connected with the Customs, Post Office, Marine and Fisheries and every other branch connected with the Government there, who went *en masse* for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENNY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there are 400 or 500 civil servants with votes in Halifax?

Mr. JONES. Yes, I say connected with these different services there are at least 400; and when you take into account the men who were taken on at the deep-water terminus, those who were sent to whitewash the penitentiary, to go up to Richmond to dig holes in the frozen earth with their picks, and who were discharged when the election was over, I say 400 votes is a moderate estimate of the number of men who were influenced in that way. You must also remember that these men had friends, so that they exercised a double influence, because they knew that their position were in peril, and their friends who desired to see them retain their positions were naturally less zealous in our cause than they would have been under other circumstances. That is the natural result of such a state of things, as any hon. member can understand. To finish the whole story, I repeat what I said then. I have nothing to take back; I have given you to-night additional evidence of the interference, and I do not think the hon. gentleman has been able to remove the impression which I gave the House the other night. I am very glad to see him here as a representative of Halifax, when my own colleague could not come, but when he and his friend and leader in the House attempt to taunt hon. members on this side with the influences which were exercised by our friends to obtain seats, I

felt it my duty, as one of the members on this side, to remind the right hon. gentleman that his own party had pursued the course which he so emphatically condemns. If the right hon. gentleman is sincere in his objection to that policy, I hope before this Parliament closes he will introduce on behalf of the Government an Act disfranchising the Dominion officials, not only in Halifax, but all over the Dominion. I believe these men should be disfranchised and taken from the control or dictation of either political party. They may be the servants of the hon. gentleman and his friends to-night, but the day may come, sooner than the hon. gentleman expects (in one, two or three years), when these men may be the servants of the present Opposition; and do you suppose these men would desire to be—if our people were so disposed, which I know they would not be—insulted and outraged by being ordered to vote according as the political parties of the day changed. I lay it down as a principle, although I am in a minority in this House, that the civil servants of the country, who are as much my servants as they are of the right hon. gentleman's, because they are paid out of the money of the country, to serve the public interests of the country, should be free from all control on either side, and feel they are in an independent position. If nothing came out of the discussion to-night, I rejoice at having the opportunity of laying down a principle which we have contended for, in the Province of Nova Scotia, for a long time. Not only there did we disfranchise the Dominion officials, but the local officials as well. They cannot vote in a local election, and are glad to be in the position in which the Act has placed them. I, therefore, hope that during this Parliament some action may be taken which will place the civil servants in an independent position.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the House will not be anxious to hear a too lengthy statement from every hon. gentleman as to the events which he may think interesting to him, and which occurred in the excitement of the last election; but as the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has occupied considerable time this Session telling us the gossip of his committee rooms during the late election, and has felt it necessary to apologise to this House for his presence here or to explain why he appears with so few followers, it is necessary I should answer him on certain statements he has made with reference to the county of Pictou. Many of the hon. gentleman's assertions made a few nights ago have been taken issue with by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who, I think, taught the senior member a lesson, because that hon. gentleman in his reply deemed it necessary to avoid any allusion to the fanciful \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 subsidies dangled before the people of Nova Scotia, and retired from the position which he took the other night a few minutes before six, when he thought that by speaking up to six no one would have the opportunity of contradicting his assertion. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the county of Pictou and if his allusions in reference to his own county had no more foundation than those, I do not see much use in the junior member for Halifax taking the trouble and time to refute them. He said the same influences were at work in the county where my colleague and myself were returned by 600 of a majority. He charges the Government with having coerced the employés of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Civil Service. I challenge every statement made by the hon. gentleman, and what is more, I say that candidates whom we met in a fair fight and defeated fairly in Pictou, had the manliness and honor to make a declaration entirely inconsistent with the declaration of the hon. member for Halifax. Both Mr. McLeod, who opposed us, and Mr. Bell, stood up like men and admitted that they were beaten fairly; they said they had done their best to win but could not. Everyone knows that the senior member for

Halifax is ashamed of the part he took in that contest. From the day he came here up to the present, he has never ventured to tell the House that he ran in the last election as the recognised leader of the secession party. I am glad the hon. gentleman has some sense of what is right and decent in the House of Commons, and is thoroughly ashamed of the policy that the Province almost from one end to the other repudiated with scorn. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite laugh? They were denounced as well as we. It was a fight of Nova Scotians against Canadians, which the ex-Minister of the Crown in Canada placed before the electors of Nova Scotia. These parish political cries, these sectional cries were pleaded for all they were worth. He endeavored to explain that Nova Scotia, forsooth, was building all the railways in the west, that she was being bled for the Canadians who were draining the resources of that Province.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that is true, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite cheered him when he endeavored to make capital at our expense by abusing them as well as the party in power. The hon. gentleman does not know why he is beaten; rather, he pretends not to know. He is too far-seeing not to be able to understand the cause that moved the people at the election. He pretends it was on account of the returning officers and the coercion of the Civil Service employés, and repeats the excuses he hears from the lips of his new found friends from Ontario. I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason he was beaten absolutely in the last election. He was beaten for a reason given to him by one who, although not a leader of his party in Nova Scotia, is entitled to be one, if ability and certain breadth of mind entitle an hon. gentleman to assume that position in the ranks of his party. When this miserable played out cry of repeal was raised in Nova Scotia, and the senior member for Halifax was desperate enough to adopt it, what was the platform laid down by him? It was this, as stated by an organ of the hon. gentleman:

"Neither political party of Canada ever has been, is now, or ever can be, friendly to Nova Scotia's interest, simply because Confederation has been, is, and ever will be, ruinous to this Province, and therefore no party which advocates the maintenance of the Union can be Nova Scotia's friend. No liberal opposed to repeal or luke-warm in the cause is now a member of what once was the Grit party of Nova Scotia. No such party now exists. The few anti-repeal Liberals are nowhere, and will have to stay there or yield gracefully to the wishes of the people and join the repeal enemy. The Liberals of Nova Scotia, by making repeal their platform, ceased to be a Canadian party, their one great aim and object being to secure separation from Canada. If Mr. Fraser is wrong in saying that 'the Nova Scotia party must fight them both' (Blake and Macdonald), then what in the name of all that is sensible did the party mean by raising the repeal cry? Fight them both we must, fight them both we will, till repeal is won. No looking back to regret for past friendships."

Mr. JONES. Who is that?

Mr. TUPPER. The *Pictou News*, and my hon. friend will not deny that it is one of the strongest organs of his party in eastern Nova Scotia.

Mr. JONES. Oh, an organ.

Mr. TUPPER. And it was to people who believed that stuff that the hon. gentleman appealed when he was asking for their votes in the city of Halifax, and the men who believed that at the time cheered the hon. gentleman and worked for him in that election. Mr. Pipes, to whom I have referred, said long ago that it would not be the returning officers or the corrupt and coercive Government that would secure his defeat, but he told him that "the jackals and crows may live on the putrefying bodies of the slain, but no political party or political man can prosper on the putrefying carcass of repeal." That was one of the hon. gentleman's friends and associates, and the day has come, as I am glad to see, when the hon. gentleman now recognises, as he appears to do so to-night, that

Mr. Pipes was right and he was wrong. The hon. gentleman has referred to the county of Pictou, and but for that reference I would not have taken the floor to-night, but he further insinuated, although our opponents fought that contest in a fair and honest way and have admitted that they were beaten fairly and above board, that we made an attempt to bribe the constituency, and used what he called these bushels of Minutes of Council in reference to the Short Line Railway in the county of Pictou, for that purpose. I deny that. I say it is absolutely without foundation. The hon. gentleman was not in that county at all; I traversed it from end to end, and, though I did not meet an ex-Minister of the Crown during that election, I met an hon. gentleman who apparently knew more than the hon. the senior member for Halifax in reference to the Minute of Council. All parties admitted in that county, and Mr. McLeod, the Liberal candidate himself, admitted, and in fact claimed the benefit of that admission, that, by that Minute of Council being passed as the logical sequence of the action of this Parliament, which the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten, the necessity was recognised for the Short Line, for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Cape Breton, which by building this piece from Oxford to New Glasgow, would bring the whole of eastern Nova Scotia forty miles nearer to this detested Canada. My opponent knew enough to see that this had placed the question beyond the point as to who would serve the people best in reference to the Short Line Railway, and he further stated that, if Mr. Blake were returned to power, he had an assurance from Mr. Blake that he would carry out that policy in the spirit and the letter; and I want to know if the hon. gentleman challenges the accuracy of the statement made by a gentleman who, since his defeat in that county, has been elevated to a position in the Government of Nova Scotia, the friends and allies of my hon. friend. He knows well that a Minute of Council never has been and never can be used as a bribe. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will teach my hon. friend a lesson on that point. He will tell him that the faith of the Governor General of Canada is pledged to carry out the statements and the assurances which are made in a Minute of Council; and in no part of Nova Scotia did any public man on the Liberal-Conservative side say that it depended on the return of the present Government whether good faith would be kept or not in reference to these Minutes of Council. Such Minutes of Council have never been repudiated, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any authority for saying that Minutes of Council have ever been held out as bribes or to induce false hopes and expectations. The hon. gentleman has not been able to give us the list, or to apportion out that amount of from ten to fifteen millions of dollars which he said, and said inaccurately, were promised by Ministers of the Crown in Nova Scotia. We meet that with an absolute denial. The hon. gentleman has a scrap-book in which he has his own speeches. Perhaps it also contains the speeches of the Ministers to whom he has alluded, and I challenge him to show that the Minister promised that ten or fifteen millions to the Province in that campaign. He cannot do it. He knows he cannot do it. But he knows what his friends in the Province of Nova Scotia did. He says this is a corrupt practice. Let me tell the House what was done by Mr. Fielding, who acts under orders from my hon. friend opposite, whose great adviser he is, whom he advises daily, when he is in Halifax, as to how he shall shape his policy and over whom he has great control. Previous to the election, at the very time that he said our Province was ruined and had not a dollar in the exchequer, Mr. Fielding introduced a Railway Bill with a lobster clause, that promised every part of Nova Scotia a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile for any railway that might hereafter be built there, and also 2,000 acres of land for every mile of railway. And, even if the

Mr. TUPPER.

project were taken up by this Parliament, Mr. Fielding, in his generosity, was willing to add that on to the subsidy to be granted by the Dominion Parliament. And yet my hon. friend, the friend and ally and leader of that gentleman, pretends to look with horror upon the statement made by the Ministers of the Crown, responsible to the people of Nova Scotia, that they were able to redeem the promises held out by the Liberal-Conservative party long back, and that if they would utterly disregard those extraordinary statements made to them by small-minded politicians from day to day, that all this expenditure west was to be of no benefit to them, that the money expended in that direction would never be paid back, the time would come when, having grappled with these great public works and with these great railways of national importance, more attention would be paid to the eastern Provinces; and when they came to that Province and told the people that from time to time legislation had been obtained, pledging the country to lines of railway of national importance in the Province of Nova Scotia, and that, no matter whether the Liberal or the Liberal-Conservative party were returned to power, these roads were secured, and it was beyond the power of any party, which regarded its own interests and its own standing in the country, to repudiate these Minutes of Council. Then this hon. gentleman, hiding forsooth behind this other policy of the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, charges the Dominion Government with bribery in the use of these Minutes in Council. He sings a different song down in the Province of Nova Scotia. What is bribery here is justice there. He told the people of Halifax, and his friends told the people of Nova Scotia, that these works should have been carried out long ago.

Mr. JONES. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. He says "hear, hear," and his friends there assert that it is justice which has been long delayed. But, taking his cue, I suppose, from the columns of the *Globe*, he says now, as the *Globe* said in 1869, that the better terms and all these subsidies, are bribes to the people of Nova Scotia. Does he mean to insinuate that that Province was bribed wholesale at the last election, and that the people of his Province, when they are making large claims now, and he and I hope that something may come out of these claims upon the Treasury here, are to be beaten off their demands, are to be changed in their views as to what is necessary for them and the country in this way? What has become then of the cry for better terms? Has the bribe been sufficient, does the hon. gentleman think? I think he was on dangerous ground when he tried the other evening to read a lecture to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in reference to his having stated what was apparently evident to the members of this House, that that repeal cry was a dishonest and a disloyal cry, used for election purposes only. I think it strange that the hon. gentleman should say that the Province has been bribed in this matter. Well, now I have shown that the policy declared while he was out of the House, the policy which, I believe, was forced through in the face of great opposition from his new found friends, was not for the first time enunciated by the Minister of the Crown during the election, and from that no departure was made; and that policy is that wherever there is such a railway, or such an enterprise, that in the opinion of the Government it can be secured by the payment of \$3,200 a mile, and it will be for the benefit of Canada, Canada at least should aid that enterprise to that extent, and further than that none of these hon. gentlemen went. I am sure that, on reflection, the hon. gentleman will admit that that is true. Now, in the excitement of the other evening, the hon. gentleman was bold enough to denounce the electors, and I hope he confined these denunciations to the electors of the county

of Halifax, before whom, no doubt, he will soon have to make his bow; he denounced them as unfair, dishonest and ignorant, and I call the attention of the electors to that charge, and I throw that charge back in his face; I say that language was unworthy of him, and could only be pardoned by hon. gentlemen stating that he labored under great excitement. He told the House to-night that the franchise was the right of free men, and that a Government who interfered with the exercise of the franchise should be denounced, and before he sat down he wanted to rob every man of his franchise; he wanted to put them back on their backs where he had them during the time he was permitted to aid in administering the affairs of the country. But I want to remind the hon. gentleman of the time when he had it in his power to threaten and coerce. It was all very well when he went before his electors to tell them, as he reads from his scrap-book to-night, that they were free men and could exercise the franchise as they pleased, and he scorned, of course, to coerce and intimidate those men. But when standing up as a candidate for the Dominion Parliament in 1874, before these same electors, before their rights had been taken away by a so-called Reform Government, the hon. gentleman spoke language that I am going to read, and I want him to reconcile it, if he can, with the language he uses now. In 1874, in the city of Halifax, as a member supporting the Reform Government in Canada, he spoke to the civil servants as follows:—

"So long as they served the State, they were protected in their offices, but if they disregarded that principle, and took a part against the Government, whose subordinates they were (?)"—

Not servants of the members of both sides of the House, not servants of the people, but subordinates, as slaves of the Government!

—"they took their offices in their hands."

This, Mr. Chairman, is language from an hon. gentleman who denounces my hon. friend and the party with which I am identified, for having coerced the civil servants, the Intercolonial Railway employés, and threatened them with loss of office. He says they would stand or fall with the party, that was the rule and that would be observed here, and to make the matter clear, the organ in the city of Halifax, that either controls the hon. gentleman or which the hon. gentleman controls, on the 10th of January, said:

"They are certainly not free to vote against Mr. Jones or against Mr. Power, and if any one of them votes, canvasses, or in any way opposes the Government of which he is a subordinate, he will do so at his peril."

That, I fancy, is explicit enough, and this has come from the organ of that pure party that we have in Nova Scotia, which has one cry here and altogether a different one at home. Then it goes on to say:

"Whatever benefit can legitimately be derived from the patronage of a political party, should be enjoyed by themselves and not by their enemies."

So, Mr. Chairman, in order to expose the hon. gentleman and to weaken the force of any harangue he may make here, it is only necessary to refer to the reports in his own press, of his own speeches, to show not only that he has no true sympathy with the Liberal party in that Province, but that he has in no sense worked in their interest. Now, we find that his political ally, his leader in Nova Scotia, only a year ago, in the House of Assembly, reaffirmed the position which my hon. friend took in 1874. He held the whip out to that effect over the backs of the employés of the Local Government. Then, my hon. friend's figures are a little wrong. He says that in the Intercolonial workshops, where he deemed it right to go, the immense majority was coerced. Why, it is only when men are employed on full time, when work is booming, at the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in Halifax, that there are 300 men all told, so my hon. friend would have difficulty in finding the 400 votes

who were allowed by that terrible franchise officer whom he has spoken of, to put their names on the list. But there is another more serious thing to which I wish to call attention. Everyone was surprised to learn the hon. gentleman who proclaims so much belief in political purity, fairness and freedom, that during the last election a gentleman holding a responsible position as a member of this House, not a civil servant or Intercolonial employé, but an independent member of this House, stated that he received a letter from the hon. gentleman when his party was in power, and he asked permission, in consequence of this statement made by the hon. gentleman, abusing the Liberal-Conservatives for coercing and intimidating their opponents, to remove the seal of secrecy from that letter, and he charged that hon. gentleman with having resorted to the same practices himself that he denounced in others, and from that time to this that hon. gentleman has not seen fit to remove the seal of secrecy from that letter. Until he complies with that request and allows that letter to be read, it will be difficult for him to stand here and claim that in all these matters himself and his party are without stain. I have another reference, if references are necessary, to show the hollow hypocrisy of the sentiments uttered by the hon. gentlemen who stand up and claim that they were not fairly and honestly beaten. I ask the hon. gentleman, the senior member for Halifax, to run back to the month of December previous to the June elections; does he recollect the argument that was made to the electors then? Because, no doubt, the hon. gentleman who used it agreed with him in thinking that the electors were ignorant, that they were corrupt, that they were unfair and dishonest, and that they could be bought off from this hallucination of repeal. Does the hon. gentleman remember when Mr. Anglin, one of the great Grit apostles of Ontario now, exiled from his native Province politically, paid a visit to his constituency? Has he got that gentleman's speech in his scrap-book—the speech of Mr. Anglin in the Temperance Hall or in one of the public buildings in Halifax, when he came there authorised by the leader of the Reform party of Canada, because neither the leader nor any organ of his party from that day to this has repudiated the statement made by that gentleman holding so high and important a position in the Liberal party of the Dominion? Does he recollect the style in which that gentleman placed the public questions before the people of Halifax? How was he on the question of subsidy, on the question of holding out bribes and spreading them by the bushel before the people? The member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) sat on the platform with Mr. Anglin; Mr. Jones cheered him. Mr. Anglin concluded his speech amid rousing cheers, and the hon. gentleman adopted and reiterated those statements made by Mr. Anglin; and I will ask the patience of the House while I read one or two extracts to show the promises held out by one of the purists of the party. Mr. Anglin, coming to this question, said:

"We feel up in Ontario that the people of Nova Scotia had something to complain about. We felt that, despite all the effort of the Opposition in the House, many of those burthens had been placed there, and, as I said, we knew that you had just cause to complain. * * * We can change the character and tone of the whole fiscal policy, so as to materially encourage and revive the commerce of the country, and in that way render important service to the people of Nova Scotia. We can do a little more than that."

I wish the House to notice that that gentleman was willing to go one better than all the gentlemen who had preceded him or who afterwards succeeded him, and he spoke as to how far this Parliament could reach in point of legislation. He said:

"There are some questions between the Dominion and the Local Government as to subsidies and as to the means placed at the disposal of the Local Government for the carrying out of the important railway work. * * * A Liberal Government, I think, if in power during

the next five years will be able to arrange that question somewhat to the satisfaction of the people of Nova Scotia."

Could any more monstrous bribe, according to the rules laid down by the hon. gentleman, have been offered to any constituency? I wonder the hon. gentleman does not blush when I read it. The hon. gentleman spoke of what constituted corruption on the part of a Cabinet. Here is a promise held out by Mr. Anglin to the electors whom the hon. gentleman represents, and made in his presence, that if a Liberal Government obtained power it would be able to make a satisfactory arrangement in regard to these terms, or this "raid" on the public Treasury of Canada. That is the favorite term of the *Globe* and in the backwoods of Canada, and it is used by demagogues who endeavor to stir up feelings of animosity among the people of Nova Scotia. Mr. Anglin further said:

"Now, I have no doubt whatever that if the Liberal party were in power to-morrow, Mr. Blake would be willing to reconsider the whole plan of Confederation, and not only give you more for your railways but accord to your necessities all that you are entitled to. He would be willing to look at the whole question fairly with the eye of justice, not to be too exacting to the smaller Provinces, but to give them, if possible, a little more even than they are strictly entitled to."

Railway subsidies must not be promised, railway aid must not be promised! It must be denounced in the House of Commons at Ottawa, but in Cape Breton, Colchester, Cumberland and other counties, every supporter of the Government must be denounced for not having procured railway aid! The position is absurd. And I may further say that the hon. gentleman's own leader in this House, who led the Local Government in Ontario, differed from the hon. gentleman in regard to this question of political morality when he defeated John Sandfield Macdonald's Administration. Everyone knows that he made a boast, and he did so during the last election where it caught my eye in a speech delivered before a western constituency, that when he came into power in Ontario and found that John Sandfield Macdonald's Administration had voted some million odd dollars for the purpose of aiding local railways in the Province, he immediately doubled the vote and adopted a bold and vigorous railway policy. Well, if that is all right for those hon. gentlemen to do, surely Parliament will listen with very little patience and attention to an indictment against the Government, not for having introduced a general Railway Bill, promising railway aid everywhere, but for telling the people of the country that the legislation they had adopted ever since 1882 would be moulded into substantial results, and having grappled with those great questions in the west they would be able at once to take up the railway question in the east. Both parties were always expressing their great desire to aid railway enterprises in Cape Breton and the western counties, and the only difference is that the people understand that the hon. gentleman's party is a party of promises, while the present party in power is a party of performances, and that is where the thing sticks.

Mr. JONES. I thought it very likely my reference to these Minutes of Council would call up my hon. friend instead of the senior member of the same name.

Mr. TUPPER. I am old enough to know what a Minute of Council is.

Mr. JONES. I think the hon. gentleman's excitement is excusable under the circumstances. I had no doubt that when reference was made to the transactions that took place in Pictou and the influences that were used there to secure the return, as I pointed out, of the Government candidate, not only in that but in other counties, the hon. gentleman would feel some disturbance in his own mind. But the hon. gentleman is not going to draw me away from the real argument. I told him at the commencement that so far from being opposed to granting subsidies to railways in Nova

Mr. TUPPER.

Scotia, I was in favor of such a policy, that I had always contended that the Government of the Dominion while expending large sums in the west had never substantially recognised the importance of public works in the Province of Nova Scotia, and, therefore, when the hon. gentleman made those promises, so far from taking exception to them, I, on the contrary, was one of those who approved of them, and I approve of them to-night; but I take exception to the time, to the mode, to the occasion, and that makes the whole difference. This Government was in power for eight years. They knew very well that the gap between Annapolis and Digby had not been completed. They knew that great efforts had been made by both Governments to secure the completion of that piece of road, and still they left it until the last moment, just before the writs were issued. They voted it down last Session, and then, just before the writs were issued, they issued a Minute of Council, pledging the resources of the Government to carry that work to completion. Now, I say that on the face of it there was a deception; there was on the face of it an intention which the people of Nova Scotia recognised, that it was only done for a party and election purpose. And the same remark applies to the Minute of Council which was passed with reference to the Short Line Railway. Here is the Minute of Council, dated on the 31st of January, and after reciting all the circumstances connected with the road, and setting forth that it shall be made a public work, "the Minister further recommends that a Bill be prepared and submitted to Parliament next Session accordingly." Now remember this was only a fortnight before the elections, and, therefore this expenditure of public money, which would perhaps be justifiable under any circumstances—and I am not saying it would not—was extremely suspicious, when you take into account the fact that these Minutes of Council were issued only a few days previous to the election writs.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to misrepresent the facts.

Mr. JONES. Certainly not.

Mr. TUPPER. Can you tell, if you know, when the legislation was passed in Parliament? Does the hon. gentleman know the dates, because that is the point. I say that legislation preceded every Minute of Council.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman is not—as he said the other night—going to get away from me in that way.

Mr. TUPPER. I want you to stick to the facts.

Mr. JONES. There was a certain subsidy or subvention promised to the Short Line, under which it was to be constructed as a private enterprise.

Mr. TUPPER. There was more than that.

Mr. JONES. No, I say that is all there was, and after the money was expended, after the House had voted a certain sum of money to pay the laborers the whole thing collapsed. It was left *in statu quo*, with not a shovel, or a pick or a man at work upon it, and then, on the 31st January, the Government came down with a Minute of Council, giving it an entirely different character, giving it the character of a public work, and pledging the Government to bring in an Order in Council to carry it on. This was done immediately previous to the election. The hon. gentleman says that I have stated, that promises were made for a very large amount. But I forgot some of the railways. There was one railway respecting which the Minister of Finance was interviewed—one from Halifax to Pictou, about ninety miles long—and I was given to understand, by a gentleman interested in the work, that the Minister of Finance had pledged that the Government would vote a subsidy to that line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the hon. gentleman was misinformed.

Mr. JONES. Well, it was a gentleman in Halifax, on the hon. gentleman's own side of politics, who said that the Minister of Finance, when there, had pledged that the Government would give that subsidy. It is a very proper public work; I do not dispute the propriety of it, but I only say that it is one of the enterprises which, amongst so many, had for the moment escaped my mind.

Mr. TUPPER. The Local Government passed a Bill, the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman says the Local Government passed the Bill which was called the Lobster Bill, but he did not tell the circumstances in connection with that measure. The Local Government found it necessary to carry out certain railway enterprises, if possible, and they pledged the credit of the country; they went into the money market to supplement these subsidies by the public credit of the country, and in that way and in no other way had they any resources at hand to carry on that work. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Anglin, when he was in Halifax, promised what would be done by the Liberal Administration, provided they came in power. The hon. gentleman has not done that distinguished man full credit. I think if he had read the whole of Mr. Anglin's speech—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. I say if he had read it himself; I do not wish him to read it to the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I have read it.

Mr. JONES. He was speaking at Halifax, where there was a great agitation for repeal.

Mr. TUPPER. Headed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES. I was on the platform, if the hon. gentleman desires to know, and I shall presently give him high authority for my presence there. Mr. Anglin was there referring to the position which the people of Nova Scotia occupied at that time, and regretting that the people of Nova Scotia had found it necessary to pursue a repeal policy; and he said then, the same as had been said by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the leader of the Opposition, that he hoped if the Liberal Government came in they would be able to remove those objections which had been pointed out by the Minister of Justice without effect; that the Liberal Government would be able to meet the just expectations of the people of Nova Scotia, so far as regards financial considerations, and would in the end reconcile them to the Union. The hon. gentleman should have given Mr. Anglin full credit for that statement. The hon. gentleman says I have not here avowed my position with reference to the repeal discussion in Nova Scotia. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows me well enough, and hon. members who had a seat in this House before the hon. gentleman was ever here, know me well enough to know one fact—that I have always the courage of my convictions, and that I have never hesitated to explain them here or elsewhere, whatever they may be. The Province of Nova Scotia was dissatisfied and discontented; she was in a bankrupt position—

Mr. HESSON. Who made her so?

Mr. JONES. The Minister of Justice was one of those who pointed out that position. Who made it so? somebody asks me. The men who put us in the Union, the gentlemen who carried out the terms of Union. The hon. gentleman who asked me that question cannot be aware of the fact that, had it not been for the additions made to the revenues of Nova Scotia, time and again, that Province would have been in a position of bankruptcy long ago. But so just were

her claims, when they were presented to the House, and so unfair was the position she originally occupied under the Confederation, so little credit did it reflect on the gentlemen who had charge of Nova Scotia's interests at the conference for the Union, that a very large addition to her revenue was made under the arrangement that was made by Mr. Howe and the present Postmaster General. And a subsequent arrangement was made twice over, and in all these arrangements hon. gentlemen know—no one better than the Minister of Justice himself, whose utterances I gave to the House yesterday—that it was utterly impossible for the Province of Nova Scotia to go on in the position she was in, and maintain her public works. And after the hon. the Minister of Justice had made this application to the Government here, and obtained no answer; after the question was taken up again by the Government which succeeded that Administration, without any answer being given, then it was that the Government deliberately arrived at the conclusion that they must make some effort either to obtain financial consideration or to go out of the Union. They put that question fairly and squarely to the people, and they invited the co-operation of the people of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick to adopt the same policy. They had high authority for that course. I hold in my hand a letter written some time ago by the present Postmaster General. This letter is addressed to one of the late members for the county of Colchester by the Hon. Mr. McLelan, in which he said:

"I am willing to take my share of the responsibility of accepting more money for the local services, and wait a better opportunity to get out of the traces, say until the other Provinces are willing to join us."

That was the course recommended by the present Postmaster General. What does "out of the traces" mean? Why, out of the Union, of course, as soon as we could secure the co-operation of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Therefore I give my hon. friend a very high authority, an authority to which I pay great deference and which he will doubtless regard.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that in 1869?

Mr. JONES. 1869. On that occasion the people of Nova Scotia voted on the question of repeal, and I say this in the presence of hon. members in this House, although I am sorry to have to say it, that the people of Nova Scotia to-day feel their interests are suffering in consequence of their connection with the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TUPPER. I deny that.

Mr. JONES. I say emphatically that if that question were put to the people of Nova Scotia by a plebiscite, and they believed their vote would decide for or against the Union, I believe three-fourths or seven-eighths of the people of Nova Scotia to-day would vote to be restored to the position they occupied previous to 1867. Regrettable as it may be, perhaps it is not altogether their own fault, because they were led by the delusive expectations of hon. gentlemen opposite into a fiscal policy which they have found ruinous to the best interests of their country. They were captivated by a so-called National Policy of a protective character, and they had not the wisdom to see that a maritime people, situated as we are, with a fishing and mining population, all large consumers and not manufacturers, must be free traders *per se*. But they were captivated by the promises that everything was going to be changed, every man was going to be made rich, and they elected members to this House to support the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocated and still sustain. Therefore I state with the hon. leader of the Opposition, that if the people of Nova Scotia are suffering to-day, it is largely due to their own act, because they had not the wisdom to see that the policy under discussion at that time would be detrimental to the best interests of a maritime people. The hon. gentleman

says that this question is dead forever. It may be or it may not be. The Local Legislature has gone through a most successful session, and has just passed a series of resolutions which conclude with the following resolution, which seems to be the deliberate policy of the party in power in that Province.

Mr. TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman mind reading the whole of them ?

Mr. JONES. I only took the last :

"That the House strongly affirms the resolution of the last House that Nova Scotia suffers great disadvantages in the Union, and declares its opinion that unless a material change takes place in financial affairs and commercial relations, whereby the position of the Province is improved, the discontent in Nova Scotia will continue and increase, and it will be necessary to again submit the question of separation from Canada to the people of the Province for their decision."

That is the final conclusion of the address, and it is only carrying out the policy of the Government of which the hon. Minister of Justice was a member, saving the question of repeal, because the Government of the hon. Minister of Justice stated most emphatically that unless they had an extra allowance, great difficulties would arise. Therefore it will be perceived that this question is not at all settled. What may be the outcome of it I cannot predict ; but I am here to take my responsibility for every word I uttered, either in Nova Scotia, during the campaign, or in this House, and to stand up here for the Province, which in her present position has not resources equal to her expenditure. I have pointed out that the position taken by the hon. member for Pictou is not tenable, inasmuch as all the promises made for railway assistance in the Province of Nova Scotia were not made during the previous years when the Government was in power, but were all made on the eve of an election, apparently for election purposes ; and I hope most sincerely that every one of these promises will be redeemed.

Mr. WELSH. Since I have had the honor of a seat on the floor of this House we have been steering North-West. I had a great mind to-night to call on the Minister of Marine to alter the course ; but I do not know whether he is well acquainted with the compass. Of course, there are many things about marine that he does not know, such as when the sun is over the foreyard. But I will not have to call on him to-night, for there has been a squall got up in Nova Scotia. I am not going to interfere with the discussion on Nova Scotia ; but this discussion is supposed to be on the Bill for North-West representation. Its object is to open up a way for appointing some senators for the North-West. I did not intend to speak on this question at all. But on Friday evening the leader of the Government got up and sung his little song of triumph before the House. He started the song, and "as the old cock crows the young one learns," so the young cocks on that side of the House began to crow to-night. Well, I will turn to Prince Edward Island to reply. The hon. First Minister said something about threatening the bolters of Prince Edward Island about voting. If I were on my oath to testify at this minute about any Government employé voting for me, I would say I could not name one. I was asked to take a walk down to the railway wharf previous to the election, and there were 200 or 300 boodlers employed about the railway works, who, as soon as they saw me, began to hoot, and I thought I would go away. Our opponents, the Hon. Donald Ferguson and the Hon. Wm. Campbell, were up here, just previous to the writs being issued, on a deputation. In fact they have been here a great many times on a deputation. They have been claiming something like \$5,000,000 from the Dominion Government. The islanders do not come here begging for any favors ; they do not ask for anything more than justice, but it appears this Local Govern-

Mr. JONES.

ernment—parties of your own stripe, Sir—have been repeatedly here asking for justice without getting any justice ; and they went back to the Local Legislature and the Local Legislature and Council unanimously voted petitions to be sent by memorial to the foot of the Throne to claim justice. They went home to represent the Government's case to the British Government ; and the Minister of Finance was there to checkmate them and argue against the granting of their petition. The whole affair is published in a blue-book, which, no doubt, every hon. member is well acquainted with. They came out, and reported the matter would be referred to the Dominion Government by the home authority. Then they came up here in January on another deputation, and returned to the Island. Whether they had the writs for the election or not, I do not know ; but they said they had a Minute in Council stating that if Sir John should be returned, he would bring in a Bill granting \$500,000 to the Island at 4 per cent. interest, which would be \$20,000 a year. Further, they stated this amount would not interfere with the \$5,000,000, but was merely granted on some arrangement connected with the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. I was not here the other day when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) stated this, and the right hon. gentleman denied it. There must be a mistake somewhere, but I rather think it is true, because, if I am not mistaken, the other night the Minister of Finance, in reply to a question, said it was the intention of the Government to grant the Island an extra subsidy of \$20,000 a year. We not only had to contend against all these things, but we had to contend against the Government railway employes and civil servants, and also against the Local Government officials ; yet the majority given us in a Conservative county exceeded anything ever known in the county before. The people of the Island took it that the whole thing amounted purely and simply to bribery, and I suppose they voted accordingly. During the discussions here, on various occasions, we have had the revising officers and the returning officers brought cut, and each hon. gentleman passed his opinion as to how they acted. But I have this much to say for Prince Edward Island : That we have three sheriffs there, partisans of the Government, and the returning officers were partisans too ; but I am proud to say that these gentlemen acted honorably, and I believe the officials under them acted very fairly throughout the whole Island. It is much to their credit that we did not see, what many perhaps would have liked to have seen, a double return, or a man who had not the majority of votes sent here to represent the people. We call ourselves hon. gentlemen when we get up to address each other, and really, I think, we ought to act in accordance with the title, but I am afraid the title will not apply all round. The elections were on the 22nd of February, and I think it was on Saturday, the 19th of February, the last public meeting I was at in the county, when the Hon. Donald Ferguson got up and produced a telegram purporting to be from the Minister of Finance, dated Amherst, saying : If the party returned him to support Sir John, the Government was prepared to go on with the sub-way right off. If that be not true, the hon. the Minister of Finance can contradict it. We have heard a good deal about Nova Scotia secession. I consider I am just as loyal a subject as lives under the Queen's flag, I was born under it, and I hope to live under it and to die under it. I like the constitution we have, but I tell the right hon. gentleman this, that if you send us to the poor-house you cannot expect us to whistle Rule Britannia. No, Sir, we will not do it. Now the right hon. gentleman is very good-natured and very jolly. He is a friend of mine, and during the whole contest I always stood up for him. I always said he was a good fellow and I can say so still. He came to the Island once very sick, and came away very much improved, almost as if he had been to the hot springs at Banff ; but unfortun-

ly he left his sickness behind him, and we have been sick ever since.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have to go back.

Mr. WELSH. You will, Sir, and take the sickness away. You have the power to do it. Nine years ago my esteemed friend, lately gone, the Hon J. H. Pope, said: Come to the rink, we are going to have a good meeting; the Minister of Finance will be there, and will make a speech. I said I would, and we went. The Minister of Finance walked in, surrounded by a body-guard of Pictonians—good-looking fellows, every one of them. He took his place on the platform, and made a very good speech from his point of view, and I sat near the door so as to be ready to run. The hon. gentleman said—I remember his words well: Gentlemen of Prince Edward Island, give us the National Policy for two years, and I will guarantee you reciprocity. If you do not put a duty on potatoes and oats, the Americans will come down here and drive you out of the country. I jumped up and ran. Mr. Pope said: Do not go yet; but I said: I cannot stand that. As the hon. Minister of Finance has just come in, I will just repeat what I said a moment ago. At our last meeting before the elections, in my county, the Hon. Donald Ferguson got up and read a telegram, purporting to come from the Minister of Finance, dated Amherst, Thursday or Friday, I am not sure which, stating if the men of Queen's county would return the Hon. Donald Ferguson, the Government would build the sub way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that I never sent such a telegram or anything like it. I never made such a statement. I never made any reference to the contingency of the present Government being supported or any pledge if they were supported, in reference to the sub-way whatever.

Mr. WELSH. Quite satisfactory. I did not say you did. I only said that the Hon. Donald Ferguson got up at the meeting and said: "Here is a telegram I got from Sir Charles Tupper, dated Amherst, and saying, if you return the Hon. Donald Ferguson, the Dominion Government will build a sub-way."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know Mr. Ferguson well, and I do not hesitate to say that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in his recollection of what Mr. Ferguson said on that occasion. I undertake to say that Mr. Ferguson never read such a telegram or pretended to read such a telegram as the hon. gentlemen has stated.

Mr. WELSH. You were not there. I say it is a good man who can answer for himself in this world. When you come to answer for the sins of your friends, you have more to answer than you think for.

Mr. DAVIN. You will permit me to recall the attention of the Committee to the question before it, whether we shall give two representatives in the Senate to the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, as we are coming back to the subject of the reference to the Committee, and most likely we will have a considerable continuance of this debate, the hon. gentleman had better move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is right; do as you are told. Committee rose and reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. JOHN HARBOR.

Mr. ELLIS asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place at the mouth of St. John Harbor during the coming season, a bell-buoy instead of that now there, which is practically unservicable?

Mr. FOSTER. It has already been decided to place a bell-buoy at or near the place occupied by the old one, and tenders for its construction have been asked for.

PUBLIC WHARVES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. ROBERTSON (King's) asked, Whether the Government has any official in Prince Edward Island to report on the state of the public wharves in that Province, and to attend to repairs on these wharves?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The management of wharves at Prince Edward Island, with that of the other wharves in the Dominion, is through the Department at Ottawa. The resident Agent of the Department in the Maritime Provinces reports, when requested, in the usual way, on the condition of the wharves in this Province, and attends also to such repairs as may be ordered.

FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. FLYNN asked, Has the bounty money to fishermen in the Maritime Provinces been distributed yet? If not, when will it be?

Mr. FOSTER. Part of the bounty has been distributed, and the remainder is being distributed as rapidly as the cheques can be made out.

SAWDUST IN STREAMS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is the Act which compels the owners of sawmills to keep sawdust out of streams in force in every county in Ontario? If not in force in every county, what counties are exempt from its operation, and why the discrimination?

Mr. FOSTER. The Act which compels the owners of sawmills to keep sawdust out of streams is enforced in every county in Ontario. The mills on the Ottawa River, near the city of Ottawa, are exempted by Order in Council.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why?

Mr. FOSTER. The reasons will be found in the Order in Council which made the exemption, and which was based on the report of the commission appointed by the leader of the Mackenzie Administration.

QUEBEC CENTRAL.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government have taken under consideration, since last year, the question of granting this Session to the Quebec Central Railway Company an additional subsidy to assist them in extending their line from Beauce Junction through the valley of the Chaudière to the Province line, and thence to the line of the International Railway at or near River L'Original in the State of Maine?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Railways not being present, I must tell the hon. member that this matter is under the consideration of the Government.

FERRY BOATS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND LEVIS.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a regular line of ferry boats between the cities of Quebec and Levis to connect the railways on the north shore of the St. Lawrence with the railways on the south shore in the Province of Quebec, those of the other Provinces and of the United States? If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to do so as early as possible.

LEATHER AND RAW HIDES INSPECTOR, LEVIS, &c.

Mr. GUAY asked: Whether Mr. Eudore Lemieux, inspector of leather and raw hides for the counties of Lévis, Bellechasse, Dorchester and Lotbinière, has resigned? If so, what is the name of his successor?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Lemieux has not resigned.

HUBERT HÉBERT.

Mr. DESSAINT, in the absence of Mr. CHOQUETTE, asked, 1st. What is the balance due to Hubert Hébert, revising officer for the electoral district of Montmagny, for salary, travelling expenses, printing, &c., in connection with the preparation of the electoral list for the county of Montmagny? 2nd. Has the said Hubert Hébert filed his account for all he claimed as due to him as revising officer for salary, expenses, printing, &c.? And if so, what was the total amount of such account?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Hébert, the revising officer alluded to, has filed an account for \$1,051. The sum of \$1,018 was granted to him, thirty-two dollars having been withheld by the auditor according to the regulations which were passed. Mr. Hébert, like other revising officers, received \$250 on account of his salary; what is left due to him is a balance for salary, which salary has not yet been finally fixed upon. The account of Mr. Hébert seems to be an account of all his personal expenses concerning the revision.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the hon. the Minister of Finance, whether he is yet in a position to give us any definite information as to when we may expect the Estimates and the subsequent Budget statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope to be able to name Tuesday next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For the Estimates?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman fix the date for the statement? I understand that he will bring down the Estimates on Tuesday, but has he made up his mind when he will be able to make the statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not sure about the statement, but, if I am able to reach it on Tuesday, I will lay the Estimates on the Table a day or two before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the House is aware, we have, as a rule, had the Estimates a day or two before the statement is made, and it is highly desirable that that rule should be followed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, it will be.
Mr. GUAY.

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY CHARTERS.

On the order being called for Mr. WATSON's motion for Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on which to found an Address to his Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be graciously pleased to effectuate the altered policy stated to the House of Commons on the 5th February, 1884, and in pursuance thereof to leave to their operation any Acts of the Local Legislature, not otherwise objectionable, which have been or may be passed for the construction of railway lines within the original Province of Manitoba,

Mr. WATSON. I have received a communication from the chairman of a deputation that has arrived from Winnipeg for the purpose of laying this matter more forcibly before the Government. They have had an interview this morning, and I have received a communication which I will read to the House:

"As the matter of disallowance is now under consideration by the Cabinet, I am desired by the Manitoba deputation to suggest that you should, if possible, have your motion on the paper for to-day stand for Thursday, to-morrow week.

" F. W. ROBERTSON."

If it is the wish of the House to have the matter stand until then, in accordance with the wish of the deputation, I ask it to do so. Of course, this deputation feel that every means possible and every pressure possible should be brought to bear on the House, and, if the Government will agree to allow this to stand till a week from to-morrow, I should like to have it stand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, there is no objection.

Order postponed until Thursday the 12th instant, to be then the First Order of the Day.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return showing the amounts (in detail) expended under warrants from the Governor General in each of the years from 1873 to 1886, both inclusive.

He said: In making this motion, I desire to call the attention of the House to the general question which is involved in the use of these Governor General's warrants, and I wish to do that, not merely because the amount involved is very large, but also because a constitutional and parliamentary question of the very first importance appears to me to be involved in this matter. Now, as this is a new House, and as a large number of the gentlemen present are new members, I may take the opportunity of recalling to their minds the facts under which we separated last June. We sat for an unusually long time; we sat up to the first week of June; the parliamentary year terminated on the 1st July, so that all Departments ought to have been unusually well prepared with their estimates of the expenditure required, at any rate, for the year which terminated on the 1st July, and more than usually well prepared with their estimates for the expenditure for this present year. Now, I do not suppose that there is any member, young or old, in this House, who is not aware that it is the very cardinal principle on which all parliamentary institutions hinge that Ministers of the Crown, and the Crown itself, should not, under any pretext whatever, expend public money until that money has been voted by Parliament, and until the reasons why the Crown asks for the money has been fully explained and discussed. To that rule there is but one exception. That is very well defined in the statute under which these same Governor General's warrants are issued. In cases of public emergency, in cases where unforeseen accidents occur, in cases where things arise which could not reasonably be foreseen or arranged for by the several Departments, then and in such cases, if Parliament be not in Session, as the

Act states, a Governor General's warrant may issue, with certain formalities and under certain precautions and safeguards. I want to call the attention of the House to this further fact, that the appropriations given by us for the service of the year 1886 and for the service of the present year, were unusually large and liberal. We voted thirty-eight millions and a-half, in round numbers, for the service of 1886; we voted about thirty-four millions and a-half, in round numbers, for the service of 1887; and yet the first thing our attention is called to when this House meets is that, over and above the thirty-eight millions and a-half appropriated for 1886, over and above the thirty-four millions and a-half appropriated for ordinary service in 1887, with a large sum further required on capital account, the Government of Canada have, under Governor's warrants, abstracted from the public Treasury two sums, one of \$308,748, for the service of the few remaining weeks of 1886, and another, amounting to \$2,005,539, for the service of the current year. I think that all hon. gentlemen on both sides will agree that this House would be entirely false to its duty if it did not, at an early period, institute an investigation into the circumstances and causes which have induced the Government of Canada, without parliamentary authority, to withdraw amounts of very nearly two millions and a-half of dollars from the public chest, without any parliamentary authority whatever, under the pretext that they were entitled to do so by Governor General's warrant. Now, Sir, although this question was alluded to incidentally yesterday, it is desirable, in case any hon. gentleman here should not be familiar with the clause, that I should read to the House the circumstances under which this extraordinary prerogative may be exercised. As I said, there is but one occasion on which, according to law, the Government are authorised to order a special warrant to issue, and this is defined as follows:—

"If, when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared and be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated."

Now, I want to call the attention of the House *seriatim* to the sort of charges which have been conceived to be warranted under this clause, which have been conceived to be sufficiently urgent to authorise the issue of a Governor General's warrant, and to be of a class which could not reasonably be foreseen or provided for in Parliament. As I have said, we separated in the first week of June last, and I find that in the short interval between the 2nd of June and the first of July, the Government found themselves obliged to call for \$150,000 to pay the Mounted Police accounts in connection with the suppression of the rebellion. Now, that rebellion had been suppressed about a year previous to the date this order was issued, and I submit that one of two things has occurred: either the Department, whose duty it was to provide the Finance Minister with the requisite estimates, has been conducted *prima facie* with great carelessness, as otherwise their estimates could not have come short of the required amount by so large a sum as \$150,000; or it has been found convenient to suppress their estimates and to adopt this extraordinary mode of providing the funds required rather than allow them to appear and be discussed in Parliament. Then I find, under the head of Charges of Management, an additional amount of \$100,000 required. Now, Sir, I confess that I cannot see how it was that with ordinary circumspection on the part of the Department whose duty it was to ascertain what was required for this service, so large an additional sum as \$100,000 should be required. I think, also, that on the 2nd of June, or

thereabouts, when we separated, the Dominion Lands Department ought to have known sufficiently nearly what they would require to expend for income to have been able to estimate for it for the few remaining weeks, instead of demanding by Governor General's warrant nearly \$19,000. However, it is possible that there may be a sufficient explanation to be advanced with respect to these various charges. But, Sir, when we come to the larger warrants involving the enormous sum of \$2,000,000, which have been added to the service of this present year, I confess that it does appear to me, on the face of it, that very grave irregularities, to say the least, have prevailed. Now, it might have been necessary that on the 1st of February, 1887, we should require to vote \$125,000 to pay certain legal costs between the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and ourselves.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is one of the election expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say. Some of those dates as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) appears to perceive are singularly suggestive; but bearing in mind the delays which have occurred on other occasions in payments of awards, I do not see myself there was any such hurry for the payment of this sum of \$125,000 on the 1st of February.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was the award to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. The award was a legal one, therefore I do not pretend to say that it may not have been necessary to provide for it; but my recollection is that in a good many other cases after these awards have been made, considerable time elapsed before they were paid. However, I am not going to insist upon that item. It is one that calls for explanation, no doubt, but it is one as to which there may be, and there probably is, a satisfactory explanation to be given. As to the next item of \$46,000 for the Banff Hot Springs, and to pay for surveys, roads and bridges—we had that tolerably well discussed on a recent occasion, and I will only say that I believe that if there was one class of expenditure which was never contemplated by the framers of this Act or by Parliament, to be defrayed by Governor General's warrant as an urgent public necessity, it was an expenditure of money for walks and drives in a public pleasure ground. Now, Mr. Speaker, I perceive that a considerable sum of money, about \$32,000, has been taken by Order in Council for salary and expenses of Commissioners on rebellion losses. That may be in itself a reasonable expenditure, but I think it was quite within the competence of the Government, and of the then Minister of Finance, and of the Department concerned, to have foreseen that this sum would be required, and to have made a provision in the Estimates; or if they liked, to have taken a larger amount under the head of Unforeseen Expenses, to which such Commission might properly enough, perhaps, be charged. The same remark would apply to the Royal Commission on Railways, for which a charge of \$20,000 is made. I think that that subject was also discussed, and I think that if the Government thought it expedient to issue a Railway Commission, they might with great ease have foreseen and provided in the Estimates, a reasonable amount for covering it. Now, Sir, I do not object so much to bringing forward the lapsed balance of the appropriation for expenses of the rebellion, because that had already been discussed in Parliament, and that, perhaps, is one of the cases in which they might reasonably and legitimately, not having been able to get through this expenditure by the 30th of September, have applied for Governor General's warrant. But when I come to the grants for seed grain to settlers in Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, although I am aware that there was serious destitution in that region, and, therefore, I forbear criticising this as much as I otherwise might, I

must say that when my hon. friend from Northumberland and other members consider the dates at which these orders were given, being respectively the 11th of March and the 17th of March, it may occur to them that other causes than the destitution of the settlers governed the grant of \$115,000 to these unfortunate people. So, Sir, similarly, although there may be a cause for it, I have my doubts whether the expenditure of the 25th of January, 1887, of \$10,000 for relief to the sufferers by the flood in the town of Cornwall, would have been so freely granted by the hon. gentleman opposite if there had not been some considerable doubt as to how the town of Cornwall would go at the approaching elections. But, Sir, I think, for many reasons, that the appropriation which I see further down of \$4,000 to the St. Catharine Milling and Lumber Company, costs in the suit of the Queen represented by the Ontario Government against that company, is one of the last things that should have been passed without reference to this House, and full discussion here. Coming to larger matters I find that in spite of the large grants made for the service of the Intercolonial Railway, enormous sums have been appropriated for various purposes—\$85,000 for rolling stock; a grant on February 18, 1887, of \$150,000 for land claims and damages for the St. Charles Branch. That, also, is a suggestive item. The sum of \$150,000 was paid for land damages for the St. Charles Branch on Feb., 18th, and a little later \$72,000 more, making in all \$222,000 paid for those land claims and damages. I cannot conceive why Parliament, which was shortly about to assemble, should not have been consulted on this subject, and why the required sum should not have been obtained here. I also fail to understand why such a large sum of money as \$20,000 for the Pictou Town Branch, and a large sum of money for other expenditures on the Intercolonial, amounting in all to \$264,000, should have been required to have been expended in three months. In all about \$600,000 has been expended by Governor General's warrant, without the authority of Parliament, on the Intercolonial alone. The reason why, on the 10th and 16th November, under the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$30,000 were paid to A. Onderdonk for removing slides, I cannot say, and I shall be glad to have an explanation. Then I come, on 4th January, to a warrant for \$100,000 for the Franchise Act. I venture to say that the exercise of common foresight and prudence on the part of those charged with the working of that Act, might have judged that this sum would have been required, and that a vote should have been taken for it. Why the vote was not taken is probably clearly apparent. It was the object to minimise the expenditure under that Act, and therefore a smaller sum was demanded than that which was pointed out on this side of the House would be needed, and which hon. gentlemen knew, was likely to be required. It will be remembered that last year an attempt was made to cut down the expenditure for Dominion lands both on capital and income; and, I fancy, as a result of that, \$101,000 more were demanded for that service—and again I think a very little prudence and foresight on the part of the officers of the Department would have led them to inform the Government what sum was really required, and prevented the Government having recourse to this extraordinary means of meeting it. Later on I find on 14th April the Governor General's warrant was issued for about \$25,000 for an experimental farm, \$189,113 for expenses of Indians in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and about \$53,000 for other purposes. With respect to the expenditure for Indians I have two remarks to make. First of all, I think it reflects seriously on the Department that they should be unable to estimate within \$200,000 what sum will be required during a period of about nine months. But there is another and I think a graver question involved in regard to these charges. I find there are no less than twelve charges, involving in all an amount of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

\$423,000, very nearly half a million of dollars, which were paid by Governor General's warrant, according to the statement laid on Table, on 14th April, this House having met on 13th April. It appears to me—the Minister of Justice is in his place, and he can correct me if I misread the Act—that this is clearly illegal. The words under which Governor General's warrants are authorised to issue read as follows:—

“If when Parliament is not in Session”——

Now, I cannot understand how it was legal, after the use of such a phrase in the Statute which gives the authority, and after Parliament met on 13th April, how it was constitutional or proper in any way that while this Parliament was sitting here, the Government, by Governor General's warrant, should take \$423,000 for different purposes out of the public Treasury. I shall be glad to hear from the Minister of Justice, if I am incorrect in this interpretation; but it appears to me, taking merely the statute, and reading it as it stands, that here there has been a distinct illegal procedure, wholly apart from the question of the advisability of the practice. With respect to a very great number of those items I desire to call the attention of the House, on both sides, to the fact that it is a most useless farce for us to go through the discussion of Estimates night after night if we find that when the Government have brought down their Estimates, and stated that they require thirty-four or thirty-five millions, as the case may be, for the public service, the Government can, when our backs are turned, by Governor General's warrants take \$2,300,000 out of the public chest and expend it for a variety of purposes. Some of those purposes may be justifiable, some may be good enough, but it appears to me to prove conclusively one of two things: either the various Departments did not fully understand their business, and made exceedingly loose estimates of the sums likely to be required, or else the Government, for certain reasons of their own, saw fit to refuse to listen to the reports of the Departments and placed smaller sums in the Estimates than were really required. Moreover, there is, I think, a special reason why attention should be called to this particular series of items. Those items were mostly taken out of the public chest at the time of the general elections, at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite could not know, unless they possessed the spirit of prophecy, whether they possessed the confidence of the country and would be sustained by the incoming Parliament or not. Under any circumstances, I think the practice is most objectionable, but it is doubly and trebly objectionable when it occurs prior to a general election, and when, as a number of these payments show, those sums were paid in certain constituencies within a few days of the time at which the voters went to the polls. I may be wrong in my reading of the law, although the law appears very clear and distinct, and although I quite clearly recollect under what circumstances Governor General's warrants in days gone by were usually issued. But it does appear to me that under colorable pretext, and even without any pretext at all, the law as laid down in the Consolidated Statutes, at all events, has been openly and boldly violated; and, I repeat, that there does not appear to be any escape from this alternative, either that the various Departments have made very gross under-estimates of the sums required, or else their estimates have not been attended to but kept back, and this number of Governor General's warrants was issued to cover very large sums which it was not convenient to allow to appear in the Estimates of last year. I will only say, in conclusion, that I cannot conceive what earthly purpose will be served by bringing Parliament together here, what earthly purpose it will serve to have financial statements submitted or careful estimates prepared, if after these have been submitted, discussed, and voted on in Parliament, we are to find that millions of money may be

taken, under this or any other pretext, out of the public Treasury, on grounds which it appears to me the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to show, come either within the letter or the spirit of the Act to which I have alluded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, there can be no possible objection to the motion which the hon. gentleman has made. In fact, I assume that, when the information for which the hon. gentleman has moved comes down, and a comparison is made between these warrants and those which were issued under the Administration of my hon. friend on the other side, it will be found that very little explanation will be required as regards a considerable portion of the remarks he has just addressed to the House. I may say at the outset that I am disposed to concur with the hon. gentleman in the principle he has laid down. I think the warrant of the Governor General should be confined to services which are contemplated by the authority under which that warrant is issued, that is, services which are unforeseen and which it is necessary should be provided for without reference to Parliament. It will be observed that with regard to this very large sum—and it is an abnormally large sum—of over \$2,000,000 comprised in these warrants, the hon. gentleman has not taken exception, as I understand him, to any item in this paper. He has not challenged any one of these expenditures as an improper expenditure. It is quite possible that my hon. colleague behind me may be open to the charge of not having accurately estimated the precise amount which would be required for some of these various services, but I may say that it is not always convenient to make an estimate in regard to matters of that kind. If an estimate which is thus made is a very large estimate it stimulates the parties who are making claims to make those claims commensurate to the estimate. Take the rebellion losses claims, for instance, which were under consideration. The hon. gentleman knows that if Parliament, in advance of the report of the Royal Commission, had provided a very large amount for the settlement of these claims, it would stimulate the parties to put in claims for amounts which, at all events, would cover the appropriation of Parliament. So that I think there is a sufficient reason why it is not desirable, in many of these cases, to anticipate what would be required by an estimate which must be, in the nature of things, very inaccurate and incomplete. The hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to a number of these items, as to which it will be seen at once that all possible foundation for a criticism of the action of the Government disappears. Take the first item of \$125,631.75. What is that item? The hon. gentleman knows that the Government of which he was a member dispossessed the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company—for whom one of his colleagues exhibited a great deal of sympathy on a recent occasion—of the possession of the Windsor branch—forcibly dispossessed them, took it out of their hands, and placed it in the hands of another company. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, under a petition of right, took an action—as they were entitled to do—against the Government of Canada for that act; and the Government—the successors of hon. gentlemen opposite—felt bound to resist in all its stages the claim which was made, and the verdict which was secured against the Government with regard to that claim. But when the time came, when the last appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had gone against Canada, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that, under those circumstances, when it was found that they were entitled by the verdict of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to a certain amount, he will agree with me that there should be no unnecessary delay in paying them a claim which was raised so long ago as the period when the hon. gentleman was in office, a claim which was founded

on the act of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. I think it will not be necessary that I should occupy the time of the House any longer in relation to that question. I will also pass over the Banff Hot Springs, as I hope the information afforded to the House yesterday in regard to that matter will be considered sufficient to make it unnecessary for me to add anything to the full and complete explanations which were then given. The fact is that the Government were led to believe by gentlemen on both sides of the House that it was very important that steps should be taken in regard to that question; and having decided to set aside that locality as a public park, the needful steps were instituted by the Government for the purpose of ascertaining precisely what would require to be done. Parliament not being in Session, they considered that it was not desirable that any time should be lost in developing the springs and making them valuable to all classes of people who might resort to them for the benefits they would afford. Steps were accordingly taken, and in order to avoid the loss of a year, the grant was anticipated and a warrant was obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will observe that the larger portion of that was after Parliament was in Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was April the 14th, but the order was passed before that. I may say that I quite agree with the hon. gentleman on the question of law, because it seems to be explicit, but the Order in Council was passed previous to the meeting of Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How long previous.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A very short time previous; but the hon. gentleman will see that it was to cover expenditures already made and that there would be considerable delay in meeting it, unless it was met by the warrant of the Governor General. No Order in Council for any warrant contained in this list was passed by Council after the meeting of Parliament. Then the hon. gentleman did not say much in regard to the question of compensation for losses arising out of the rebellion in the North-West Territories, and very naturally, because he would at once perceive that the Government would be bound promptly to provide for losses, if there were any. If there was any case which could possibly justify the issue of the Governor General's warrant, it would be a case of that kind, in which it was found that individuals had suffered—as they did suffer—in consequence of that unfortunate rebellion. Therefore I think you will agree with me that no unnecessary time should be allowed to lapse between the finding of the commission and the payment of the relief to the parties who are the claimants. Then, the salaries and expenses of commissioners on the rebellion losses could not be very well estimated until the work was closed, and it had been found what amount of time, labor and expense had been involved in performing that important duty. The hon. gentleman has made no remark in regard to the consolidation of the Statutes, because that is a lapsed balance for which Parliament had provided, and which forms an item of \$24,772.30. The Royal Commission on Railways was also authorized by this House. I do not, perhaps, sympathise so very much with that appropriation, from the fact that while I had the honor of occupying the position of Minister of Railways I opposed the efforts that were being made in that direction; but the House came to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that whole question examined by a Royal Commission, and provision, of course, had to be made for it. Then, the amount of \$163,938.83 for expenses of the rebellion in the North-West Territories is also a lapsed balance, and the hon. gentleman will agree that having had the sanction of Parliament before—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did state that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I think so; but as my hon. friend will see, it all goes to make up that large total of \$2,000,000, and shows that for a considerable portion of that amount there was actually the previous vote and approval of Parliament. So, with reference to seed grain for settlers, I believe there is no question that, if it was found necessary to give relief of that kind, it should be dealt with as an unforeseen expenditure. So with regard to the relief of distressed settlers at Prince Albert and Batoche. Therefore I think this sum of \$136,679 is one to which no objection will be raised, and I think it will be admitted that it was right and proper that a Governor General's warrant should be obtained in order that relief should be afforded. The Royal Commission on Lachine Canal leases was a matter that would necessarily have to be provided for. The Bow River bridge in the North-West Territories was found to be very much demanded, and as this was a case in which the Government were led to believe that delay would be attended with great inconvenience, the expenditure was warrantable. The compensation for sinking the barge *Williams* in the Lachine Canal was entitled to be granted, it having been found that the Government had damaged those parties to the amount of \$2,638.79. Then the sum of \$10,264 is a lapsed balance, which had received the approval of Parliament, for a return to persons in Prince Edward Island of the amount of duties paid to the United States Customs on fish and fish oils. The next item is a small amount of a savings bank account paid to the surviving executor of the late George Wilson. The only item in the whole of this long and rather formidable list to which the hon. gentleman took very decided exception was \$4,000 to pay the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company costs in the suit of the Queen, represented by the Ontario Government, against that company. But the hon. gentleman will be greatly relieved to learn that that expenditure had received the approval of Parliament, and is among the lapsed balances, although it is not so stated here. Then, we have next a number of items connected with the Department of Public Works, in reference to which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will, doubtless, as he is always able to do, give the most minute, specific, and satisfactory information. The expenditure of \$25,460 for Mounted Police buildings is also in the category of lapsed balances, having been approved and previously voted by Parliament. The expenditure of \$18,000 on the Negro Point breakwater, at St. John, was, I suppose in consequence of its being carried away by a storm or something of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one item in the Public Works Department which the hon. gentleman has passed over—arbitrations and awards—to pay Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co., for loss of tug *Sultan*, \$8,000, on January 10th, 1877. I should like to know what great urgency there was for that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was in consequence of an award. The award was contested by the Government, but the parties wanted a larger amount than this. They wanted interest as well, and finally they agreed, in order that their case might be settled, to take the \$8,000 without costs or interest, and a Governor's warrant was obtained for the amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The next item of \$5,000, for rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway, it will at once be seen, arose from the hope on the part of the Government when Parliament was in Session that they would not be required to increase the rolling stock, and a sufficient vote for that service was not taken; but it was found during the year that the great increase in business, especially the greatly increased demand for coal cars, made it an absolute necessity to have this increased amount for that purpose. The land claims and damages on the St. Charles Branch, to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the amount of \$222,091.46, to which my hon. friend also took very decided objection, will at once, I am sure, be recognised as warranted by the fact that the awards of the arbitrators were resisted by the Government. They refused to pay those awards to the parties, took the case into the Exchequer Court, and this amount was to pay the judgment of the Exchequer Court against the Government, and was consequently one which it was impossible to avoid. The expenditures amounting in all to \$264,000, for the Halifax Extension, the Dartmouth Branch, the Dalhousie Branch, the Rivière du Loup Branch, the Pictou Branch, the Indian-town Branch, air brakes and sleeping cars, were expenditures that became due under the authority which Parliament had granted for proceeding with those works, and, of course, there was no possible means of avoiding payment as the work was done and the money became due. The largest proportion of that amount had been voted by Parliament, and had lapsed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It ought to have been, but I may say I have been so very closely occupied as not to have given, perhaps, the personal attention I should have to this paper; but the bulk of that amount of \$264,000 should appear as a lapsed balance, which it is practically. Then the payment to Mr. Onderdonk for slides in British Columbia arises from the fact, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the railway there had been constructed through an exceedingly difficult country, and it has been found impossible to avoid very serious landslides. After the track had been completed and everything done according to specification, it was not unusual to have serious landslides occurring. I saw myself in that locality, on the Fraser, a case in which a large portion of a farm was one day on one side of the river and the next morning on the other side, with some of the buildings and constructions upon it not having been disturbed. In regard to the Franchise Act, that Act involved an expenditure of \$100,000, and, as my hon. friend knows, that also had the approval of Parliament. It was expenditure incurred carrying out the Act which Parliament, after full, careful and exhaustive discussion, had decided it was necessary should become law. Then there is the expenditure on the canals, repairs to Port Colborne and Port Maitland harbor works, Welland and Chambly Canals. The hon. gentleman knows repairs have to be made occasionally, and these repairs, amounting to \$23,661, had to be provided for.

Mr. POPE. They were owing to a very heavy storm.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were the result of an exceptionally severe storm which involved the absolute necessity of immediate expenditure to relieve the damage. The House will see this was a case of unforeseen expenditure which we could not avoid providing for. Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, St. John, N.B., and ports in the Basin of Minas, \$2,000. This arose from an error in not having put in the amount which it was agreed between this Government and the Government of Nova Scotia should be provided for, and that error required to be corrected by warrant. The next item, \$2,016, mail subsidy from Campbellton to Gaspé, is also a lapsed balance, provided for by Parliament, but which had not been paid over at the time the amount lapsed. So with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway's suspense account, to pay the Grand Trunk Railway for fuel and the North Shore Railway, at the time of the transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, \$35,373. It was not known under the contract what money would be required to be paid when the claim should be established, and the claim was not established during the Session of Parliament. The Province of Manitoba debt account, was a settlement in full of all claims in connection with the contract of J. A. Gellay & Co., for the Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg, in which the amount provided was exceeded by

\$4,767, to complete the buildings. Carleton Branch Railway capital, to pay for outstanding stock, \$3,000. The Liquor License Act, to refund fees, \$29,000. The amount of \$70,000 in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition is due to the fact that the expenditure considerably exceeded what we hoped at an earlier period would have covered the cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When did that close?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The exhibition closed about the 11th November. Of course the closing of the exhibition and getting rid of the exhibits which filled such an enormous space as we were able to fill in that exhibition, are two very different things, and it required a large amount of expenditure, under the arrangement which had been made by the Government, to dispose of the exhibits after the close. The experimental farm had also received the approval of Parliament, and the appropriation of \$25,000 for that was to carry out the arrangements submitted to and sanctioned by Parliament. The \$189,113 for the Indians in Manitoba, North West Territories and British Columbia was, of course, unforeseen, the amount required to meet the necessity in that case having very far exceeded the amount anticipated by the hon. the First Minister, who has charge of that Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And whose attention I called to the probable estimate at the time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman having called the attention of the Head of the Department to the fact of its being a moderate estimate, would be better prepared to excuse the necessity of the Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite the reverse. I cannot agree with that logic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The next item is Quarantine: compensation to owners of cattle to prevent the spread of pneumonia, \$39,256. This arises from the great misfortune created in pleuro-pneumonia having broken out in the quarantine station at Lévis, and to the prompt and energetic measures necessary to be taken—measures which have had the effect of instantaneously stamping out all possible extension of the disease in this country, and thus enabling us to continue to enjoy the security we do. This security makes the expenditure, great as it is, appear very insignificant, compared with the very important purpose for which it was provided. I am certain the House will agree with me that this was entirely an unforeseen expenditure, and one which I hope will not soon occur again. Ocean and River Service and Dominion Steamers, \$14,000, arises from the fact that this service which Parliament had authorised exceeded by this sum the amount appropriated. I quite agree with the principle which the hon. gentleman has laid down, that the Governor General's warrants should never be resorted to in any case in which it is possible to obtain the consent of Parliament, without great inconvenience to the public service, and I hope, when the papers he has moved for are brought down, to find a great deal of justification in the practice of the Administration of which the hon. gentleman had the honor of being Finance Minister.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise now mainly to call the attention of the House, after the explanations given by the Finance Minister, to a single item in this list; but before doing so I may say in reply to the hon. the Finance Minister, that it would be very desirable now, in order to avoid the recurrence of such a statement as this, which certainly presents a very abnormal amount of money drawn from the Treasury without the action of the people's representatives having been had upon it—I say it would be very desirable for the

hon. gentleman in future to get accurate statements as far as possible from the different Departments. Either they are to blame in not putting in such amounts as would cover their probable expenditure, or the officer who made up the Budget must have understated these amounts, and, therefore, misled the House in making the expenditure of the year apparently less than was actually required. With regard to a single item in this, I propose to criticise the action of the Government. The Minister of Public Works has given an explanation of this. The item is a warrant issued on the 10th January, under the head of Public Works—Arbitrations and Awards, to pay Call, Sadler & Co. for the loss of the tug *Sultan*, \$8,000. The hon. gentleman says there was an award made by the Dominion arbitrators, and that these gentlemen awarded this amount to Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co. for the loss of the tug *Sultan*, but that, as they claimed more, and the Government were going to contest the award, they accepted that amount. I know the circumstances of this case, and I will give them a little more fully. This tug *Sultan* was employed on behalf of the Government to do certain service, and during the season to transport tugs and scows between Prince Edward Island and a port in Nova Scotia. A Government officer was on board that tug, the Government officer was in charge of that tug, and the captain of the tug took his instructions from that Government officer. The proprietors of the tug had the Government officer effect an insurance upon a particular voyage on which that tug was engaged, but, while at sea, and after proceeding on the voyage to transport these vessels from one port to the other, the Government agent altered the order of transportation and changed the voyage, and so vitiated the policy of insurance, and then the vessel was lost. When a claim was made on the insurance company, the fact came out that, by direction of the officer of the Government, who was on board and in charge of the tug, the voyage had been deviated from, and the insurance company obtained a non-suit before the Circuit Court in Northumberland. I think this occurred eight or nine years ago. I am not sure about the time, but I know it was a long time ago, more than five years at any rate. The firm applied to the Government for compensation, which the Government refused to give them. The matter went through my hands. I did my level best to induce the Government to come to some arrangement, but they would not do it. I tried to get them to refer it to arbitration, but that was refused year after year. I will, however, say this for the Minister of Public Works, under whose charge the matter was, that he was always impressed with the justice of the claim, and that I never found more fair consideration given to any claims that I had to press upon the Government than was always given by him as head of a Department; and I do not impute to him anything improper or any act of injustice in connection with this transaction. At last, I got the matter referred to arbitration, I think something like fifteen or sixteen months ago. The arbitrators sat upon it, I think some fourteen or probably fifteen months ago. I think it was in December twelve months, some time near Christmas. They awarded \$8,000 to Messrs. Call, Sadler & Co. After that award was made, I had occasion to wait on the Department in order to endeavor to get the amount paid, or to get it put in the Estimates of last year. I was told by the Minister that he would have to submit it to Council. I understood that the decision of Council was that they were determined to contest the claim, and the amount was not put in the Estimates last year. So the matter stood. Peter Mitchell was out of favor with the Administration. He had the courage of his convictions. He had the courage, when he differed with the Administration, to say so. Consequently, although this was a just and equitable claim, which had been passed on by the Dominion arbitrators, I could not get a sum put in

the Estimates last year to pay it. These gentlemen are two prominent merchants in the port from which I came. They were and are great personal friends of mine, and have been strong political friends of mine in the past.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will come to the key of the position. When it was probable that an election might occur, a gentleman who had for years been my friend, who had supported me for years, who had got into my buggy and gone over portions of the county and canvassed the county in July last with me, was approached by some members of the Cabinet for the purpose of endeavoring to induce him to come out and oppose Mr. Mitchell. Then it became necessary to go around and work up the influences in the county which were necessary to defeat Mr. Mitchell, and this was one of them. These two influential gentlemen, who are still great personal friends of mine, were led to understand that, if they would sign Mr. Adams' requisition, then the Liberal-Conservative convention having committed itself to hostility to me, the knowledge that two influential friends of mine would oppose me would largely influence the county in regard to the vote which Mr. Adams would get. The next thing was that Mr. Adams was sent for. Whether he was sent for by the Government or not I do not know; but he came to Ottawa, and the word came down that if these gentlemen would sign the requisition and would support Mr. Adams, that which Peter Mitchell could not get from a sense of justice and fair play would be given to them as a matter of political exigency. When it was attempted to get up political meetings against me, though I know they were very loath to do it, they attended some meetings of these conventions. Then an Order in Council was passed, and I believe it was held over for some time in order to see if they were firmly fixed in their opposition to me; and then what Peter Mitchell could not settle, though over a year had elapsed since the award was made, the imminence of the election made it desirable should be paid, so that these men might be conciliated. Was there any reason for this being paid in January or February last more than there was for its being paid in the previous January or February? Why was it not put in the Estimates of last year? The award was made in the previous December, and I should like to have some explanation of this. The Finance Minister has stated that he agrees with the mover of the resolution in regard to Governor General's warrants and the inexpediency of using them as they have been used.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad that the hon. gentleman agrees with me in that. I think that the House and every member in it should be anxious to see that no improper use is made of these Governor's warrants for one purpose or the other. Certainly, they should not be used on the eve of an election in order to defeat members who have generally supported the Government in past years, but who have stated their opinions on the floor of this House and have chosen to differ from the Government, and have had the courage of their convictions in that regard. If a member who does that is to be blackballed and tabooed, and if the public moneys are to be used in order to get up an opposition to him, then it is time that we were a little more strict in regard to the use of Governor General's warrants. That is all I have to say about that matter just now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat says that this matter was settled for a purpose, referring to what occurred in his county. This is the first time I have heard that alleged, so far as I am concerned —

Mr. MITCHELL. I exonerated you.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Although I thank the hon. gentleman for his confidence in me, he must be aware that I share with my colleagues all the odium there may be in this matter. Of course, being a member of the Government, no matter what my colleagues may do, I share in the responsibility of their acts, as they share in the responsibility of my acts. With reference to this matter, the hon. gentleman states correctly that he came to me several times to get it settled. He was aware that the matter could not be settled there and then. I tried to have it settled according to the award, but, as is usually the case, the matter was referred to the Minister of Justice to ascertain his opinion whether we should pay the award or appeal to a higher tribunal, and the Minister of Justice thought the award should be appealed from. This occurred during the last Session. Later on during the summer, the parties interested came and tried to get the Government to give them the amount of the award, which was \$8,000, and the interest which, at the date of settlement, would have been about \$3,800, and the costs, \$500, which would have amounted to \$12,300.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was Mr. Adams with them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember. I know the parties interested came about this case. Is Mr. Adams a lawyer?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I suppose he came as a lawyer, but I do not remember whether he was alone or with one of these gentlemen who are mentioned here; but, at all events, parties interested came to my Department, and after discussing the matter I told them that I would recommend that the award alone, \$8,000, should be concurred in, and that there should be no interest or costs. I submitted the matter to Council, but the hon. gentleman knows I cannot say what occurred there. The result of the decision of the Council was what the hon. gentleman sees on this paper: we agreed to pay \$8,000 instead of \$12,300, and as that sum was the award, we procured a Governor General's warrant for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I can tell you what took place in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. There was a good deal of the Old Adam in it, I think.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Could the Finance Minister explain how it was necessary that warrants should issue in favor of a Royal Commission on Railways for \$20,000, when I find it was not necessary to issue any in respect to the Commission appointed to enquire into the management of Indian affairs in the North-West?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to state to the hon. gentleman what reason there was in the one case more than the other; but I think he will agree with me that it is not usual to find gentlemen of the position and ability necessary for such a commission as this Railway Commission, to travel all over the country, and spend a long period of time, at large expense, without being paid. However, I do not understand him as taking any exception to the amount provided for the payment of the Railway Commission.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister, last year, gave a distinct pledge to the House that there would be a commission appointed to examine into Indian affairs. It was charged against certain members of the House that they had made statements that were not correct, which were really false, and the Administration declared that the charges made against them were not true, and the First Minister pledged himself in the following words: —

"More than that, I accept the challenge thrown out from the other side. It is the intention of the Government to issue a commission, and I pledge myself that it will be an impartial commission, to look into the whole question of the management of the Indians in the North-West, as well as the charges which have been brought, or may be brought against the Department. I am quite satisfied, on the part of the Department, to abide by the result."

That was a very burning question during the last of the Session, and during the late election, and the Minister having pledged himself that a commission should be issued, I do not see why it was not done, especially when we find special warrants issued for the payment of commissioners appointed for another duty. I wish to ascertain whether the Indian Commission had been appointed, as the First Minister said it would be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no commission appointed, and unless an occasion is made out, there will be no commission. At the time I made that statement the House will remember the circumstances. When I was absent, from indisposition, for a couple of months, an attack was made upon the Department by a member of the House at that time, he giving an immense number of instances of impropriety, and offences of various kinds, of misconduct, neglect and absolute malfeasance. I said there would be a commission, when I returned, as it was impossible to examine into the matter without sending messengers to the North-West to ascertain on the spot whether these charges were true or false. On examination into them which I caused to be made, I found the charges, from beginning to end, to be a mass of falsehoods, without one single merit of candor or honesty in the statements, and I think that was proved in the statement issued by the Department. So complete was the answer that during the whole canvass we did not hear anything, so far as I was concerned, about either the offences of commission or omission on the part of the Government. The answer was complete and thorough. There never was a more unjust, a more dishonest, a more untruthful attack made since the beginning of the world to this date, than was made on the Department at that time. The answer was complete, and there was no necessity for a commission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I, on behalf of Mr. Cameron, of Huron, who is the member alluded to, beg to inform the House that he again and again challenged the First Minister to meet him on any public platform, and the First Minister did not dare to do so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to that matter, I suppose the First Minister has alluded to the hon. gentleman whose name has just been mentioned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think justice ought to be done to everyone. The First Minister complains that he made his statement when the First Minister was absent from the House. I am sure that hon. member regretted, quite as much as any member of this House, the cause of the First Minister's absence, but he cannot be condemned for having made these charges in the House in the presence of the hon. gentleman's colleagues. He also made charges against the Department. I made the charge on returns brought down for which I moved. I supported those charges by proofs, and I produced official documents from the hon. gentleman's own office, and those documents so recorded and forming part of the history of this country, clearly established by the testimony of the Government's own officers that there had been incapacity and neglect, that it had gone to such an extent, according to the reports of the hon. gentleman's own officers, that life had been sacrificed through it. I gave the authority. It was not my own statement. I did not wish unduly to push the Department, I made all the excuses I could; and the First

Minister having failed to carry out what he said he would do, it is no excuse now to affirm that he has ascertained that those statements were untrue. We had the solemn pledge of the First Minister given to members of this House that he would appoint a commission, and the country had a right to look for it, and had a right to demand it; and the hon. gentleman is not in a position, having thus pledged himself, to say, in the absence of the gentleman who brought up the matter, that that gentleman told lies in the House. The right hon. gentleman himself said: I will appoint a commission, and I pledge myself it will be an impartial commission, before which he and I can submit our proof. But the right hon. gentleman never appointed his impartial commission; but he takes advantage of his position in the House now to say that the charge which a gentleman who was then a member made, is as false as false can be. It would have been more proper and becoming after he had seen fit to make a distinct pledge, as I have read from *Hansard*, if he had appointed an impartial commission and allowed the country to judge as to who told the truth in regard to this matter. I say that the charges made against the Department were supported and proved by official documents and by the hon. gentleman himself, and the attempt made in this book, prepared in the Indian Department and printed at the public expense, which we had not an opportunity for criticising, but which was prepared in the hon. gentleman's own Department and purports to be an answer to the charges made—I say that this attempt does not answer the charges I made. I maintain to-day, as I did when I made the charges, that the statements were true, and their truth was proved by the document of the hon. gentleman's own officers, and those charges were sufficient to warrant investigation, especially when this investigation was promised to be made by the appointment of a commission. It will not do to say to hon. members that the charges were unsubstantiated. The First Minister is not in a very nice position in regard to this matter. The right hon. gentleman and his press have denounced Mr. Cameron as a liar, as the hon. gentleman has virtually done to-day, and they have prepared the document in the hon. gentleman's Department, which, as I have said, is not subject to criticism; and yet when Mr. Cameron challenged the First Minister, in the absence of a commission, to meet him on the platform and discuss the question, he failed to do so. Nevertheless the First Minister appeared in that hon. gentleman's riding and made charges against him, and, in common justice, he ought to have had an opportunity of appearing on the same platform and defending his statements. Not only was the commission not appointed, but the right hon. gentleman now denies that he has any intention of issuing it. This report of the Indian Department is prepared by men not responsible to this House—I suppose the First Minister is responsible, but I question very much if he examined it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This report is prepared in the Department and sent through the country as clearing the Government of all charges of mismanagement and neglect made by the ex-member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) and by myself—and I speak for myself positively—on the evidence of official documents brought down under an Order of the House, documents which were prepared for the hon. gentlemen's medical and other officers; and the country will understand that these charges levied against hon. gentlemen opposite have not been answered in that pamphlet, let the hon. gentleman give what reason he may for failing to carry out the solemn pledge made to the House for the appointment of an impartial commission to which all the facts were to be submitted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman having spoken twice, perhaps I may be allowed to do likewise, although he committed a breach of order in

speaking twice. The hon. gentleman also committed a breach of order in bringing up this subject, which is not at all germane to the subject now before the House. I will say this, that when I promised a commission it was in answer to charges made by the then member for Huron (Mr. Cameron); it had no reference to the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite, I think.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, very well. If I remember rightly, the statements made by the hon. member for Brant were answered at once and on the spot fully and satisfactorily by the hon. gentleman behind me. But I will say this: Let the hon. gentleman bring up this subject separately and we will discuss it in all its bearings. As to the vague challenge made by Mr. Cameron, that I would meet him on the hustings and discuss 999 specific charges against the Government and bring up 999 answers to those charges, and that I should keep an audience for hours, even for days, was an absurdity. It meant nothing—it was a mere matter of bravado. It was only by specific charges being brought in words and figures that they could be dealt with. Every charge brought was answered, and answered in the only way it could be answered. The speech of the hon. gentleman was fully reported in *Hansard*. The charges were specifically made, and they affected men in the North-West, civil servants, who had their own characters to maintain, officers whose conduct was challenged; and evidence was taken on the subject. I am quite satisfied that in the opinion of the country that answer was full and satisfactory. But let us not enter into this discussion on a question about warrants. Let the hon. member for Brant make his motion, and he will have a full opportunity of discussing it, and we will have a full opportunity of replying.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was very much taken aback by the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the law, which is very specific and precise, had been violated by warrants having been issued after the meeting of Parliament; and I communicated with Mr. McGee, the Clerk of the Privy Council, and I will send across the House the statement which he returned, and which shows that those dates are inaccurate. The trouble has arisen from a typographical error or an error in the manuscript.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the date of the Governor General's warrant or to the date of the Order in Council?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are the dates of the warrants.

Mr. MILLS. I think they will be found to be also the dates of the Orders in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. McGee writes:

"I have corrected the enclosed list in red ink showing dates of Orders in Council authorising special warrants, in so far as the date 14th April is mentioned."

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that that does not touch the question. The point made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was as to the issue of the warrants. The Governor General has no legal authority to issue a warrant for the expenditure of public money when Parliament is in Session. It does not matter whether an Order in Council was passed or not. The very moment Parliament meets the Order in Council becomes inoperative, no action can be taken upon it; and the hon. gentleman will see that the additional information he has furnished does not add to that we have already before us, in regard to the correctness of the date, in regard to the issue of the Governor General's warrant, but it is merely additional information as to the date of the Order in Council

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

on which that warrant was based. Now, so far as the law is concerned, it is not of the slightest consequence when the Order was passed; the law assumes immediate action. Suppose it was passed before Parliament met, and the Governor General's warrant was issued after the meeting of Parliament. Would not the absurdity of such a step being taken be perfectly apparent to everybody? and it is not the less a violation of the law that it was issued a few days after the Order in Council was carried. After Parliament was in Session the Governor General had no power or right to act; he has no power except under the supreme and urgent necessity of the State, and when Parliament is not in Session. After Parliament is in Session and is capable of acting, the Governor General has no authority to act on behalf of Parliament, and to invoke his authority in such a case is clearly an act in violation of the law of the land. I was rather surprised at the speech made by the hon. the Finance Minister. He has made many speeches during the last twenty years, since I have been in Parliament, but I never heard him make a reply so weak as the reply he made to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He took up this statement of the issue of the Governor General's warrants; he admitted that the action of the Government was a violation of the law; but did the hon. gentleman assign any reason why the Government, in any one of these particular instances, should have taken the course they did take?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not admit that the action of the Government was in violation of the law. I stated that I agreed with the general principle laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who formerly occupied the position I now occupy, that the Governor General's warrant should not issue except in the case of necessity, as provided by the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman admitted that the Governor General's warrants had issued for some expenditures which he said provision had been made by Parliament, but which had lapsed. Now, what is the rule with regard to these appropriations? Why should they lapse at all? If the view which he endeavored to impress upon the House be the correct view, why should a warrant be necessary? Why should there be a provision that appropriations should lapse after a specific time? We know that, under the provisions of the law, the Government may extend the period for which appropriations are made, for three months, by an Order in Council, but they cannot extend them further than that. Parliament, in its wisdom, must see some propriety in limiting the period for which appropriations that have lapsed might be extended by Order in Council. Now, the period for which Parliament had limited the expenditure, expired. Then what was the position of the Government with regard to that expenditure? They were precisely in the same position as if Parliament had not made the appropriations at all. Parliament may have seen sufficient cause for making the appropriation at the time. But the Administration, acting perhaps upon the view which it knew Parliament would take, failed to make the expenditure, and allowed the appropriation to lapse; and what then? That appropriation having so lapsed, the Government were in precisely the position they would have been in had such an appropriation never been made. Then what answer does the hon. gentleman intend by the observations which he has made? In what way does he meet the objection made by the hon. member for South Oxford, that these were appropriations which had lapsed, and that the Government had no power to make them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the contrary, the hon. member for South Oxford passed over the lapsed balances, as having been approved by Parliament, and therefore not coming within his strictures.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for South Oxford never could have committed himself to so absurd a proposition. It is a proposition in face of the law of the land. It is a proposition which that hon. gentleman could not for one moment have seriously defended. My hon. friend from South Oxford is not so much in the confidence of the Government, nor does he approve so highly of their course, that he will attempt to extenuate a violation of the law of the land on behalf of hon. gentlemen. So that the hon. Minister of Finance must have fallen in this matter into some misapprehension, as to the observations addressed to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford. That hon. gentleman passed them over, not because they were not violations of the law of the land; he said that every one of them was a violation of the law of the land, but he pointed out that there were other far more serious and glaring violations of the law, and it was to them that my hon. friend addressed himself, and it was to them that he especially directed the attention of the House. We find here any number of Governor's warrants, issued for enormous sums, on the 14th of April, after Parliament was in session. There is no argument which could be advanced in favor of the issue of the Governor General's warrants, under these circumstances, that would not apply twenty days after Parliament was in Session, as well as the second day after it was in Session. There is not a reason in law or parliamentary government that the hon. gentleman could assign in defence of such an appropriation, that would not apply to the whole of the moneys required for the public service for the twelve months of the year. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen need only look at these appropriations to see that they are not such as were contemplated by the law—not such as the law was intended to meet. They are not of the class that the Act put upon the Statute-book was intended to enable the Government to deal with. These are ordinary appropriations for ordinary purposes. If they are extraordinary appropriations for extraordinary purposes, they are for purposes that Parliament itself might not approve of, and, that being the case, the hon. gentleman has really made no defence. The Government have openly and flagrantly violated the law of the land and set it at defiance; and the hon. gentleman, in reading over the list, in giving information which we have already before us in the printed paper, is not making a defence of the Administration; it is no defence of the conduct of the Government to say that these appropriations have been made. Why, we know that. But we see here that they were appropriations, many of which were made after Parliament was convened, when this House was in Session, when neither His Excellency alone, nor His Excellency with the assistance of the thirteen gentlemen who are his advisers, had any authority to take any action. Not a dollar had they the right to take from the public Treasury, under the authority of the law, and every dollar which has been taken in that way has been a flagrant violation of the law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unfortunately I was not present when this subject was first under discussion, and I lost—which I greatly regret—the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford. I was exceedingly anxious to hear that speech, but it is my loss, which perhaps I may repair by looking at it in *Hansard*. I shall, therefore, only speak of the one point which has been raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who says the Government have acted flagrantly in violation of the law, because money has been issued on warrants dated on the 14th day of April, Parliament having met on the 13th day of April. That, I think, is the charge made by the hon. gentleman as being conclusive proof of the illegality on the part of the Government, in issuing warrants on the 14th day of April. Well, I do not wish now to discuss the question as to whether any of these warrants which have been issued were

improvidently issued, or issued contrary to the spirit of the law or not. I am not able to discuss that point, not having been present during the previous part of the debate. But I think the hon. gentleman will admit that although the Government may have acted very improperly, a warrant dated on the 12th of April would be legal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It might be—not necessarily.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be legal, although it might be very improvidently and improperly issued by the Government. It would not be a breach of the law in any way. Now, I contend that the hon. gentleman has misread the clause, and that the law does not say that the warrant is not to be issued while Parliament is sitting. What it says is that the Order in Council authorising the issue of the warrant shall be issued during the recess; the warrant may be issued any time afterwards. I will read the clause to the House, and they will see that it is so:

"If when Parliament is not in Session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor General in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared."

So that whenever the Minister goes to the Governor in Council, when Parliament is not sitting, and states that an interest is urgent and that there is no money in the Treasury, and the Finance Minister says there is no appropriation out of which that urgent need can be supplied, then at any time during the time Parliament is not in Session the Governor General may legally issue his warrant; and the fact that the warrant, the mere paper, is not signed until afterwards, is a matter of no consequence whatever. It is like the appointment of a man to hold any office under the Crown. The moment the Order in Council says he is appointed, he holds his office, although the commission may not issue for twenty years afterwards. And so, in this case, the moment the Order in Council is signed, that is an appropriation of the money; it is quite legal and does not come under the technical point taken by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman's point, as I understand it, is this—that supposing the case is urgent and the money is wanted at once, supposing there will be great loss to the country if the warrant is not issued, yet if the warrant happens to be issued after the 13th of April, when Parliament is sitting, that is altogether illegal. I do not think that is good law, nor is it common sense.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister arrived in the House at such a late stage of the discussion that he evidently has not understood the position taken by the hon. gentleman who made the motion. The main objection which has been urged is not that the ministerial act of signing the warrant took place after the meeting of Parliament and after a proper Order in Council had been passed. That is a mere ancillary point, and may or may not be correct. I am disposed to think myself that if a proper Order in Council had been passed, the mere affixing of the signature of the Governor General, while Parliament is in Session, might not invalidate it. But surely the hon. gentleman understands that that is not the point which has been pressed here. The point submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford was this: that a large sum of money, amounting to \$2,000,000, has been paid by Governor General's warrants, and while a portion of that money—and he singled out some of the items—might be justified, it was clear that a large portion of it was issued unjustifiably and illegally. The hon. gentleman went through the list, gave the items, and asked for explanations; and certainly, if there were circumstances which in any of these cases justified the Order in Council, we would have heard those circumstances detailed by the

Minister of Finance. But has the Minister of Finance attempted to justify them? He has done this: he has made statements which might or might not have been received by the House if we were sitting in Supply, and the hon. gentleman was asking a vote for this purpose or that purpose. He has said this was necessary and that was necessary. The point is not whether it might have been prudent for the House to vote the money. The point is that the Government, not recognising the powers and limitations prescribed by the statute, have chosen to vote moneys by Orders in Council which should only have been voted after having received the sanction of Parliament. Two things that must concur are—first, that the expenditure is unforeseen, and next, that it is urgently and immediately required. Has the Minister of Finance attempted to say that one-half of these expenditures were urgently and immediately required? Has he attempted to argue that the issue of these warrants was within the powers given to the Government by Parliament? He has not done so, nor has the First Minister. Then, I say that the document on its face clearly shows that the Government have been guilty of issuing those warrants unconstitutionally and illegally. I know the facts connected with one or two of those items myself, and I know they cannot be justified; I know the money was spent illegally. Here is a small item of \$3,800 for filling in a station yard at Charlottetown. That was not a matter which was not foreseen, because it is many years since it was reported upon by the engineer in chief as a work that ought to be undertaken by the Government. Nor was there any particular urgency about it. The space filled in has remained for many years unoccupied, and will, I venture to say, remain unoccupied for years longer. But just before the elections came on it was thought advisable to give employment to the large class of unemployed. Orders came down from Ottawa that the unemployed of Charlottetown should be engaged at the public expense. That was the urgency. No doubt, my hon. friend thought the public good would be served by gentlemen being returned to Parliament to support his Government, and the money was spent to secure that return. Not every unemployed man, but every unemployed man who could go to the hon. gentleman's candidate and obtain a certificate of character, could go and get work and be paid out of the public moneys of Canada, illegally appropriated by hon. gentlemen for an illegal and immoral purpose—the purpose of trying to control in an improper way the voice of the people. I venture to say that those who take up this statement and go through it, and have a knowledge of the facts contained in it, will be able to make the same statement as I have made. If these are the facts, the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell are strictly true that these warrants have been issued illegally and unconstitutionally, and I am glad that this new Parliament, at its first meeting, should take the opportunity of putting on record, clearly and distinctly, its views on this matter. The hon. gentleman says he recognises the truth of the proposition laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); but if he recognises that proposition in theory, he has flagrantly abused it in practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might call attention to the fact that if there be any confusion, it was none of my making, because the date, the 14th April, is given in the document itself.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the statement of the Minister of Finance was based on an entire misapprehension of the character of the document with reference to which he made that statement. He said there was a typographical error. There is none in the return, which is perfectly accurate. It is a statement of the Governor General's warrants issued, and it gives the numbers and dates, no doubt, accurately,

Mr. DAVIES.

with reference to the warrants issued on the 14th April, just as it does with reference to the warrants issued before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does not Mr. McGee's correction in red ink alter the dates?

Mr. BLAKE. It does not. Mr. McGee says:

"I have corrected the subjoined list in red ink, showing the dates upon which the Orders in Council issued, authorising special warrants in so far as the date 14th April is mentioned."

But this return does not purport to give the date of a single Order in Council. It does not deal with them, but with the dates of warrants in all cases, as well in the cases of warrants issued on the 14th April as in the others. There is no typographical or other error corrected, but an additional piece of information is supplied to us, namely, the dates of the Orders in Council upon which the warrants of the 14th April were in fact issued. There is nothing incorrect in the paper. The First Minister says this is a technical point, that these warrants were issued after the 14th, and the Orders in Council just before. It is a technical point to pass Orders in Council the day before Parliament meets in order to escape from the jurisdiction and the control of Parliament, as to the votes of money required. It is to prostitute the powers which the Government are given under the law, to issue warrants when no public necessity required the money to be paid before Parliament met, in order that the Government may close the transaction and then call upon us to go through the empty form of saying the money should be paid. I agree in the criticism made of the general declaration of the hon. the Finance Minister. He said he entirely agreed in the general view taken by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Why, we all understand that there is nothing more popular than the agreements in declarations of a high standard of morality, or of a high code of public virtue, and there is nothing more unpopular than the application to particular instances of that high standard of public morality and virtue. "I entirely agree," says the hon. the Finance Minister, "in the principle laid down, but I object to its being applied to the cases in hand." It is only in cases of urgent necessity, in which the public interest does really require an expenditure to be made, that, owing to certain circumstances beyond the control of the Government, could not be foreseen in time to obtain parliamentary approval, that this power of issuing special warrants ought to be used. We find, by this statement, it has been used to the extent of \$2,000,000, and the hon. the Minister of Finance claims, rightly used. But on what grounds does he justify it? In almost every case, he confines himself to the statement that the money ought to be voted by us because the expenditure was a good and proper one. This would be a good reason, if true, for the hon. gentleman, when bringing down an estimate, to ask Parliament to pass it; but it is no reason for asking us to vote him this money which he has expended in this unauthorised way. More than a justification of that description is required for the exercise of this particular power. The law does not entrust the Administration with the power of making expenditures during recess simply because the expenditures may be good in themselves; the law does not authorise the Government to incur expenditure which is simply to be justified, when Parliament meets, by the statement that this would be a proper thing to vote if you were here, and therefore we were justified in spending the money without your consent. The law imposes certain restrictions—restrictions which are not adequate, but it certainly does impose restrictions upon the expenditure by the Administration, outside the Session of Parliament, of moneys which Parliament did not vote. What is the marginal note to this clause of the Act? "Accidents during recess of Parliament." That is the interpretation which is given. Then the clause goes on to say:

"If when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof—

If a lock breaks in a canal or some accident happens which requires some public work to be repaired.

—"or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared."

So that you get, first of all, the example of the class of cases, you are told what Parliament meant; and then you get the general principle from the illustration just given. If some accident happens to a public work or building which requires immediate outlay or repair—not merely an accident, but an accident of such a character that it requires immediate outlay for repair—then the warrant may be issued; or

"If any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently required for the public good."

So that you get the illustration in the particular, and then you get the general condition, and you find urgency and the necessity for immediate action for the public good are the elements which give to the Administration power to act. Now, in a great many cases, it is utterly impossible to apply these views to the warrants in this return. In many cases, the use of this power was made so late that Parliament was actually sitting when the warrants issued. I care not whether there is a legal justification in the clause of the absolute power of the Government to issue the warrants for which the Orders in Council were passed, the day before the Session of Parliament or the day before that again. I want to know what the spirit of the clause is, and what the meaning of it is. It is that if the public good imperatively requires money to be expended, in respect of which the condition of things renders it impossible that Parliament should be consulted and its consent obtained, the Government may issue special warrants for such expenditure during recess; but that cannot be said in reference to certain expenditures for which the Orders in Council were passed just before the 13th April, so late that the warrants could not be issued in time to have them out before Parliament. Take the expenditure on 14th April of \$31,000 on the Banff Springs. I am not speaking of the work done. What I would ask is, was there such urgent and immediate necessity in the public good for that expenditure, that it was necessary on the 12th April, the day before Parliament was summoned to meet, to pass an Order in Council ordering the immediate issue of a special warrant, which it was not possible, with all diligence, to get out until the day after we met? If the public good required the immediate expenditure of such moneys, the duty of the hon. gentlemen was at the earliest possible moment to have brought down a vote of credit, to have brought down a proposal to us to ask us to assent to the expenditure of this money on the ground of the public urgency, and not to have waited for estimates, but to have said: We cannot wait for the estimates, but the public good requires that we should ask for this expenditure, and we ask you now and at once to grant this money for the public good; but it does appear, and I repeat it, that this power is prostituted when, just on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, warrants for this large amount are issued, warrants for moneys which are not paid until long after the time of our meeting, warrants which were not issued at all until the date of our meeting. We see here an Order in Council passed on April 12th to pay the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, costs in the suit of the Queen, represented by the Ontario Government, against that company, \$4,000. Did the public interest so urgently require that the eminent lawyers who were employed in that case should be paid before a vote was taken, that it was neces-

sary to use the Governor General's warrant, this statutory warrant, in order to prevent our having a voice in saying whether they should be paid or no? It is absurd, it would be ridiculous, if it were not worse, to apply the warrant under these circumstances. It is only when the necessity is urgent that this special warrant is to be prepared, and it is only when the expenditure is immediately required. I find, by the light the Finance Minister has thrown upon this matter, that one Order in Council was made on the 11th February, and that not until the 14th April was the Governor General's warrant issued for it. There is proof upon the face of the documents that that Order in Council was improperly issued, that it could not have been urgently needed, for, though they passed the Order on the 11th February, more than two months followed before the authority was acted upon. When they had waited so long, would it not have been easy to wait until they got our consent and authority for the payment. One of the most important functions of the House of Commons—perhaps the most important function, if the House rightly understood its duties—is its control over the public expenditure; and how is it possible to say that we are discharging our duty, as controlling public expenditure, if we are to permit two millions of money to be expended, without our consent, upon such flimsy excuses and pretences as have been offered for our consideration to-day. Then there is the First Minister's own Department. On the 11th April, it seems, by the information which has been supplied to us, an Order in Council was passed under which a warrant issued on the 14th, for Dominion Lands, income, amounting to the sum of \$26,000. I do not know, I have no particulars as to what it is for, but you find that, after the meeting of Parliament, the consummation of the authority is taken to pay \$36,000 on account of income, in the Department of Dominion Lands, which the First Minister, at any rate, presided over very lately, and in regard to which he is said still to have a great deal to do. There is yet another instance, in regard to Indians, Manitoba and North-West Territories and British Columbia, a very large sum. On the 23rd March, according to the corrections, so-called, which the Minister of Finance has placed in our hands, a warrant was issued for the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories and British Columbia, to the amount of \$189,000, but it is not until the 14th April, after Parliament has met, that the Governor General's warrant issued for that payment; so that it is evident that the necessity was not urgent and immediate to obtain the money, but it seems clear that in many of these cases the necessity was urgent and immediate to obtain the authority to spend the money without the consent of Parliament, and nothing else. Now, I cannot understand how it is possible for us, consistently with our duty, to accept as satisfactory the statements of the Minister of Finance as a fair justification for this use of this extraordinary power. It is a power to be used for the good of the State in order that, in case some unavoidable, some unforeseen, some extraordinary accident or other emergency occurs, the commonwealth may not suffer damage by the fact of the Government not having the power to spend necessary moneys at the moment. That is the essence of the whole provision, and, if such a provision as this, given for such purposes as these, illustrated by such an example as the statute illustrates, is to be admitted by the House of Commons of Canada as a reason to justify the expenditure of two millions of money on the principles on which that expenditure has been justified, then I do not think that, whatever may have been the expectations of the people of Canada as to the action of this House of Commons newly elected, those expectations will be at all realised.

Mr. THOMPSON. In this discussion it seems a little difficult to ascertain precisely what the point is that hon. gentlemen opposite desire to make against the Government

in regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman who made the motion distinguished himself by fairness from some of those who followed him, and stated that those points were two—in the first place, that we had exceeded the right the statute gave us in respect to the nature of the expenditures themselves—that they were not of the kind contemplated by the statute; and in the next place, he pressed upon us the point that no less than twelve of the warrants issued had been issued in the exercise of a power which no longer existed in the Governor in Council, because Parliament had commenced to sit; and, holding in his hand the statement of the warrants, he pointed out that no less than twelve had been issued under date of the 14th April, the day after Parliament sat. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), followed him and declared, in answer to the explanation of the hon. the Finance Minister (which was that the power had been exercised by the Governor General on Orders in Council which had been previously passed, and that the date which appeared was the date of what was called the ministerial act of signing the papers occurred), that the Governor General's power in this respect ceased when Parliament met. Immediately, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), rises and says that is not the point at all; that there is no doubt about the power of the Governor in Council to issue his warrant, and that no question is involved in regard to the date at which he issues it; and, immediately after he resumes his seat, the leader of the Opposition rises and says that is not the point, but the point is the technical use of the power which is vested in the Governor in Council so near the opening of the Session. I think that, when so many of these hon. gentlemen, one after the other, has repudiated the point so prominently put before the House by his predecessor, the House must conclude that the points have been pretty well disposed of; and, as to the twelve warrants which have been referred to as bearing the date of the 14th April, it has been explained by the Finance Minister that these warrants were ordered to be issued before the sitting of Parliament. In stating that this return was typographically wrong, the Finance Minister was misled by me. I sent for the Clerk of the Privy Council, and asked him to give an explanation of the dates which appeared to be subsequent to the opening of Parliament, and, in stating to the Finance Minister that those were erroneous, and had been corrected in red ink on the paper which was in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, and which he stated was not corrected at all, I was simply giving the information which I had received from the Clerk of the Council without having examined carefully the head note at the top of that paper. So it appears that what two out of the four gentlemen, who have undertaken to lead the Opposition on this question, say is the principal point this afternoon, is disposed of by the admission of one of them that there was nothing in it at all, and by his calling the attention of the House back to the point that although we had not used wrongly, in point of law, the power granted to us, still as to the time at which it was exercised these sums ought not to have been paid. Now, addressing ourselves to that point for a moment, let me refer to the statements which were put forward by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as the ground for attack. His statement was made in refutation of the admission of the hon. gentleman who made the motion to the House. The hon. gentleman who made the motion to the House based his criticisms principally on this ground of argument: that it was unfair to Parliament that large expenditures should be made without the consent of Parliament having been obtained, but he was candid enough to say that that criticism did not apply to the items in this list which had been previously voted by Parliament, and in respect of which the power of ordering a warrant to issue was simply used to revive the lapsed grant. After he had

Mr. THOMPSON,

made that candid statement to the House as one of the leaders of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bothwell declared that he could not have made any such statement at all, because it would not be common sense if he had. The hon. member for Bothwell went on to make this single criticism: why should these grants lapse at all? He declared the Governor in Council had power to extend them for three months. So they have. But in respect of some of these which are immediately connected with my own Department, I can give the hon. gentleman an illustration by way of answer. Votes were taken by this Parliament during last Session for certain purposes, and the votes were extended for three months, and even after they had been extended for the three months, although the service was being performed, its complete execution had been delayed beyond the time expected, and the time had not come for the payment of the money. In pursuance of the authority of Parliament we had ordered the work to be done and made a contract. The contract was longer in its performance than was expected, and the hon. gentleman says that although we have the authority of Parliament to enter into the contract after a vote of Parliament for the payment of the money and the extension of the grant for the time which was supposed to be sufficient to cover the time during which the contract was being performed, that we were not at liberty to pay the liability that was incurred under Order of this Parliament, simply because the time had elapsed within which the vote of Parliament itself was available, after, as I said, authority had been expressly given by Parliament, and after the money had been voted by Parliament, and when payment of the money was simply delayed because the time for payment had not arrived. All I can say is that if the hon. gentleman thinks that is a reasonable and fair argument to answer to the contention of the Finance Minister that many of these were lapsed votes, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman who leads him and who made this motion, does not agree with him. Let me refer the hon. member for Bothwell, however, to a statement of special warrants of His Excellency the Governor General issued in accordance with that chapter he has quoted, from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th February, 1878, inclusive. The hon. gentleman has declared to the House that under the provisions of that very statute, the principle that ought to prevail is that after a grant has lapsed, and after the Government has exhausted its power of extending the grant, even by his cheer to me a few moments ago, he must be taken to have implied that even if a contract had been made under authority of a vote of Parliament last Session, we were just as much without power until we came here and met Parliament, and waited for three months to get an appropriation to cover the contract—we were just as much without power as if that statute had never been passed at all, and as if the grant had never been made by Parliament. I think there is a very good reason why the hon. gentleman who made this motion did not concur with him; and the hon. member for Bothwell will find, when he refers to that statement of special warrants from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th February, 1878, when he was not in a position, I admit, to exercise the fine legal criticism which he has displayed this afternoon—he will find that the Government of that day, of which he was a member, exercised that power in relation to lapsed balances to an extent of no less than \$134,718. The hon. member and his Government expended on account of the following services, being balances of previous appropriations the votes of which had lapsed, namely: British Columbia penitentiary, \$19,106.89; public buildings in the North-West, \$503.05; Lieutenant Governor's residence, Battleford, \$3,784.83.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will turn his attention to the first section of the Act, and remember

how urgently he required these items: Removal of beacon rock, British Columbia, \$9,800; Guelph Custom house, \$6,378.36; Shippegan harbor, \$9,630.27; Grasshopper relief, \$380.10; Criminal statistics, \$4,558.75; Australian exhibition, \$6,959.20; Cow Bay, Cape Breton, \$1,343.84; military stores, ammunition, &c., \$71,973.34, making, as I said before, a total of \$134,718.63. These warrants were brought down on 9th of February, 1878, and Parliament met on the day previous to the date down to which that return comes. Some of these warrants bear date the 9th February, 1878, and Parliament met on the 7th day of February on that year. The hon. gentleman will see from the language of the heading of his return, that it is a statement of the special warrants drawn from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th February, inclusive. Now, Sir, in respect of all these appropriations, the hon. member must admit that there was no authority for them, and no urgency for them, except that these appropriations having been made by Parliament during its previous Session, the work was undertaken by Government and contracts were entered into, and the faith of the Government was pledged to the payment of the contractor when his contract was finished, even though, in the meantime, the vote had lapsed. I stated to the House what the expenditure of the hon. member's Government during the six months prior to the meeting of Parliament in 1878 had been, but I find I have only stated those which fall under the head of Consolidated Fund expenditure. But that hon. gentleman and his colleagues had found that expenditures on capital account were urgently and immediately required to no less a sum than \$236,587.66.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was when wheat was worth \$1 for half a bushel.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am measuring the hon. gentleman in his own half bushel. The hon. member for Bothwell perhaps will call attention to the urgency of some of the items of capital expenditure which were required, and had not been foreseen or provided for, and he will find them as follows: Ottawa public buildings, tower, \$8,950; Ottawa buildings, western block extension, \$142,325.80; Intercolonial Railway freight cars, \$76,736.72; Intercolonial Railway expenses before the Supreme Court—almost as iniquitous a claim as that of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company—\$8,575.14. And those amounts, extending not over a whole year, but over less than six months, came to nearly \$400,000. Some observations were made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as to one item of this statement, in respect of which he said it was quite apparent, or, at all events, his argument was to that effect, that there could be no urgent or immediate requirement. That was with regard to the appropriation for the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, and I suppose special attention was called to that item because it might kindle some political feeling in relation to the particular case in respect of which those costs were paid. Let me call the attention of the House, however, to the fact that as regards that item of \$4,000, it is less than one-half of the sum which Parliament voted for that service last Session. The hon. gentleman bases some argument on the fact that the Order in Council for the payment of the \$4,000 was made in February and the warrant did not issue till April.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it was not that item. The item for the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company was dated 12th April, I think—that is the date of the Order in Council just before we met.

Mr. THOMPSON. That claim, as I said, was less than half what Parliament voted for that service. The costs had been actually incurred under the authority of Parliament, and the amount had not been paid before, for the reason that I gave in reference to other balances, that although costs were being incurred from day to day, the

case had not reached a stage in which they could properly be taxed and payment made.

Mr. BLAKE. I would just say in regard to that point that the expenditure on account of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company is not stated in this return to be any part of a lapsed balance.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is, nevertheless.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be so, and of course it may be another error in printing or otherwise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know whether the Minister of Justice has the dates of the Orders in Council passed in 1877, or whether he was simply giving a general statement with respect to the date at which the return was laid on the Table of Parliament. The information will, of course, be given fully when the return for which I move is brought down, but it has a bearing on the question in hand. I am rather inclined to think the hon. gentleman will find that the date given refers to the date of the return. That is my impression. I see the dates do not appear to be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You were wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we were in the same box we shall be glad to be put in the right way, and we hope you will be of the same mind. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find it is quite so, for I notice that the dates are 20th and 30th October, and the last date is given as the 17th December. The last of the whole list, I say, is apparently an Order on 17th December, 1877, for public works, approved by the Governor General in Council on 24th December, a good while before Parliament met. I rather think the hon. gentleman will find that the date, 9th February, 1878, simply refers to the date at which the return was presented. And I may observe that I think this form of statement which was used in my time is to be commended for other reasons. Under it the Orders and copies of the reports of the committees were printed, the very thing for which I am going to move; and I think that was drawn in a more business shape, and more in conformity with the dignity of a Parliament, than the one at present in my hands.

Mr. BLAKE. But it would increase the cost of printing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt it would add to the expense of printing, but if there are any subjects on which light is wanted it is on points like these. The other matter deserves a little consideration, and I speak under correction in regard to it. I think the Audit Act, under which we now work, was passed as late as 1878, and I am not quite certain as to the terms of the Act under which we worked previously. The First Minister, whose memory is good on these points, can perhaps inform us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It also will be a matter worthy of enquiry to ascertain whether these orders are under an Act passed as late as 1878, because I think we appointed the Auditor General to whom the Audit Act has special reference. I do not attach the same importance to items with respect to lapsed balances that I do to other items being paid, for two or three reasons. One is that the matter having been discussed in Parliament, and parliamentary authority having been obtained, although there might be grounds which my hon. friend pointed out on which they might be objectionable, yet they were not *prima facie* so objectionable. Another point is this, that, as regards public works particularly, I am aware that it was found necessary during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration as well as under other Governments, to push them forward in order to prevent damage being done to the works. As regards public works, no doubt this is a difficult ques-

tion; I know its difficulties, and I introduced several modifications, with a view to remove some of them, and everyone understands that when a work is in progress it is difficult to suspend it without great injury being done.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question as to whether the dates of the warrants appear. They do not. It may possibly be that they did not come down so late as 9th February, 1878. The hon. gentleman will not find that I was in the least degree incorrect as to my statement of the items of those warrants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not disputing the items.

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards the dates: the hon. gentleman has made reference to December, 1877, and some other dates which appeared in the papers. These are the dates of the Orders in Council. The dates of the warrants do not appear.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the latest date given.

Mr. THOMPSON. December.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. Minister of Justice has hardly been fair, because the House was led to believe that the warrants came down almost the day before the House met, and the dates came down to 9th February, 1878. It appears, however, that that is the date of the Order brought down to the House. We now find that, although there were no dates given for the warrants, yet the very paper which was in the hands of the Minister of Justice gives the dates of every Order in Council, and the last order was passed on 24th December, or nearly six weeks before the House met. The Minister of Justice, I say, had the information in his hands at the time he made his argument, and yet he endeavored to lead the House to believe that these Orders in Council went up to the date of the meeting of the House, and he put that forward as a justification for the issue of the warrants under discussion. So much with regard to that question. I think, however, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice ought not to have dealt unfairly with the argument of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. He said there might be cases of urgency in which an Order of Council might be passed a short time before the meeting of the House, but I scarcely think the Minister of Justice will undertake to say that the circumstances here are circumstances of extreme necessity or urgency, such as will alone justify such action. I think the hon. member for Bothwell is right in laying down the principle that this is a power which should not be used except in cases requiring immediate attention. But does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that there was any immediate necessity for passing an Order in Council before the meeting of the House, to pay the costs in the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company? Then I see there is an item, Intercolonial Railway deep-water wharf, St. John, \$5,000. Now, what urgency was there for paying that amount, or issuing an Order in Council, dated on the 21st of February, just one day before the elections took place? I may state that there was a large hole there which had remained open for years, and they suddenly put men on to fill it up. These men were paid by tickets, hundreds of which were issued by special parties in the city of St. John, who exacted a promise from those who received them that they would vote against the Opposition candidates. That is the case of urgency which required an Order in Council to be issued on the day before the elections. I would ask the Minister of Railways what urgency there was that required the issue of an Order in Council, on the 11th of March, for increased accommodation at St. John. It is rather remarkable that while the Minister of Justice puts forward such pleas as those, the dates of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the Orders are mostly found to be between the time of the issue of the writs for election and the day of election, a fact which, to say the least of it, is very suspicious. And we find that the Minister of Justice has been put forward, with the assistance of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, to make the charge against the Government of Mr. Mackenzie that they issued Governor's warrants to the extent of \$100,000, and they urge that as a justification for the issue of warrants to the amount of \$2,500,000, most of these warrants being dated after the House met, or being based upon Orders in Council issued a few days before. Sir, the Act itself points out under what circumstances this power should be used, that is in cases of immediate necessity and urgency, and hardly a single item has been pointed out where that urgency exists except, as my hon. friend behind me has said, the urgency of a general election. This power is granted for a particular purpose, and there is no power which a Government possesses as to which we should be more careful; it is a power which, as has been said before, should not be prostituted by being used for the mere party advantage of the Government.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Porter.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Brandon, Souris and Rock Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Manufacturers' Life and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the New Westminster Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Chisholm.)

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the "Hamilton Central Railway Company."—(Mr. McKay.)

DISCHARGE OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.

On the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 9) for the discharge of Insolvent Debtors whose estates have been distributed ratably among their creditors.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I will ask the hon. member to be kind enough to allow this Bill to stand, and I will state the reason. Within the last twenty-four hours documents have been served on me in relation to proceedings now pending before the Court of Appeal in Ontario to test the validity of the Ontario Act, the efficacy of which is necessary to be established in order to make this Bill effective. I will undertake that the hon. gentleman's Bill will not be lost by delay.

Mr. EDGAR. It is getting fairly late in the Session, and I should not like to see the Bill lost on account of delay. I really think a good deal might be gained and nothing would be lost if the Government would allow this Bill, after discussion to-night, to go either to the Committee on Banking and Commerce or to a special committee. In either case there will be ample time to consider it in all its details as well as with regard to its general principles. With reference to what the Minister of Justice says about

the constitutionality of the Ontario Creditors' Relief Act, which I suppose he refers to, having arisen, that does not materially affect this Bill. It is not to the Province of Ontario alone that this Bill is intended to apply. It is intended to give relief to debtors who are entitled to relief all over the Dominion, and it will apply in Ontario to cases which do not come up under the Creditors' Relief Act, those of debtors who have made full assignments for the benefit of their creditors. That is a very minor point indeed, and I hope the Minister will allow the Bill to be gone on with to-night. No harm can possibly happen, as the Bill can be stopped at any stage of the proceedings, and there is another House before which it must come, and in which it will probably be fully discussed.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is true there will be abundant opportunities to consider the details of the Bill, but if we take the second reading we assent to its principle, and it affects very important principles in the Province of Ontario, and in other Provinces. I should like very much that the Bill should stand, but I will give the hon. gentleman a pledge that it will not be lost by the delay, and I do not ask it to stand longer than to-morrow.

Order allowed to stand.

PUBLIC MORALS AND PUBLIC CONVENIENCE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting public morals and public convenience. He said: I explained the character of the amendments briefly on the first reading. The Act passed last Session provided that the seduction of idiot or imbecile women should be a misdemeanor. One of the amendments proposed in this Bill is to add insane women to that list. The other is to restore the original provision with regard to seduction under promise of marriage. The Bill was changed in the Senate last year so as to restrict the age of the woman who could have a remedy under the Act to 13 years, the male not to be liable under the age of 21 years. The Bill proposes that the male shall be liable over the age of 18 years, and the women shall have a remedy up to the age of 21 years. The principle of the Bill was assented to by the House. The amendment with regard to insane persons is of the same character as the Bill passed last Session in the Ontario Legislature.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient that the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow should be completed as a Government railway, and that, in addition to any unexpended balance of the sum of \$224,000 granted as a subsidy for the construction of the said railway by the Act 45 Victoria, chapter 14, there shall be granted to Her Majesty, for the said purpose, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, a sum of \$500,000.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC STORES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 20) respecting Public Stores.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some fuller statement of the specific circumstances which have led to the introduction of this proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot state the circumstances more fully than this, that in Nova Scotia and Quebec it has at various times been found necessary to prosecute persons who had committed larceny in respect to public property, especially to that property which belongs to the Railway Department. The House is quite aware that in that Department, more than any other, goods and chattels which are public property are scattered at various points along the line. These consist not only of sleepers and rails but, more especially of tools used in the construction and repair of railways, such as pickaxes, axes, shovels, barrows and chattels of every description. It has been found practically impossible to prove the property, and the proposal which the Bill makes is that it shall be in the power of the head of each Department to establish certain marks which shall be put on goods of that description. Such marks shall be proof of the property of the Crown in respect of such stores, and penalties will be imposed, similar to those provided in chapter 170 of the Revised Statutes, against persons having goods of that description in their possession so marked, also against persons who counterfeit or obliterate the marks. On reference to chapter 170, hon. members will find that nearly all the provisions of this Bill are there contained in respect to property connected with the Departments of War and Admiralty. It was found necessary, and it was requested by the Imperial authorities for precisely the same reasons as those given now, that such an Act should be passed. It was passed in Nova Scotia, and was afterwards adopted in this Parliament, and we think it would be very desirable in order to meet the difficulties which have led to the loss of a large amount of public property by larceny, to establish the same provisions in respect to other Departments. The principal difficulty has been the identification of the property. The matter has been brought to the notice of my Department by our agents in those Provinces, who have experienced that difficulty in conducting public prosecutions, in respect to which there is no reason to doubt the sufficiency of proof in any other particular than that which arose from the impossibility of identifying the things which are precisely like those in use by other individuals. The same provisions will be found useful in connection with my own Department in the penitentiary service, although not to the same extent. These are the reasons for the Bill more than any special defalcations, which the hon. member seemed to suspect had led to the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. JONES. Clause 11 of this Bill reads:

"No person shall, without permission in writing from the Admiralty, or from some person authorised by the Admiralty in that behalf, creep, sweep, dredge or otherwise search for stores in the sea or any tidal or inland water, within one hundred yards from any vessel belonging to Her Majesty or in Her Majesty's service, or from any mooring place or anchoring place, appropriated to such vessels, or from any mooring belonging to Her Majesty, or from any of Her Majesty's wharves or docks, victualling or steam factory yards."

I think the hon. gentleman will remember that vessels in the harbor of Halifax sometimes lose their anchors in their moorings, particularly about the upper wharves, and under this Act they would not have power to employ persons to search for their own property without permission from the Admiralty or the Government. I remember several occasions, within my own knowledge, when steamers have had to slip their anchors or lose them or foul them with the Admiralty moorings and the Admiralty moorings off the deep-water terminus are rather an obstacle in the way at times. Of course they have to be respected, but when a steamer or sailing vessel drops its anchors there they would not have, under this clause, the right to search for their property without authority from the Admiralty.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think any difficulty has ever arisen in obtaining the necessary permission, from any undue insistence on the provision of the Act. I may say to the hon. gentleman, however, that that section is merely a

transcript of the present law and is only embodied here in order that all these provisions may be contained in the same Act. That provision has been in force for many years in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I do not think there has been any trouble in regard to it.

Mr. JONES. I am not aware that there has been any trouble about it. I did not know it was in the present Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that, in regard to some of the marks appropriated for the stores in the schedule, it would be much more satisfactory if one mark or series of marks were designated by the Act. It is important to involve as little risk and embarrassment as possible to the trade of the country, and, if you are to put the initial of every Department on the stores, it might require a much more extended knowledge than I think is general of all the public departments in order to be quite sure that certain initial letters which were to be found on a bale or what not, represented the cabalistic insignia which would render it criminal to have the property in possession. I suppose it is only in one or two classes or cases that this would come into operation. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the penitentiaries for example, and it seems reasonable that the penitentiary goods should be secured in this way, and so with regard to the railway stores, which, I suppose, will be those principally affected. But why not adopt some one mark, such as "P.S.C." for Public Service of Canada, to be put on all the stores which are to be protected in this way? Then the public would know that this, whether with or without the Royal Arms, was a mark indicating Government property; but this which is proposed would be almost a trap as you would have some thirteen or fourteen different sets of initials.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will amend that.

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to strike out the words "and also the city court of Halifax." That jurisdiction is exercised really by the stipendiary magistrate of Halifax, and the city court is merely a court in which he sits, so that it is sufficiently described.

On section 15,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to amend this so that it will read: "any person convicted or sentenced to imprisonment under this Act before the stipendiary magistrate in Halifax, in his discretion."

Mr. BLAKE. Is it not possible that any person may be convicted in Halifax before any other of the persons named than the stipendiary magistrate?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, he is the only person.

On the schedule,

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand the suggestion of the hon. gentlemen to be that we should use the letters "D.C." with the name of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I would put only "D.C." or "Canada."

Mr. THOMPSON. The name of any Department, or "Canada."

Mr. BLAKE. If you have the full name of the Department, I suppose that would be a sufficient warning, but it would be simpler to put "Canada" and the Royal Arms.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it would be better to have the discretion to use one or the other.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well.

On the preamble,

Mr. BLAKE. I have not had an opportunity of examining the references in the Bill. I observe that in some cases

Mr. THOMPSON.

only part of the clauses are adopted. I would ask the hon. gentleman if there is any substantial change from existing legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, the only reason for adopting only part of some clauses is that the other portion has been embodied in other sections.

Committee rose and reported.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. McLelan.)

SALARIES OF PENITENTIARY OFFICERS.

House resolved itself into Committee to take into consideration certain resolutions (p. 223) respecting salaries to be paid to officers of penitentiaries.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. In order that the committee may understand the matter I would refer them to chapter 132 of the Revised Statutes, which is the Penitentiaries Act, and especially to page 2222 of the second volume, in which the committee will see a schedule prescribing the salaries of the different officers of the penitentiaries. As I explained to the House when I moved the resolutions, the schedule to the Penitentiaries Act contains, as respects every officer in the penitentiaries, a minimum and a maximum sum between which the salary is to be fixed by the Governor in Council. In practice it has been found necessary and fair to make a distinction between all the penitentiaries according to prison population, Kingston, of course, being very much the largest, St. Vincent de Paul coming next, Dorchester next, then British Columbia, and Manitoba. The salaries of all these officers are graded, from the warden down, according to prison population, but the schedule to the Penitentiary Act makes no distinction as to each prison. What I propose to establish by the first resolution is a scale of salaries for each of these penitentiaries, and a provision that the officers, according as they are newly appointed, shall begin at a fixed minimum, and progress from year to year until they attain a fixed maximum. I think that will be more satisfactory and more economical than allowing this matter to be fixed from time to time as the offices become vacant. When a vacancy occurs, especially in some of the chief offices, it is somewhat individious to appoint the new officer, by the mere act of the appointing power, at a smaller salary than his predecessor received. But that would be comparatively unobjectionable if the officer knew that according to law he would progress from year to year. He is to begin always at a minimum salary. The hon. gentlemen will see by reference to the Kingston penitentiary, it is proposed that the warden shall begin at \$2,600, and he is to progress by \$50 annually, until he reaches the maximum of \$3,000; the deputy warden beginning at \$1,200, and going to \$1,500; the chaplains beginning at \$1,000, and progressing to \$1,200; the surgeons beginning at \$1,400 and going to \$1,800. Then at St. Vincent de Paul the warden begins at \$2,400 and goes to \$2,800; the deputy from \$1,200 to \$1,500; the chaplains from \$1,000 to \$1,200. I may say that it was the original suggestion that the latter should begin at \$800, but I think there are practical objections in the way of commencing at a smaller minimum than \$1,000. That arises to some extent from the fact that the prison population is large, the two chaplains as a matter of course, receiving equal salaries, and the difference between \$800 and \$1,200 would, perhaps, be severe. I therefore propose that the minimum should be \$1,000 and the maximum \$1,200. The surgeon begins at \$1,000 and

goes to \$1,400. In the Dorchester penitentiary the warden begins at \$2,000 and goes by \$50 a year increase to \$2,400; the deputy goes from \$1,100 to \$1,400, and where the deputy warden's and chief keeper's offices are combined, he begins at \$1,200 and goes to \$1,500; the chaplains begin at \$500 and go to \$600.

Mr. LANDRY. Why is there so much difference between the salaries of the chaplains at Dorchester and the salaries in other penitentiaries?

Mr. THOMPSON. In all cases the difference of salaries is in consequence of the difference in the prison population. Speaking from memory, giving the figures roughly, the population in Kingston is about 600, at Dorchester only about 200. In Kingston the chaplains require to devote their whole time to the prisoners; that is not necessarily the case in Dorchester.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. Minister as to the chaplain's work. I see that in St. Vincent de Paul and Kingston, the salary ranges from \$1,000 to \$1,200; in the Manitoba and British Columbia penitentiaries the salary is half this sum. Now, what is the duty of a chaplain? Is it simply preaching sermons on Sunday and having prayers, or does he attend generally to the religious and moral interests of all the inmates, and how much of his time is devoted to this work?—because a chaplain might be quite as hard worked, and quite as diligently employed in one institution as another, although there might be a smaller population.

Mr. THOMPSON. There might be a great difference in the zeal of the chaplains. But the duties of the chaplain are not merely to officiate on Sundays, but to attend to all the spiritual wants of the prisoners. In some of the large penitentiaries the work of the chaplains is laborious. For example, the work of one of the chaplains at St. Vincent de Paul, the Catholic chaplain, and I mention him because he has far the larger proportion of prisoners under his care, is such as to occupy his whole time, and a very laborious office it is.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe there is but one engineer provided for Kingston, one for St. Vincent de Paul, but an engineer and an assistant engineer for Dorchester. Why is this?

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is not necessary that this staff be appointed. We are now fixing the salaries of persons who may be appointed from time to time.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the hon. gentleman does not propose to ask the committee to prescribe salaries for officers at penitentiaries whom he does not intend to appoint.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is the possibility of their being appointed.

Mr. BLAKE. What is that possibility to the smaller institution at Dorchester which requires us to provide for filling the office of assistant engineer when at the very much larger institutions of Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul, there is no such possibility as the hon. gentleman is proposing to meet.

Mr. THOMPSON. The reason why there is no such office at Kingston is because there are other persons connected with the Public Works Department who are capable of doing the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us an indication as to what will be the general result of this new scale of salaries, whether it will increase, diminish or leave at the present sum this public charge.

Mr. THOMPSON. The result will be a reduction when the system gets fairly into operation. At the present time

the warden of Kingston receives \$2,600 a year, and in addition he has perquisites of at least a value of \$400. He is, of course, entitled to his house, and that is not reckoned; but he has been entitled for a number of years past to fuel, light, keep of horse and cow, and convict labor to work on the grounds he has for domestic purposes. Under the operation of this resolution he will begin at \$2,600, without any perquisite except his house. So, practically, there will be a reduction of \$400 a year when a new appointment is made although he will receive an increase of \$50 a year. The late warden of St. Vincent de Paul received a salary of \$2,600 a year, and perquisites amounting to \$400 more. On his retirement some three or four months ago, the present incumbent was appointed at a salary of \$2,400 without any perquisite. So there is a saving for the present year of \$600. The warden at Dorchester will receive under these resolutions \$2,000. The late incumbent had \$2,400 and perquisites amounting to \$400 more. In all these salaries we have placed the minimum at considerably less than the officers now receive in order that they may begin with the understanding that they are to progress in salary. I am not prepared to give in very great detail what my estimate of the saving is, but I have had such a calculation made, and my officers inform me that it will result substantially in a saving of \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, and that will be more especially by the abolition of perquisites.

Mr. BLAKE. Then so far as regards the salaries they will remain about the same.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understand the Minister of Justice by these resolutions is desirous of seeking to equalise the salaries paid to the officials of the penitentiaries, and he grades them according to the size of the penitentiary, the responsibility attached to the office and the danger, because we know that the officials engaged in the penitentiary not only occupy responsible positions but at different times incur great danger, and they are entitled to the consideration of the House in that respect when it is fixing their salaries. But I notice there is a strange difference between the salaries of some of the guards and keepers, when you compare the penitentiaries of greater importance with those of minor importance. For instance, the guards at Kingston receive from \$400 to \$500; the guards at Manitoba from \$500 to \$600. The guards at the Manitoba, British Columbia and Dorchester penitentiaries have, moreover, free residence, whereas the guards at Kingston have greater responsibility and incur greater danger, and yet have no residence. A short time ago the guards at Kingston sent in a petition referring to this matter and asking that their case should be considered. I do not see that these resolutions make that matter any better, but they rather keep up the inequality of giving these officers at the smaller penitentiaries larger salaries and more perquisites. That is not in accordance with the object of the resolution stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. At Kingston penitentiary the inferior officers are divided into two classes, guards and keepers. In Manitoba the guards are really keepers as well; and as regards perquisites, the hon. gentleman will bear in mind that they are proposed no longer to be continued as to those officers coming under the operation of the Act. As regards residence it is true that in Manitoba residences have been provided. That is principally owing to the fact of the distance of the penitentiary from the city of Winnipeg and the necessity of providing residences for the guards at Stony Mountain, where it would be almost impossible to get residences if they were not provided in this way. I may say it is the intention of my colleague the Minister of Public Works to ask Parliament for an appropriation which will enable us to put up residences for the keepers and guards at Kingston, because we find that the efficiency of the institution is very much

enhanced by the officers having residences on the penitentiary property and thus being at all times accessible for any services which may be required of them.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, the reason why there was the difference in those salaries, which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), was largely the cost of living in these remote parts, owing to various causes which may come under discussion at an early day. I see the messengers in Manitoba penitentiary get from \$500 to \$600; British Columbia, the same; Kingston, \$400 to \$500; St. Vincent de Paul, \$400 to \$500. I see the teamsters at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary get \$300 to \$400; Kingston, \$300 to \$400; British Columbia, \$500 to \$600, so that my hon. friend must understand that they require more money to live in those distant places.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That was in the olden times. It is all done away with, now that the country is opening up.

Mr. THOMPSON. The only reason for the lower salaries being paid at the latter place is the one mentioned by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), that is, they have residences, but it is not proposed to give residences to the messenger in Manitoba.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Is this based on regulations which the hon. gentleman has found applied in any analogous institution?

Mr. THOMPSON. This is substantially the present regulation which allows a month's salary for every year of service as a retiring gratuity to those officers not entitled to superannuation. It has been thought fair to make a distinction between those officers who have been long in the service and those who have been a short time in the service.

On resolution 5,

Mr. BLAKE. The effect of the last clause of this resolution appears to be to provide for a supply of uniforms at the public expense?

Mr. THOMPSON. They are so supplied now. All the officers have uniforms excepting the chaplains, so there is no change as to that.

Mr. BLAKE. Has it been a perquisite of any person that there should be any personal services rendered by the convicts, apart from keeping the grounds?

Mr. THOMPSON. There has occasionally been the employment of convict labor for domestic purposes, for some of the principal officers. It has also been found that lands which are not connected with the domicile have been tilled by the convicts. Practices like that have grown up in various places without any distinct sanction that I know of.

Mr. BLAKE. What occurred to me was that the words used, which are obviously intended to make it very clear that, with the exceptions specified, there should be no convict labor employed by any of the officers, might be construed into meaning that convict labor might be employed for other private purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will add the words, in the fifth resolution, "or in any other manner for any officer."

Mr. LANDRY. I would suggest that there ought to be some authority allowed for convict labor to be employed. For instance, when the guards have houses, it is often desirable to employ some of the convicts to keep them in repair. I do not think it should be done at the will or option of the guard himself. But if it were provided that it should be done at the order of the warden or some other responsible officer, it appears to me that it would not be out of place.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course you have always to guard against abuses which might grow up. If it be the intention that the public, besides providing residences for the officers, should keep them in repair, it is well that it should be done by convict labor. But a provision of that kind, I am afraid, would result in the neglect of residences by those occupying them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think the words I have added will prevent the convicts being employed in that way. They would not be working for the officers, but for the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the Act to be based on these resolutions will be an Act amending the Penitentiary Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a provision in the last resolution which I think requires some explanation. It is that the Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the sale to officers of articles manufactured in the penitentiary shops or grown upon the penitentiary property.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course the hon. gentleman is aware that there are various workshops in all the penitentiaries, in which the convicts are taught trades, such as tailor's shops, shoemaker's shops, &c., in which articles are made for prison use. The convicts are provided with clothing by the tailor's shops, and with boots and shoes by the shoemaker's shops; and in respect of any articles of that kind which may enter into domestic use, instead of having no regulation on the subject, the result of which might be that wardens or superior officers might, by the exercise of their mere authority, order articles produced in those trade rooms to be transferred to their own houses, it is thought better to have a definite regulation. It is not provided that they shall not have the right to obtain any goods produced in these workshops. If a regulation is made, it will be that, under the supervision of an accountant, proper charges shall be made against the officers receiving those articles. It is virtually in the same direction as the other provisions, to prevent abuses creeping in.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it liable to considerable abuse that the officers in the penitentiaries should have the practical power of utilising the labor of the convicts, and deciding the price at which they should supply these articles. Of course, if it only concerns boots and shoes and articles of clothing, the amount would be very little, but still there is always that difficulty. Then, with reference to articles grown on the penitentiary grounds, I do not know that the accountant would exercise a very diligent supervision as to the prices his superior officers, or those with equal authority to himself, should pay for them. I should think it would be better for those persons to buy what they want outside, instead of having such an anomalous regulation as would exist if they made their purchases within the walls of the penitentiary; besides which there would be less interference with free labor if they bought their goods at the general store, the production of the mechanic, of whom the hon. gentleman has constituted himself the guardian.

Mr. THOMPSON. That may be very true, but we have not yet engaged in brickmaking at any rate. The accountants in the various penitentiaries keep an account of the hay, oats, potatoes and other produce of the penitentiary farm, and the institution is credited with the produce at the regular market prices. The accounts are laid before Parliament in the report on penitentiaries, and whenever an officer receives any of the produce, the accountant charges him with it.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that the accountant did not keep an account. What I said was that he was not

exactly the right person to decide what should be charged his superior or co-ordinate officers for the goods.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is quite true, and it would be a good argument if there were no supervision over the accountant; but there is the accountant in the Department to whom the accounts of each penitentiary are submitted. It is his duty to see that precisely the same price is charged for the produce of the farm that the institution has been credited with.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a notification of a vacancy occurring in the electoral district of Restigouche by the decease of Mr. Robert Moffat, and that he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Mr. Adam Hudspeth to represent the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Victoria, in the Province of Ontario.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

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

Adam Hudspeth, Esquire, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Mr. White.

CROWN SECURITIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 51) to amend an Act respecting defective letters patent and the discharge of securities to the Crown. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of discharging the lien which the Government have on the lands of the makers of bonds under an old law which is practically now extinct. Before 1866 the mere entering into a Crown bond of itself became a charge or lien upon the obligors in regard to land wherever situated. Since 1866 the bond must be registered like any other security on the lands. I am told by the Referee of Titles that it costs a great deal when parties desire to have a title made, to discover whether this bond has been discharged to the Crown or not, and the object is to relieve the lands of all claim or lien by the Crown where it has not been registered.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 52) to empower the employés of incorporated companies to establish pension fund societies.—(Mr. Hall.)

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. TISDALE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 53) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to amend sub-sections 4 and 5 of section 3, and is to enable occupants or tenants to vote if they are entitled to vote at the time of the preparation of the list. As the law now stands, they have to be residents a year in the electoral division, before their names can be put upon the roll.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act. He said: This Bill contains all the provisions of the Bill passed by this House last Session, but which did not pass through the Upper House. First, the Chinese wife of a white man shall not be subject to the duties imposed upon Chinese, she being considered as of the nationality of her husband. The second provision is to allow Chinese to pass through the territory of Canada, as it were, in bond. The third provision is to allow Chinese to take leave of absence for three months, and to return to Canada without paying a duty, after it is ascertained that there has been no fraud in the return of such immigrant. The fourth provision is to make one fourth of the net proceeds of the entry dues paid by Chinese immigrants payable to the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill does not contain any provision restricting the immigration of Chinese in a more stringent form?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FLOODS IN THE RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. HESSON, in the absence of Mr. CURRAN, asked, Has the report of the engineers charged with investigating the River St. Lawrence flood been received, and is it the intention of the Government to lay it before the House at an early day? If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was only one report received from the engineers, and that was made public at the time. We expect another report in a very few days, and then I will bring it down.

AMENDMENT TO THE CUSTOMS LAWS.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to propose any amendments to the Customs laws during the present Session of Parliament?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

POSTMASTER AT PICKERING.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Who is the present postmaster at Pickering, in the county of Ontario, and when was he appointed to that office; also, was he deputy postmaster previously to December, 1883?

Mr. McLELAN. William Logan is the postmaster at Pickering, and was appointed on the 22nd November, 1884.

The Department has no deputy at that office. I believe Mr. Logan was in the employment of the postmaster previous to that date.

PACIFIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Has the Government expressed its willingness to contribute a subsidy in aid of the Pacific mail service, as announced by Lord Onslow in the House of Lords, on the 29th April? If so, to what amount? Is the proposed service to be fortnightly, tri-weekly, or monthly? What are the proposed terminal ports for the line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Imperial Government will grant a subsidy for a Pacific line of steamers of £60,000 sterling, the Canadian Government has expressed its willingness to ask the Canadian Parliament to contribute £15,000 annually to that amount. That matter is now under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. It is hoped that with that sum we will get a good tri-weekly service.

Mr. EDGAR. Between what ports?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Between Vancouver and Hong Kong.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT ST. GERMAIN DE RIMOUSKI

Mr. Fiset asked, What is the name (Christian and surname) of the officer of Customs appointed for the port of St. Germain de Rimouski, in the place of L. P. Gauvreau, deceased?

Mr. BOWELL. The name of the officer is Joseph Adhémar Martin.

WEST INDIA COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance when the report of the gentlemen who were sent to the West Indies, to open up trade with that country, will be laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect to be able to lay that on the Table to-morrow.

PUBLIC MORALS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting public morals and public convenience.—(Mr. Charlton).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill as passed by this House last Session, provided that any one unlawfully having connection with idiot or imbecile women or girls, is guilty of misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment. Since then, representations have been made showing that insane women should also have been placed under the provisions of this Bill. I have had communications from the superintendents of various asylums in Ontario, on this point, and a Bill was introduced and became law which made the provision which this amendment proposes to cover—that the seduction of an insane woman shall be a misdemeanor as well as the seduction of an idiot or imbecile woman. It is merely adding "insane" after the words "idiot or imbecile."

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill of last Session, as it passed this House, provided that the seduction of a female under Mr. McLELAN.

promise of marriage, the female being under the age of twenty-one, by a male over the age of eighteen, shall be a misdemeanor. The Bill was amended in the Senate, and as it passed that body it provided that the seduction of a female under the age of eighteen years, by a male over twenty-one, shall be a misdemeanor. I propose to restore the provision as it passed this House, viz.:

"Everyone above the age of eighteen years who, under promise of marriage, seduces and has illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character and under twenty-one years of age, is guilty of a misdemeanor and liable to two years' imprisonment."

Mr. THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman will have no objection to amend the provision so as to read, "not to exceed two years' imprisonment," so as to leave some discretion with the court.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was the phraseology of the original Bill, and I am quite willing to accept the amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest that the age of the man should be placed at twenty-one and not at eighteen years. There is, in my opinion, quite as much risk of females of twenty-one seducing lads of eighteen or nineteen as there is the other way. Although I most heartily approve of the general principle of this measure, and I think the hon. gentleman has done great service to the community, I would suggest that the age limit be altered and the ages of the parties be made equal, at all events.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am perfectly willing to submit to the view of the committee with respect to changing the age to twenty-one. I do not know but that there is some force in what has been said by the hon. gentleman with respect to having the ages equal. Perhaps there might be cases where young men of eighteen or nineteen had not arrived at the age of discretion, but my observations in this country go to prove that young men of eighteen are pretty well informed as to the affairs of life. I should like an expression of opinion by the committee on this point.

Mr. BERGIN. I suggest that the proposal of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) be embodied in the Bill, and that, accordingly, another clause should be provided, by which young ladies of eighteen who seduce young gentlemen should be punished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is no necessity for having this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would point out that the Act at present only applied to females under eighteen years. I am willing that the age of the male shall be made twenty-one before he is liable to imprisonment; but it is important to give females the remedy up to the age of twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman had better leave the clause as it is in the Act. A woman between eighteen and twenty-one is equal in age and worldly wisdom to a man of twenty-five years. I think that when girls are above eighteen they should protect themselves, and there is no need of special legislation. If the hon. gentleman presses this clause, the chances are that the whole Bill will be thrown out in the other branch of the Legislature, and we shall lose the advantage of a very great improvement in the first clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it very doubtful whether the other branch of the Legislature would, on account of this second clause, sacrifice the whole Bill. However, I cannot abstain from pressing it owing to any such possible contingency. I would point out that the general sentiment of the country which calls for legislation of this character considers the character of the Bill in this respect, as it now stands on the Statute-book, not a commendable one, and that

sentiment calls for the protection of the female of any age under the circumstances of seduction under promise of marriage. I felt it was impossible to secure the passage of a clause protecting females of any age, but I thought it would be a reasonable compromise to adopt the age mentioned in the Bill. I can see very little difference in protecting females under eighteen and twenty-one years, and I act in this matter in obedience to the expressed sentiment which favors legislation of this kind. Although I always feel like paying all due deference to the wishes of the right hon. gentleman, I cannot feel it to be my duty, under the circumstances, to abandon entirely the provision contained in the second clause. As a compromise I have proposed that young men shall not be liable till they are twenty-one, but that females shall have this remedy up to twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the assurance of the hon. gentleman that there is a general sentiment in the country in favor of it—though I must say we have no assurance of that fact—I am willing to amend the clause as indicated, the punishment not exceeding two years' imprisonment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not exceeding two years' imprisonment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well; that makes it conform to the other provisions of the Bill with respect to other offences.

Bill reported.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright for:

Return showing the amounts (in detail) expended under warrants of the Governor General in each of the years from 1873 to 1886, both inclusive.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me from the arguments which were used by the members of the Government, when this subject was discussed in the House the other day, that they believed that the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was so worthy of imitation that they desired to imitate it in every respect. In those days we were told that if a change of Government took place all these things would be remedied, while to-day we find that when any complaint is made from this side, of their mode of managing public affairs, they immediately turn round and justify it by referring to something that was done by the previous Administration. The Minister of Justice, in this particular case, endeavored to show that the warrants which were issued in 1877 and 1878 were of a similar character, and issued under similar circumstances, to those which were brought down during the present Session. But, as I said before, I think my hon. friend was rather disingenuous in the manner in which he referred to the special warrants issued from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th of February, 1878. He will find, if he refers to those warrants, that they were totally different, and that they were mostly issued in October, 1877, the last one being on the 27th of December, 1877. I find that the statement is a statement of special warrants of His Excellency the Governor General issued in accordance with Act 31 Vic., cap. 5, sec. 35, from 1st July, 1877, to 9th February, 1878, inclusive, and that certified copies of the warrants and of Orders in Council recommending the same, were annexed. I find in that statement the particular reasons given why the warrants were issued. For instance,

the first one authorises an expenditure on public buildings at St. John, N.B., \$50,000. I find on the 20th of October a warrant, under the hand of the Governor General, on a report of the Privy Council, dated the 19th of October, 1877, in which it is pointed out that in consequence of the great disaster which occurred at St. John, immediate provision had to be made for the repair of certain buildings, and making a commencement to rebuild others. The fire had taken place in June, 1877, and it is stated:

"That there is no parliamentary appropriation from which such expenditure can be made, and that a necessity for the work in question is urgent and immediate, and recommending that a special warrant do issue conformably with the provisions of the 35th section of the Act 31 Vic., chap. 5, for the said amount."

Then we find that the next one was for the following services, being balances of previous appropriations which had lapsed: Ottawa buildings, the tower; western block extension; Intercolonial Railway freight cars, and expenses before the Supreme Court. I find that the report states:

"On a memorandum dated 15th October, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that having had under consideration the reports of the Ministers of Public Works, Militia and Agriculture, respecting certain balances of appropriations of 1876-77 which have lapsed, and it appearing that the continued expenditure for those services, which are not otherwise provided for, is necessary, he concurs in the recommendation that those appropriations be provided for by Governor General's warrant."

That report is dated on the 15th of October, and the warrant issued on the 20th of October. Then the next one is for certain public buildings and other services, being balances of previous appropriations which had lapsed. They are as follows:—British Columbia penitentiary; public buildings, North-West; Lieutenant Governor's residence, Battleford; removal of Beacon rock, British Columbia; Guelph custom house; Shippegan harbor; grass-hopper relief; criminal statistics; Australian exhibition; Cow Bay, C.B.; ammunition and military stores. Then on the 12th of November, 1877, a warrant for what is called the Mennonite loan issued, on a report dated the 9th November, 1887. The report states:

"On a report, dated 30th October, 1887, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that on a memorandum from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, representing that there was a pressing necessity for an advance to the Mennonites, for which there was no available appropriation, an Order in Council was passed, the 26th of October, advising that \$7,600, the balance unexpended of the appropriation for the Mennonite loan, in the years 1875-76, be paid into the hands of the Receiver General for that purpose; that the balance had been deposited by the Receiver General, 14th September, and that there is no authority for issuing a warrant for the amount."

Then the last one is a warrant issued on the 27th of December, 1877, on a report of a Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency in Council on the 24th December, 1877:

"On a memorandum dated 17th December, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, representing that the Superintendent for the construction of the Government buildings and other works at Battleford and Fort Pelly, North-West Territories, reports under date 20th September last, that owing to several unexpected causes the original estimated cost of these works has been exceeded by about \$30,000, and recommending that in accordance with the provisions of Act 31 Vic., chap. 5, sub-sec. 2 of section 35, a special warrant for \$30,000 be issued to meet the extra liabilities necessarily incurred for the works in question, and that the amount be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to be laid before Parliament at its next Session."

There we have not only a statement in regard to the special warrants and Orders in Council, but setting forth the reasons why these expenditures were made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is in them all.

Mr. WELDON. Not in what is brought down here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but every one of these warrants is founded on an Order in Council in precisely the same terms as the hon. gentleman has read to the House.

Mr. WELDON. I know that, and they can only be issued on an Order in Council, but the report brought down

by the Minister of Finance should include a statement of the reasons for which the warrants were issued, showing the urgent and immediate necessity for them; and it appears that this is required by the Act, because it says:

"The Auditor General shall in all such cases prepare a statement of all such legal opinions, reports of Council, special warrants and cheques issued without his certificate, and of all expenditure incurred in consequence thereof, which he shall deliver to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to be by him presented to Parliament not later than the third day of the Session thereof then next ensuing."

The object in having this return is not only that we should guard the public expenditure, but that the Government should be required to show to Parliament the urgent and immediate requirements which made it necessary to incur such unauthorised expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not touch the point I raised, that is, that you cannot get the Governor General's warrant at all without stating precisely in the same terms that he has read to the House the urgent necessity that exists. That is all that is contained in what he read; there is no information further; because the law requires that the Governor General's warrant shall only be obtained on the statement that the necessity of the expenditure is urgent and unforeseen, and that there is no parliamentary provision for it. So that the hon. gentleman's argument does not affect the case at all.

Mr. WELDON. I do not think we quite understand each other in this matter. There is no doubt that the law is as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Finance, that urgency is a condition precedent to the issue of the Order in Council. The Act provides that the Auditor General shall prepare a statement of all such reports of Council, special warrants and all expenditure incurred in consequence thereof, which he shall deliver to the Minister of Finance, to be by him presented to Parliament, not later than the third day of the Session thereof then next ensuing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has been done in all these cases.

Mr. WELDON. That has been done, but what I say is that it should appear in the statement brought down to this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, the hon. gentleman, I suppose, will be very much surprised when I tell him that although the law requires that this statement should be laid on the Table within so many days of the Session, in the years 1874, 1875 and 1876, the Government did not lay any statement on the Table of the House at all, although they had expended money in the same way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The law was passed in 1878.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the law was passed before. It was exactly the same in 1874 that it is to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What warrants were taken in those years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A number of warrants. The hon. gentleman will find in the Supplementary Estimates a large number of items, with a foot note saying that \$222,000 of the above were issued on Governor General's warrants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1877, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was brought down in the proper time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not laid on the Table.

Mr. WELDON. The Audit Act was not passed until 1878.

Mr. WELDON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The law requiring these Governor General's warrants to be laid on the Table of the House was passed in 1867.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this is getting to be a conversational discussion, I may remind the hon. gentleman that the warrants for that \$222,000 he refers to were brought down and laid on the Table on the 9th of February.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not in the previous years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have not produced the statement of the previous years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because they are not in the archives and cannot be produced. Therefore it is impossible to comply with the demand of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WELDON. What I say is that the authority was not obtained previous to 1878, and the Auditor General's office was not created until that year. But when the hon. Minister of Finance refers to the statements brought down in those years as his justification, I say the circumstances are very different. Those statements showed precisely the days on which the Orders in Council and the warrants were issued, and it is the duty of the Government to bring down the warrants and Orders in Council as well as the accounts. What have we to show the urgency of these matters? We can form no opinion with reference to many of these transactions, and we can hardly suppose a case in which there was urgency. On the 14th of April, by Order in Council passed on the 12th of April, \$4,000 is paid to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company for their costs in the suit of the Queen against that company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is only half the amount voted by Parliament for the purpose.

Mr. WELDON. If it is a lapsed vote, it should be so pointed out; and that, again, is a strong argument why we should have the warrants, the Orders in Council or the report of the Committee of Privy Council, to show the House whether it is a lapsed vote or not. In some cases the amounts are stated to be lapsed votes, and I am not disposed to quarrel very much with them; but where it does not appear that the expenditure is a lapsed vote, but appears to be something new, the objection is that on the eve of the sitting of Parliament the Government passed this Order in Council with regard to a matter for which ever, as a lawyer, I cannot see any urgent and immediate necessity. Then we find that nearly \$85,000 was expended in October and December and March for rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway. We voted an appropriation for that purpose for the year; and has there been during the past year such destruction of the rolling stock as to require the expenditure of that amount of money for additional rolling stock?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend allow me to call his attention to the fact that in the appropriation of the Governor General's warrant, which he has in his hand, of 1878, there is \$76,726 for Intercolonial freight cars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A lapsed balance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not so stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, it is so stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I believe it is, but the service is precisely the same as that taken exception to.

Mr. WELDON. The Order in Council reads:

"On a memorandum dated 15th October, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that having had under consideration the reports of the Ministers of Public Works, Militia, and Agriculture, respecting certain balances of appropriations of 1876-77 which have lapsed, and it appearing that the continued expenditure for those services, which are not otherwise provided for, is necessary."

Again, we find the deep-water terminus at Halifax. I do not know whether the hon. member for Halifax saw such damage created to that, that it required this expenditure, but I can speak with regard to the deep-water wharf at St. John, and I think my hon. colleagues will join me in saying that we could not understand what immediate necessity there was that required work to be done to the extent of \$5,000 on that during February, 1887, except that it happened just about the time of the general elections. We also find on the Intercolonial alone nearly \$600,000 paid out of the Treasury by special warrants. We should have full explanations with regard to these matters, to show whether the Act authorising the warrants to be issued, which is clear and specific in its terms, has been complied with. There is no point in which we, as representatives of the people, should be more jealously guarded in our conduct than in the appropriation of money unauthorised by the representatives of the people, and when we find an unauthorised expenditure of between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 we ought not only to have the fullest explanation, but, as was done in 1878, we ought to have the warrants and the Order in Council showing the necessity of this expenditure and enabling us to judge whether it was necessary expenditure under the Act or not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has brought up a new point to be added to the many views adduced yesterday, and that is, that these expenditures were unwarrantable, because the Orders in Council upon which they were based do not appear with the return laid on the Table. He says the Orders in Council are necessary to show why these warrants were issued, and that the Orders in Council having been brought down in one case whilst they were not brought down in the other cases, is proof of the necessity of their being brought down in all cases. There is not much in that argument. The Orders in Council are simply the orders upon which are based the warrants, a statement of which is laid before the House, for the past year, and if they were brought down they would be couched in the same language as those upon which the statements brought down of warrants issued in previous years were based. My hon. friend stated, and I think some other hon. gentlemen bore him out in his statement, that there was no law which made it necessary, under the late Administration, to bring down a statement of warrants which strictly defined the purposes for which warrants could be issued. The law was passed afterwards. If he will look at 31 Victoria, chapter 5, Statutes of 1867, he will find there was an Act then, and that it was just as strong and explicit as the Act from which he read; he will find that the present Act from which he read is in this a transcript of the other. The second clause of section 35 says:

"If when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arise when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the particular service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor himself, &c.

The words are the very same as those in the clause in the later Act. More than that, the Act requires that not later than three days after Parliament sits, a return of the warrants shall be presented to the House. It would not make much difference whether there was an Act or not, provided you took your stand, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did yesterday, on the principle that it was one of the peculiar functions of the House of Commons to regulate and to keep a strong supervision over the expenditure of public money, and that it was an abuse of power to expend money without parliamentary appropriation. Surely that hon. gentleman will not argue that it was necessary to have an Act in order to keep him right; surely he will not argue that if

there is a constitutional function invested in this House, and that function would be violated, the excuse may be set up that there is not an Act of Parliament forbidding its violation? Unfortunately, however, for my hon. friend, there was an Act of Parliament whose provisions were just as stringent as those of the present day, and that Act having been violated by my hon. friends opposite, they are responsible for the wrong. However, the hon. gentleman seems to think that the present wrong cannot be condoned by the fact that a previous wrong had been done. That is true, but the whole force of the indictment yesterday made specially by the leader of the Opposition, was, that it was wrong, that it was almost criminal to use money under Governor General's warrants unless an accident happened, unless some great and pressing necessity existed, and if any money was expended under a Governor General's warrant without this condition, the expenditure was illegal and almost criminal. My hon. friends opposite cannot get away from that position; they cannot escape the castigation of their own leader. If it is wrong and almost a crime in this instance to use money under the Governor General's warrant, when there was no accident, no great unforeseen pressing necessity, it was equally wrong then. If the castigation applies to any one, it applies to the hon. member for Bothwell and his colleagues in the Mackenzie Government who did the wrong complained of.

Mr. MILLS. You have not shown anything wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says I have not shown anything wrong. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they have shown wrong in connection with the statement of warrants now brought down, but in 1874-75 it has been said no statements of warrants issued were brought down as required by the law. Not having been brought down, that omission was a direct violation of the law and of the Act of 1867, and it was committed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that in 1876 \$25,000 were expended under the authority of the Governor General's warrant, and I do not find that any accident occurred or that there was any great or pressing necessity to justify this unauthorised expenditure. The \$25,000 were voted for the exhibition at Sydney, N.S.W., and if we are to go by the letter of the Act, as the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell say we ought, why not go by it in the one case as in the other? There was no pressing necessity or urgency for this expenditure of \$25,000 by special warrant, yet the warrants issued. The hon. the leader of the Opposition yesterday made some very severe remarks about hon. gentlemen on this side not estimating sufficiently the sums required, or being so wide of the mark that afterwards they had to make up the deficiency by special warrants, and he stigmatised that as a very improper thing. What do we find in this report of the warrants issued in 1877? We find them confessing, in a report of the Privy Council, that for some unexplained or exceptional causes, the original estimate of the cost of works in the North-West, at Battleford and Fort Perry, had been exceeded by \$30,000, and they had to cover up that error in estimation which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, stigmatised as so improper, by obtaining a Governor General's warrant for \$30,000. I find, also, that in 1878 there were Governor General's warrants issued, special warrants to complete the main tower of the Parliament building, no appropriation having been made for that purpose. Why was that appropriation not made? Did not the hon. gentleman know that the main tower needed some amount of money to complete it? But they did not ask for it during the Session, and, after the House adjourned, they obtained a Governor General's warrant. Then there were a number of lapsed balances which were carried over in the same way. Then, in order to relieve the distress among the Indians, they had another warrant issued. That might be found to be a pressing necessity, but the same thing occurs in the warrants

for this year, which these hon. gentlemen so vigorously denounce. They may say that the warrant required to relieve the Indians in 1877 or 1878 was not for an amount so large as that which was passed this year, but the principle is the same, whether the amount involved be \$10,000 or \$20,000 or \$100,000. Then there was a warrant issued in 1878 for expenses incurred in connection with the Fishery Commission, and also for annuities to Indians, and supplies and appropriations for agricultural implements. There was no more urgent necessity because of accidents or unforeseen or unavoidable expenditure in those cases than in regard to the various statements which appear in the list of warrants which have now been brought down to the House. The main point is this, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot get over it: Why, if it is wrong for the Governor General to issue his warrant for the expenditure of money now, it was not equally wrong in 1875, 1876, 1877, or 1878. Before hon. gentlemen can appear to be so virtuous and indignant in regard to what has been done this year, they should look at the corners of their own room and sweep them out before they refer to the cobwebs that may have accumulated in the rooms of others.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman say of his own knowledge that moneys were paid on Governor General's warrants in 1874 and 1875, for which no returns were brought down, or is it a mere statement which he makes on information from others?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already said that I made this statement on the information of the Finance Minister.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is time that this kind of argument was put an end to, and I speak now as an independent member. I object to the course of this Government, and the criticisms upon it, being answered by a statement that a previous Government did something of the same kind. The *tu quoque* argument is one that will not affect very much the view of the House, and I object to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened to the arguments which have been used in reference to these expenditures, and, I think, if the House is to trust to the Finance Minister to make the Estimates every year of the annual expenditure, this is simply a manner of getting rid of what he professes to do. It is time that a stop was put to this expenditure of money without the consent of Parliament. The other evening the Finance Minister made an apology for his hon. friend behind him, on the ground that he had not closely estimated what was necessary for the coming year, and then it became necessary to make this deficiency up by Governor General's warrants. If we follow this system, any Government may strike off \$500,000 or \$600,000 from the Estimates, if it is likely to startle the House, and say they will make that up by applying to the Governor General for the issue of his warrant. We ought not to allow this system to go on, and it is no reason, when hon. gentlemen say their predecessors possibly violated the law in this matter, that we should go on and perpetrate the same wrong for years to come. We, as a new House and as new members, coming fresh from the country, should express our views and should let hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, understand that this is to be put a stop to, and that, unless there is an urgent necessity, the deficits at the end of the year should not be made up by Governor General's warrants. The law has been laid down in regard to the terms upon which the Government may expect to get a Governor's warrant, but I would ask if there was any urgent necessity for the payment of some of these amounts. For instance, in connection with the commission which was appointed to settle the rebellion claims, was it necessary to apply for a Governor General's warrant on the 14th April to pay these commissioners? Were they in such distress that they could not wait until Parliament met in order to obtain this amount, or was it

Mr. FOSTER.

absolutely necessary that the Government should apply for a Governor General's warrant to pay them \$12,100? Take another instance. There was a Royal commission appointed to investigate the matters connected with railway freights, and so on, as they affected the interest of the public. That commission was appointed last year, and it appears that no appropriation was made to pay the members of that commission; but they appear to have been in such financial embarrassment, in such distress, that it became absolutely necessary for the Government to apply to the Governor General for his warrant to pay them \$10,000 a day after this House met. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has pointed out the terms on which the Governor General's warrant could be applied for, and I think the Governor General has been very lenient in accepting the excuses which hon. gentlemen have given for the issue of these warrants, for I think no case of absolute necessity has been shown where the country is going to destruction for the want of the money. Then I would like to know what excuse the Government gave for asking for the Governor General's warrant to pay this \$10,000 for the Railway Commissioners. I hold that it is wise on the part of this House to closely criticise this expenditure, and for every man here to express his determination, no matter what Government or what party is in power, to condemn the course which has been followed as a gross fraud and imposition on the people of this country and upon their representatives. I certainly hope that the Finance Minister will be able to lay before us this year such a statement as will put a stop to the abuse of Governor General's warrants. He apologised for his friend behind him and defended the course that had been adopted during the last year. He felt, I suppose, that the ability necessary closely to estimate the necessities of the country, was wanting in the case of the hon. gentleman whose place he has now taken, and I supposed he had a guarantee that, for the future at least, nothing of this kind would occur again, as long as he fills the post of Minister of Finance. During last year, Governor General's warrants to the extent of \$1,000,000 have been resorted to to make up for the miscalculation, for the want of that necessary ability to estimate the country's necessity, which has been shown by the ex-Finance Minister. Now, we have for the next year another Finance Minister, who, I hope, is going to estimate more closely, who is evidently going to put his best foot foremost, in order to stop this system. I say it is the duty of every member of this House to express his opinion fully, and we certainly shall in the future closely criticise the grounds upon which the Governor General has been asked to issue warrants.

Motion agreed to.

DISCHARGE OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.

Mr. EDGAR moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) for the discharge of insolvent debtors whose estates have been distributed ratably among their creditors. He said: In the year 1885, a large and important special committee was appointed by the House to consider the whole question of insolvency legislation. That committee, after very full consideration indeed, under the able presidency of Mr. Abbott, reported a comprehensive Bill on the subject of insolvency. Nothing was done with that Bill in the Session of 1885. However, in 1886, I felt so strongly impressed with the importance of, at least, one branch of insolvency legislation, that I introduced a Bill largely taken from the provisions of the Bill that had been reported upon in 1885, to deal with that portion of the insolvency law which affects the discharge of insolvents. That Bill, last Session, was introduced, printed and distributed among the members, and they had an opportunity of which, I dare say, they availed themselves, to some extent, of allowing the different

classes of the people who are interested in that subject, to become acquainted with its provisions; and the Bill, the second reading of which I now move, is the same Bill that was introduced and printed last Session, so that there is no possibility of the House or country being taken by surprise at this important Bill being introduced again. All former insolvent laws have dealt with the two great branches of insolvency, of which one is the distribution of the estates of insolvent debtors, and the other is the discharge of debtors when their creditors have obtained all their assets. Canada had a complete system of insolvency from 1864 up to 1880. Under the different Acts of 1864, 1869 and 1875, the objections which were made in this House to the Insolvency or Bankruptcy laws, and which ultimately prevailed, caused their repeal in 1880. The chief of these objections was the cost of the distribution of the assets; and it was pointed out by many hon. members from the Province of Quebec that in that Province they had a very satisfactory system of distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. But since then, in Ontario, upon the repeal of the Insolvent law in 1879, a Creditors' Relief Act was passed, but that law was not brought into force until the 25th March, 1884. It has since been in force with several amendments, and it has accomplished, I think very fairly, the object that its title expressed, that is, to abolish priority of and amongst execution creditors. That is a very important portion of the Insolvency law, which has been adopted and is in force in the Province of Ontario. I am informed, and have ascertained, that in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia, there is no system of equal distribution by law, except, I believe, where the debtors have been confined in jail; but in every one of the Provinces debtors are at liberty to make assignments for the benefit of all their creditors equally. Now, this Bill provides for the discharge of all honest debtors whose entire estate has been distributed without any undue preferences amongst their creditors, whether that distribution takes place by the force of law in the different Provinces, or whether the debtors have done so voluntarily, by making assignments for the benefit of their creditors. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, grossly unfair and unwise to refuse a discharge to any man who gives up all he has in the world to pay his debts, and who has been unfortunate, but has not been dishonest. To-day, in every Province, the creditors may take all the debtor has. In some Provinces, I am sorry to say, there are still preferences allowed amongst the creditors by preferential assignments, or by priority of execution. But there is no discharge provided for under this Act, and, in fact, no discharge can be obtained under its provisions where any preference has been allowed to exist in the distribution of the debtor's assets. The two great Provinces of the Dominion have legislated against preferences, and surely a discharge ought to be made to cover every honest debtor in those Provinces at least, and it also should be made to cover all cases of voluntary assignments in every Province where the creditor has given up all he has to pay his debts. On this subject, I would ask permission to quote the words of the distinguished Chief Justice Meredith, which are quoted by Mr. Abbott in his book on insolvency. They are as follows:

"So long as the debtor has his estate in his own hands, he need not despair; his friends, to supply his deficiency, may come to his assistance; his creditors may accept a compromise, or he may, by some fortunate speculation, increase his means so as to meet the demands of his creditors; but no situation in life can be more utterly hopeless or more deserving of commiseration than that of an honest debtor, who, after having been divested by law of every vestige of his property, is cast upon the world destitute of all means, and still exposed to the claims of unrelenting creditors."

Now, in order to guard against a dishonest debtor obtaining a discharge unduly, this Act provides that, as a basis for the whole thing, the consent of the creditors is required. Then the insolvent has to make a full and complete state-

ment, under oath, of his affairs. Still further, the insolvent is subject to examination before a judge of the court and is bound to make a full disclosure under oath; and even after that, his discharge is to receive the approbation of the judge of the court. But under the third section of this Bill the consent of the creditors is so arranged as to encourage voluntary assignment before the insolvent has parted with the whole of his estate. It is done in this way: in proportion to the percentage of assets which the estate pays to the creditors, so will the number of consenting creditors be decreased; the more the assets the fewer the number of creditors that have to sign the discharge. That, surely, will be a great public advantage. It will induce the debtor to make a voluntary assignment before his whole estate has become wasted. Now there is no encouragement whatever for a debtor to make an assignment for the benefit of his creditors; on the contrary, the temptation is very strong to hold out to the very last, to continue to make a living out of the remainder of his estate, or to make away with part of the assets and get them out of the hands of his creditors. In Provinces where preferential assignments are allowed, this Act would not apply, and no discharge could possibly be given under it in those cases. Another condition is that the insolvent shall make a full statement under oath showing the nature of his assets, the full amount of his liabilities, and give the causes of his insolvency. Then at the public examination of the insolvent, which is to take place on his application for confirmation of the discharge, he is bound to produce all his books and his wife may be examined, and every possible facility is given to oppose any improper application for a discharge; and then at last, when all this has been done, the judge may either confirm the discharge or refuse it, or sign it conditionally. I know it is sometimes said that if a discharge of any kind is made possible to a debtor it will destroy credit; that a trader who may obtain his discharge by force of law will not be able to secure credit. I venture to think that if the system of long credits in this country is destroyed, it will be all the better for the country, for it is one of the curses of the Dominion, and if by giving an honest trader an opportunity of obtaining his discharge he does not obtain such long credit, it will be an advantage both to himself and to the wholesale merchant. I should like to ask if the present condition of the law is at all satisfactory. It encourages frauds of all kinds, in this way: if the debtor becomes involved, he is hopeless of obtaining relief and becomes desperate. He has lost his freedom in a free land, his honesty is not rewarded by a discharge, and, no matter how honest he may be, he cannot go to any tribunal and say: I wish to get my discharge because I have done everything I could, and acted honestly. The present condition of the law offers a premium to dishonesty. The trader secretes his assets; he sometimes puts his business in his wife's name, and under that thin disguise he goes along for the rest of his life. Or he may be driven from the country altogether, and go to a new country where he can make a fresh start without having around his neck the millstone of debt which he cannot throw off in Canada. We lose a great many of our good but unfortunate trading population in that way. The other day I received a letter, sent to me through the hands of an hon. gentleman opposite, relating to this Bill. I will read part of it to show the House how the Bill strikes some people who are interested in it. The writer says:

"I do pray to the God of Heaven to prosper your efforts. By a life of almost incessant toil I earned and saved \$40,000. I put the whole into a woollen mill. The market failed for that particular line, and I had to give all up, and I lost every dollar and honestly relinquished everything; and yet I have no relief. I hope and pray your measure may succeed."

Of course it is true that a debtor to-day may get a release from his debts. But how can he do it? He must get every single creditor in the world to sign or he cannot get a

release. What is the result? Among a number of creditors there is always somebody who insists on obtaining one hundred cents on the dollar, whether the estate can pay it or not. That man has to be bought off by the debtor to induce him to sign the deed of composition, and if one man gets one hundred cents on the dollar, others, who are not attempting to blackmail but are acting honestly, obtain a reduced amount, and they are injured. Every business man knows, and every lawyer knows, that cases continually arise where, in order to obtain a deed of composition and discharge, and the assent of the creditors, the debtor goes and secures by undue preference the signatures of certain important creditors to the deed, to start the movement, and the other creditors follow; and thus the preferential creditors, who are paid some special amounts, get something more while the other creditors get less than they should receive. Surely that is a position of affairs that should not continue to prevail. Surely the commercial morality of the community must suffer where that law is the only law relating to the discharge of honest debtors. Now, Sir, in this Bill it is not proposed that the benefit of the discharge should be limited to traders only. I think, as all people have to pay their debts, as all other people as well as traders may have families dependent on them, and all classes as well as traders may honestly become insolvent, that all have equal rights to be relieved, if they are not guilty of fraud. Some of the former Insolvent Acts—the later ones, at any rate—applied only to traders, and no farmer, for instance, could get the benefit of a discharge, no matter how much in debt he was, and no matter how injurious it would be to him to stand all his life with a load of debt on his neck. Sometimes farmers have been ruined by traders, by endorsing for them, or becoming sureties for them, and then we know that summer frosts and wet seasons, disease among cattle, and rust in wheat, and fire, and sickness happen to farmers as well as to other people, and why should not they have a discharge? I propose that they shall, as well as any other class. I would be ashamed to advocate a Bill to confer a boon upon honest men and not include farmers, or confine it strictly to traders, for that would be class legislation. Now, Sir, I really do not see any valid argument against giving honest debtors their discharge. It must be remembered that, if this Bill becomes law this Session, we can repeal it any future Session if we choose. Debtors have been seven years without their discharge, and why not give the honest debtors a jubilee year in 1887. I think I remember having heard the First Minister express himself in favor of a sort of jubilee discharge of honest debtors; that from time to time provision should be made to relieve them, and that they should not be forever without release and discharge by law. Now, I call his attention to the fact that over seven years have elapsed since they obtained a discharge, and I think we might mark the jubilee year of Queen Victoria, in Canada, by passing this Bill, even if we have to repeal it after it has been in operation a year. I would propose that this Bill should either go to the Banking and Commerce Committee, if it is read the second time, or a special committee, whose names I would suggest to the Government. I, therefore, move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JONES. I have listened very attentively to the observations of my hon. friend, and he has not over-estimated the importance of this Bill, in bringing it to the notice of the House. I remember that at the time an Insolvent Act was passed in this House, there was even at that day a very divided opinion on the subject. There were many in this House who were of opinion that an Insolvent Act was a necessary measure for a certain time to clear away some of the difficulties which had been accumulating for the previous years, but that it was not a measure that should be

Mr. EDGAR,

a permanent statute of the Dominion. For myself I was of opinion at that time, looking at it from my own experience and from the opinions of gentlemen in my own community, that an insolvent Act of some character was necessary for the protection of the creditors generally. I believe the Bill on that occasion was sent to a committee comprising as large and influential a body of gentlemen as are likely to be selected to-day, or at any future occasion, to take such a measure into consideration. I well remember, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty which was felt by that committee in considering the Act. It was supposed by those who had charge of the Bill and were interested in its success that, when that Act became the law of the land, we had established an Act which was, in fact, as near perfection as could be passed by this House. That Act was put in operation, and I speak now with reference to my own Province, because while I advocated that measure at the time I was opposed by many prominent gentlemen, leading commercial men in my own community. We had the working of that Act most satisfactory—I mean to say as far as the assignees were concerned; but we found in a very short time that the expense and inconvenience and delay under the Act were so tedious and annoying that the creditors lost their interest in the estate, and the estate as a whole paid smaller dividends than it would have paid under other circumstances. We found also that the small estates only were placed in the hands of the official assignees, and that undoubtedly was one of the weak points of the whole Bill, because, whenever an assignment was made of any value it was generally arranged among the creditors that some one man should be appointed assignee to work the estate. Now, so far as my own experience goes, I am bound to say that the working of that Act in my own Province was not satisfactory. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) says the creditors did not manage their own business. That is perfectly true, and that is what I pointed out—that the delays and intricacies were so great that, after a short time, the creditors lost all interest in the management of the estate, and it was left to the official assignee to drag it along just as long as he thought proper. While expressing that as my own opinion, I am bound to add that the Chamber of Commerce in my own constituency, no longer ago than last year or the year before, passed a very strong memorial in favor of renewing the Insolvent Act. That measure I think was promoted more in the interests of the banks than in the interest of the commercial community generally. Still, it had the sanction of the mercantile community at Halifax, and representation was made to this Chamber at that time in favor of the passage of such an Act. No action was taken at that time, and the Act therefore stands in the position in which my hon. friend proposes to deal with it to-day. Of course, the measure which he introduces to-day is of an entirely different character. It is almost in the nature of a permissive Act. While, of course, its clauses become obligatory upon the bankrupt, the creditors have, to a certain extent, control over it, without all the machinery which was provided by the original Act. I think the question is of such importance that it would be wise to send this measure either to the Banking and Commerce Committee or to a special committee to consider all its provisions. I have not had time to read them over as carefully as I should like to do before expressing a final opinion upon the Bill; but I am willing to agree with my hon. friend to this extent, that if a man is placed in such a position that he is obliged to make an assignment, an honest assignment, and distribute his property among his creditors, I am willing that an Act should be passed in this House to give him a legal discharge. I have seen one or two cases myself in which one or two creditors have refused to go into an assignment since the old Act became ineffective, holding out with the object, in which they sometimes succeed, of getting a larger dividend than those who came

forward and frankly accepted the dividend which the debtor thought he could pay. If, under the circumstances, a measure such as is contemplated by this Bill could be reached, I certainly think it would be without objection; but there are so many clauses in the Bill to which I presume some exception will be taken, that I think it can only properly be considered by a committee, where the opinions of gentlemen both outside and inside of this House can be obtained, with the view of making it as perfect as possible, if the principle of the Bill meets with the approval of the House. That is the main question for our consideration to day. I have no hesitation in expressing my own opinion that a measure such as this should pass, and that a man who has honestly distributed his assets should not be kept in the position which my hon. friend has spoken of, but there should be an inducement to a man, when he gets into difficulty, to place his affairs honestly in the hands of his creditors, knowing that the law will give him a discharge if he has acted honestly.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understood that the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill expressed himself last evening as entirely willing, after the second reading of the Bill, that it should go to a special committee, or the Committee on Banking and Commerce, with the fullest opportunity to consider its details. With that understanding I think it would be expedient to let the Bill go to a second reading this afternoon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think this Bill is really enacting insolvency legislation again. Those who were members of the previous Parliament know that, when it was attempted to repeal the Insolvency Act difficulties were raised. Such an attempt tends to disarrange trade, and if you make it you are sure to find a large crop of men ready to take advantage of it. I trust that I am not insensible to humane feelings. I trust that I am not one of those who are inclined to grind down and keep in abject position those who are unfortunate in business. But I can scarcely agree with all the statements made by the introducer of the bill. The Bill is in effect to compel men who are not willing to take a portion of their debt in full settlement, to do so. That, on the face of it, I think hon. gentlemen will see, is something that can only be justified by very strong reasons. The hon. member has pointed out that it is very hard to keep an honest man, a man who has been unfortunate, in a position of being subject to obligations which he is unable to pay. To that, of course, every one of us would assent. We could all desire that it were possible for every creditor to receive his pay in full, and every honest debtor to have a discharge. But misfortunes happen to men engaged in trade. There are many good men, good business men, who have been unfortunate perhaps because of circumstances they could not control, and who have found themselves unable to pay their liabilities in full. But I differ from the hon. gentleman in this respect—I do not think these men are without hope simply because there is not an insolvent debtors discharge Act on the Statute-book. In the great majority of such cases there is relief for a man in that position without the operation of a Bill of this kind at all. A trader who becomes insolvent through misfortune, on the presentation of the state of his business to his creditors, will, I believe, in almost every case receive the assent of his creditors to a composition and discharge. I have been nearly a quarter of a century in business, and I think in that time I could point to very few commercial houses in Canada who have not been prepared to deal with the honest debtor in the most liberal manner. During that experience I have known a business man, a manufacturer, who has only once refused to sign a discharge, having done it in hundreds of other cases; but in this case he thought he was justified in withholding it, as did all the other creditors,

because they thought it was a case of such clear embezzlement and fraud on the face of it that it was in the interest of the general public that the man should be kept out of business. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to show that he knew of any number of cases of men who were unable to become free through the voluntary act of their creditors, then I would be willing to go a great way in helping him forward with his Bill; but in my experience I have been unable to find men of that description. It is true, he has read us a letter of one gentleman who embarked \$40,000 in a woollen mill, and upon whom reverses came and he was bound down and handicapped. I do not know the case at all, but I am sure that unless there are circumstances connected with it which would tend to make the hearts of his creditors close against him, I believe he would have found relief in the voluntary action of his creditors. I, at any rate, speaking of my business experience of wholesale men, manufacturers, traders, and of all those who are the creditors in this country, believe the experience has been, and it has found expression in monetary journals before now, that instead of being blamed for withholding their consent to deeds of composition and discharge, these men have been found fault with as a rule for being too willing to obtain a composition and discharge, and then re-enter trade advantageously against their neighbors who have tried to pay dollar for dollar. The hon. the Minister of Justice seems willing the Bill should go to a special committee. I do not know that I shall assume the responsibility of opposing it, if it be the desire of the House that the Bill should go to a special committee, but it seems to me that the proposition to place an Insolvent Act again upon our Statutes ought not to be lightly considered. I believe the right hon. the First Minister did, at one time, say it would be well at certain periods to pass an Act by which those who for years had been placed in a position of hardship, through the want of an Act, might be relieved, but, if I understood him, his idea was not to place an Act permanently on the Statute-book, but only to place one there periodically in order that relief might be granted. The mover of the Bill suggests that we can put this Bill upon the Statute-book this Session, and next Session repeal it. But we know the difficulties when an Act is once placed on the Statute-book, especially an Act of this nature, in the way of its repeal. We know that its repeal causes disarrangement in trade and commerce, and also that many will take advantage of its existence, knowing that it may be repealed, and ask for a composition, who otherwise would make an effort to meet their debts, and probably carry on their business successfully. The hon. gentleman designs that if a man who is conducting his business, and is conducting it at a loss, should ascertain his position and finds he is actually doing business at a loss, if he finds he is doing what his neighbors are doing, selling goods at cost, and any business man knows that if he sells goods at cost he cannot pay his honest debts—the hon. gentleman designs and this Bill provides if such a man stops at a period when he can pay 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents per dollar on his liabilities, the majority of his creditors in value and amount shall compel the large minority of creditors in value and amount to accept this 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents, though this minority may say: This gentleman should not have sold his goods at cost, but should have pursued prudent business methods. The Bill provides he may go on after he has found he is short that much, and apply to his creditors when he is only able to pay 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ cents in the dollar, for his discharge, only then he will require to have two-thirds of the number of his creditors representing three-fourths of the value of his liabilities. Then, if he finds he has run behind and is running still further behind, he can pay only ten cents or fifteen cents on the dollar, but the task devolves upon him to get a larger majority in proportion of his creditors representing a larger amount in order to

obtain his discharge. The statement made that the present state of things is grossly unjust, unfair and unwise, is a statement of the hon. gentleman that I think requires a little demonstration. Even the un wisdom of it might not be easily demonstrated, but how such terms so grossly unfair and unjust should be applied is rather beyond my comprehension. I do not know that it would be grossly unfair and unjust on the part of the hon. member, if I owed him a dollar, that he should say to me: I want you to pay me. If he should say: I think you ought to pay me that dollar, and you ought to conduct your affairs in such a way that you would be able to pay your debts, would I have the right to reply: It is grossly unfair and unjust that you will not allow me to live and bring up my family in a certain style, and that the Parliament of Canada will not pass a law to compel you to do that. Whether the hon. gentleman's Bill be desirable or not, I do not pronounce against it wholly, but I do say it is not well that we should enact such legislation on the idea that there is any large number of persons in the country who are weighted down by the present condition of affairs, who are in an abject condition, suffering that which is cruel, unjust and unfair. There may be cases of hardship, cases of misfortune in business and sickness in family, but these things find a legitimate remedy in the large, hearty sympathies of our fellow-citizens; and I believe that in the vast majority of cases, that a man, unfortunate in business, and anxious to do his business honestly, as the hon. gentleman points out, is the debtor to whom he wishes to give relief, he has but to present a statement of his affairs to his creditors, showing such to be the case, and a composition will be accepted, and a voluntary discharge given him by his creditors. If the hon. gentleman can show any perceptible percentage of cases of hardship, I would be inclined to listen to them, and hear what he might urge in their behalf. I trust, if the Bill goes to a committee, the importance of the subject will not be lost sight of, for, depend upon it, it is a very important measure we are considering.

Mr. SPROULE. The number of petitions and applications sent to this House for several years past would indicate that the commercial community are in favor of some such Bill. One of the great objections always raised against Bills previously introduced in this House, is avoided in the present one. Other Bills for the relief of insolvent debtors only applied to traders, and hence they met with the opposition of the very large class known as agriculturists, who could not take advantage of the insolvent law, because, while these Bills compelled those indebted to traders, who were frequently farmers, to pay one hundred cents on the dollar, the insolvent trader need only pay whatever percentage on the dollar the estate realised. In this Bill, however, that anomaly has been avoided, and if the other principles of it are as much in harmony with public opinion as this, I think the country will be satisfied to see it become law. This Bill applies to all classes in the community, and appears to be a fair measure, while previous ones applied only to traders, and, being unfair in this respect, did not commend themselves to the better judgment of the people. There was another objection to the Bills which we had before on the Statute-book of this country, and that was, that they were always too roundabout in the matter of settling up an estate. A man was put into insolvency, and the greater part of his estate was eaten up in administering the estate, and the creditors received very little from it. Generally speaking, the experience was that the greater portion of the estate went into the hands of lawyers or the courts, and the creditors received very little when the estate was wound up. Many people were opposed to the law on that ground. If these objections could be obviated in this Bill, I believe the country would be satisfied with its

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant.)

adoption. I believe there is a general desire for some such measure, but, if the same objections are found to exist which existed in regard to other Bills, it will be almost as objectionable as those Bills which heretofore have become law. Seeing, however, that this Bill includes not only traders but non-traders, I would be disposed to support it, and if it is sent to a committee, no doubt that committee can perfect it in such a way as to avoid the mistakes which were contained in other Bills, and then I think the country will be willing to accept it.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. In 1864 the Parliament of Canada passed a Bill for the division of the estates of insolvent debtors and the discharge of those debtors. In 1869 more extended provisions were made, but, it having been found that that Act did not work satisfactorily, a new Act was passed in 1875, which, with few amendments, existed until 1880. In that law, there were two ways of obtaining the discharge of an insolvent debtor. The first was the consent of the majority in number and value of all creditors having claims for an amount of \$100 and upwards. The second was that, when the debtor could not obtain the consent of such a proportion of his creditors, after one year he could apply to the court for his discharge, after giving thirty days' notice, and then the creditors could appear and oppose the application if they chose, but there was no satisfactory provision made as to the proportion of dividend which was to be paid by the insolvent debtor before obtaining his discharge. It is true that there was a provision that, if he paid less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ cents on the dollar, the judge might refuse the discharge or suspend it, but it was found in practice that the facilities for obtaining a discharge were so great that the law became objectionable, and in 1880 the feeling was so strong that the law was repealed, and since that time we have been entirely without an Insolvent Act. But the necessity has been felt for such an Act, and boards of trade and other commercial bodies have asked that some such provision should be made. Accordingly, as the Dominion Parliament took no steps in that direction, the Provincial Legislatures have made provisions for the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. But they have been unable to provide for the discharge of those debtors. There is no difference of opinion in regard to the discharge of an honest man who has been unfortunate in business and has given up every cent he possessed in this world; but, because the fear that, if once the principle was admitted, the discharge would again become so easy to obtain, that there would be no practical guarantee against its being granted to unworthy parties, this Parliament has not interfered. The Bill which is now before the House attempts, and, I think in a great degree succeeds, to provide as much safeguard as can be provided against such an abuse. The insolvent cannot obtain his discharge unless a very large proportion of his creditors consent to it. If the estate has paid 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., which is practically the highest dividend that can be expected from any estate when the party has made an assignment, the majority in number, representing one-half of the creditors in value, is required for such discharge. If the dividend is less than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ and not less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$, it requires the consent of two-thirds of the creditors in number, representing three-fourths in value; and, if it is less than 33 $\frac{1}{3}$, it requires three-fourths of all the creditors in number, representing four-fifths in value, to agree to the discharge. The author of the Bill has also provided that the relatives of the insolvent shall not be counted in this proportion of the creditors, so that the father, mother, brother or cousin of the first degree cannot be considered in the proportion of the creditors who have signed or refused to sign such a discharge. More than that, should any creditor desiring to have a higher proportion of dividend refuse to sign, and then sell his claim to others, he is barred from taking part in the final

decision. That is not all. After the discharge has been signed, it has to be deposited in the court, with a sworn statement by the insolvent of all claims existing against him, with the names and addresses of all his creditors and the nature and extent of such claims, and that statement must be sent to every creditor by the clerk of the court, and in that way the greatest possible publicity is given to the proceedings which are being taken. The statement is also to be published in the *Official Gazette* and another newspaper. The insolvent is bound to appear before the court to answer all the questions that may be put to him in regard to the administration of his estate. After that has been done, after he has been examined, he is bound to deposit an affidavit stating that he has not obtained the consent of his creditors by payment or promise of payment or advantage, and then he has to give thirty days' notice to every one of his creditors of his intention to apply for his discharge. After the expiration of the thirty days, the insolvent and the judge are bound to be present, and the creditors are entitled to appear and show that the insolvent debtor has not been honest in his statement, or has not acted in accordance with the law. Then, if the insolvent is unable to prove, to the entire satisfaction of the judge, that he has administered his business honestly, the judge may, and in fact is bound, to refuse the discharge. The Bill also provides that all claims of a personal nature, and especially all claims of farmers for the sale of their produce, are excluded from the operation of the discharge, and the insolvent remains bound to them to the last cent. It has been objected that the farmers' interests were not sufficiently protected in insolvency legislation, but that objection is removed by the present Bill. Ample protection is granted to farmers, and if the insolvent, discharged from his commercial debts, goes back to business and makes any money, of course the farmer will be entitled to claim every cent that is due him. Under these circumstances, I think the House will admit that the provisions of the Bill submitted by my hon. friend are in this respect wise, and afford ample protection to the farming class. There are some points, however, in regard to which I would like to see some changes effected in the Bill. I would suggest that notices sent to creditors should be registered for greater safety, and that the discharge should not apply to any creditors who have not been notified according to the Bill, so that the insolvent debtor should be bound to give ample notice to all his creditors if he wishes to be discharged. I think that this Bill will be regarded as a boon by the community, inasmuch as it will enable men who otherwise would remain idle, to go back to their business and become useful members of society.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I must say that I cannot concur in all the opinions expressed by my hon. friend who introduced this Bill. We remember that until a few years ago, we had an insolvency law in this country, but public opinion became so indignant at the consequences of the operation of that law, that in the Session of 1880 the House repealed it. The old members of this House, perhaps, will remember that I took an active part in the repeal of that insolvency law, and for that reason I must be regarded as looking with much suspicion on the Bill which is now before the House. It is true this cannot be considered, perhaps, as an insolvency law, but I regard it as partially, if not entirely, so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to my hon. friend that if it is not an insolvency law we have no right to deal with it.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I repeat that it is, to some extent, an insolvency law; that it deals, it seems to me, with what is considered the principal feature of an insolvency law, that is, the relief of what is called in stereotyped phraseology, the honest but unfortunate debtor. This expression is always used, and I have heard it used in this House by those

hon. gentlemen who have pleaded in favor of an insolvency law—the relief of the honest but unfortunate debtor. It appears that but for this reason there would be no occasion at all for the existence of an insolvency law in any country. Well, Sir, like my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), I am not inaccessible to humane feeling. I am always disposed to sympathise with men who are in distress, but, as he has well said, there are several causes of distress in operation in this world, and it is certain that this Parliament cannot afford relief for all kinds of distress which are suffered by humanity. The purport of the Bill is to come to the relief of what is called the honest but unfortunate debtor. In my view here lies the great objection to such legislation—the great difficulty of discriminating between the honest and the dishonest debtor, of discriminating between the honest and the dishonest man. It is my opinion that out of 100 men who become insolvent, at least 80, if not 90, of them cannot be called honest debtors. Sir, we are living here under the influence of a good and sound principle, an old principle, a very moral principle, against which nobody can say anything, and that is that every man ought to be responsible for his liabilities, and ought to pay his debts. He uses his own judgment when he goes into debt, or at least he ought to do so; and, Sir, I do not think it is right for the representatives of the people in any Parliament in the world to interfere to protect any man from the consequences of failing to pay the debts which he has contracted; it is unfair to men who have dealings with each other. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill has said that under the present law, if any man cannot meet his liabilities and cannot get a discharge of his debts, he is obliged to leave the country. If this is the last shift which is left the debtor, I think that in ninety cases out of a hundred it would be better for the country that such men should leave it. We want honest men in the country, men who are willing to pay their debts, and if we could get rid of all those who are unwilling to pay their debts, I, for one, would be glad to have some law to which we could resort in order to place them in such a position that they would have to leave the country, for it is no misfortune to the country to lose men who will not do justice to their creditors. The hon. gentleman says that any debtor has a right to be discharged, provided he has not committed fraud. But how can you ascertain that a man who has become insolvent has not committed fraud? I think that most of us who have been in the habit of doing business, will be able to remember some cases, some transactions, where men who were, perhaps, your best friends, men whom you have trusted, have conducted themselves in such a way as to leave in your mind that they had committed a fraud upon you, that they were dishonest debtors, and that they took all the means they could to pay as little as possible to their creditors and endeavored to reserve or conceal as much as possible of their estate in order to keep it out of the reach of their creditors. The hon. gentleman said that for six or seven years the country had had no means of discharging debtors, that consequently it is time to pass a law by which they would be discharged from their legal liabilities, and if the people were not satisfied with the law we could repeal it next Session. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has pointed out the difficulties which exist with respect to repealing such a law after it has been in operation for some time; and the action of my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Edgar) would, I think, be found in practice to amount to the enactment of a law for one year, during which all debtors, dishonest as well as honest, would be discharged. We would then repeal the Act, and when another period of seven years had elapsed we would probably be asked to pass another such law so as to grant discharges to all debtors whatsoever. That hon. gentleman also suggested that

this Act might fittingly become law during this jubilee year, the celebration of Her Majesty's fifty years' reign. I would be very sorry for my part that such legislation, which would add a great deal of rascality, should be enacted in this jubilee year. The hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) have spoken at length upon the advantages which this Bill would confer upon farmers. Well, I am a farmer, I live among farmers, and I can tell this House that the farmers of the country do not want such legislation. If you go to them and tell them: "We will place on the Statute book a law under which when any one of you becomes insolvent from his own conduct or through extravagance he will be relieved of his liabilities after he has surrendered to his creditors all he possesses, what would they say? They would feel indignant. Such a proposal conflicts too much with their natural honesty and their habit of paying their debts, and their belief that every man who incurs debt ought to make payment. Such an Act would be very unpopular with the agricultural community instead of being favored by them. They do not want such legislation. But if such legislation is to be enacted, they want to be kept out of its operation and not be affected by such a law. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, said that the discharge of the debtor would not affect the claims of the farmers who happen to be creditors, if the claim was the result of the sale of his farm produce. To my mind this is too vague and indefinite. It would take time and some kind of machinery to ascertain whether the claim of the farmer came into existence by the sale of his farm produce or not. I do not feel inclined to move any amendment to prevent this Bill going to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, but I think this House will hesitate a long time before passing such a measure, and that it will require to be studied much more than it has been studied by hon. members. We must examine it more closely, and I really hope it will not pass. I dislike the principle of the Bill; but, if it is to pass, it must be amended so as to make it less objectionable in many of its provisions.

Mr. CASEY. I do not propose to refer to the details of the Bill, for on the second reading we should only consider the general principle. This Bill has steered clear of many of the objectionable points that have existed in previous Insolvent Acts. It is proposed to use the machinery existing in the several Provinces for the distribution of the assets of insolvent estates. This Bill contains no provision for the distribution of the property. The definition of the word "insolvent" in the interpretation clause makes that quite clear. It is:

"The word 'insolvent' shall mean a debtor whose estate has been ratably distributed amongst his creditors, under the provisions of any Provincial Statute providing for such ratably distribution, or who has made a general assignment of all his estate for the benefit of his creditors."

This steers clear of the difficulty involved in the old Insolvent Act. So far as I am aware the principal objection to the old Act arose from the cost of distributing the property of the bankrupt debtor. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) evidently thinks the farmers will object to being included in the Act, and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) seems to think that some persons should not have the advantage of it. I, on the other hand, think that the best point about this Bill is that it applies to all classes; that it is not a Bill to relieve insolvent traders merely, but that it applies to all classes of the community. All who are agreed that an insolvent is entitled to his discharge, under any circumstances, should vote for the second reading of the Bill. I do not pretend to have studied its details, and I do not know what my opinion will be after I have studied them; but I strongly support the principle that under some circumstances an insolvent should obtain a discharge. I do not

Mr. BÉCHARD.

see what good can come either to the creditors or the community at large by maintaining claims upon a debtor who has given up all his property for the benefit of his creditors. I do not know what good can come either to the creditors or the community by maintaining claims on a man who is unable to make payment, and I think it would be better for all parties if insolvent debtors were allowed to start afresh, whether they were traders or non-traders. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the discharge is not compulsory, and cannot be obtained unless by the consent of an increasing majority of the creditors according to the amount of the dividend the insolvent is able to pay. Every safeguard appears to be provided for the creditors, and as hon. members I believe, are unanimously of the opinion that an honest but unfortunate debtor should obtain a discharge, they should support the second reading of this Bill, which is intended to effect that object, at the same time surrounding the granting of discharges by sufficient safeguards. If I thought it would be likely to allow rascals to secure their discharge even once in seven years, I would oppose its second reading. I, however, support heartily the second reading, whatever opinion I may have to pronounce upon the details when we go into committee.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. The Bill which has been introduced by the hon. gentleman is one of considerable importance, and is deserving of mature deliberation before we embark on the project of making it the law of the land. I think it will be generally admitted that such legislation as this is not usually resorted to except in cases of dire necessity. Such legislation is generally enacted for a brief space of time, and in the presence of a demand made by the country at large, through the press, or from boards of trade, or other bodies which are recognised as authorised to give expression to the views of those engaged in commerce. The principal objection that I see to the enactment of such a law is that there is nothing before this House to show that there is a demand for bankruptcy legislation, which this really is, as distinctive from the ordinary Insolvency Acts that we have been called upon to pass or amend from time to time. If there was any large class of persons in our community laboring under the want of such a law as this, we should certainly have heard something of it through the columns of the press. A demand would have been made upon this House to enact some law of this kind in order to afford relief to such persons as were in need of a discharge. It would have been pointed out to us that there were a large number of persons in the different cities and towns of the Dominion, as well as the country parts, that were laboring under a great disadvantage, that were being kept out of trade and commerce, that were kept in a state of oppression, owing to the want of legislation of this kind. Now, we have no such representations made. On the other hand, in so far as the public bodies of the country—boards of trade for instance—are concerned, we have had no representations from them upon this subject. We have had on several occasions—and I have been charged to bring before this House—an Insolvency Bill which, being enacted, would affect the whole Dominion and enable mercantile people to obtain an equitable distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. My hon. friend who has brought in this Bill to-day knows what was the fate of the last Insolvency Bill that I had the honor of laying before this House on two or three consecutive occasions. When at last we were authorised by this House to have the matter brought before a special committee, appointed for the purpose of investigating the subject and reporting thereon to this House; after many weeks of arduous labor the committee presented to this House the draft of a Bill which embodied in it a dis-

charge clause. We found that amongst those who had been the strongest in urging on this House the necessity of insolvency legislation, there was not the slightest unanimity when that Bill came before the House, and those who were the most prominent in urging it said they would not have any such Bill. It is true, there were some who were willing to have a Bill with a discharge clause, but there were also a large number of the leading merchants in the country who said they would rather the law remained as it was than that we should have the country exposed to the dangers which would be incurred under a law containing a discharge clause, such as our former Insolvency Acts had. Under these circumstances we allowed the matter to drop, and the mercantile community thereupon, as has been represented by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beau-soleil), applied to the Local Legislatures to have legislation enacted there which would, to some extent, meet the requirements of the case. There is no doubt that the laws existing in certain Provinces of the Dominion enabling persons to make undue preferences are very objectionable, and that in the large centres there is felt the need of some law that will enforce in the Dominion at large the principle which is found in the law of the Province of Quebec, and, I believe, in the Province of Ontario, that these undue preferences shall not be tolerated. But this Bill will not meet any of the requirements that have been urged upon this House by those various mercantile bodies. There is another thing also, to which I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention. The only principle upon which any Parliament of this kind has ever attempted to introduce insolvency legislation granting a discharge, and thereby interfering with rights which have been so ably dealt with this afternoon by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), is this: that it is merely the case of traders, that there was a special privilege, as it were, attaching to traders, or men in commerce, that entitled them, owing to the peculiarities of the business in which they were engaged, to a discharge when they had performed all that was required of them and given over their property, after having been unsuccessful in business. But I believe this is the first time it has ever been attempted anywhere to introduce a law by which any general discharge would be given indiscriminately to all classes of persons, wiping out their indebtedness by Act of Parliament, outside the cases of traders and commercial people. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find a precedent for such legislation as he is attempting to enact here. There is another very grave and serious objection to such legislation. No doubt it is pleasing to hear from the representatives of the agriculturists of the country that they for one class would repudiate any such legislation as this; that they do not desire a law to relieve them from the just payment of their debts, and which will have the effect of putting temptation in the way of honest men, and inducing people to become insolvent who otherwise might struggle along and pay their debts in the end. Under these circumstances, I think it is gratifying to find the hon. member for Iberville, speaking as he does advisedly, and as a representative man of his class, stating that the agriculturists do not require, and would repudiate, any such legislation as this. I think my hon. friend when he considers the matter will discover that those who are in most need of such legislation are the very persons who cannot utilise it. They are the very class of persons beyond whose reach this law would be placed, that is, the poor working men of the country. How can a poor working man obtain the money to pay for a discharge under this law, if he is crushed under a weight of debt? I have been an eye witness myself of cases in which a poor man has found himself crippled by two or three paltry judgments of a few dollars each, in which the costs have amounted to twice the debt for which his wages have been seized. He never can be in a position to obtain a discharge and become a free man under

this Act. There is nothing in it which will reach the working classes, who are most in need, to enable them to rise superior to their difficulties. I concede that if the hon. gentleman could have devised some means by which that large class of the community could be relieved, it would meet with a great deal of favor in this House; but I do not perceive in this Bill anything that should commend itself to the good sense of the House; and for my part, until I hear from the boards of trade of the country, as representing the great commercial and industrial interests, I will not be disposed to vote for any measure calculated, as I believe this is, to entail upon us another reign of depression, and to open the door to very serious abuses which cannot be avoided under such a law. We all know what these abuses were under the old law. True, this law does not go so far as that one did; but even as a mere bankruptcy law, it will open the door to a whole series of abuses, and I am satisfied that if it should become law and is enforced for a few years, there will be as great an outcry to have it abolished as there was to have the old insolvency law struck from our Statute-book. Under these circumstances, not having had any information from those most authorised to speak on behalf even of the commercial community, I think this motion of my hon. friend is premature, and I must refrain from giving it my support.

Mr. KENNY. I did not intend addressing the House on the measure now under consideration. I assumed that the very reasonable suggestion that a measure of this importance should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce would meet with the approval of the House. A measure so important to the commercial community should not in my opinion be summarily dealt with. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), placed its importance forcibly before the House, and informed us that in his experience in the larger Province, where a debtor had behaved with becoming honesty, he had been invariably treated kindly and generously by his creditors. I may say that as that has been the hon. gentleman's experience in the largest Province of the Dominion, it has also been mine in the smaller Province from which I come. My hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), I believe—for I was not in the House when he commenced his remarks—made it known to the House that in the community from which we come, there is a certain desire on the part of some of our fellow-citizens, that some bankruptcy law should be enacted. That opinion prevails especially amongst those connected with our monetary institutions, whose opinions on matters of this kind are entitled to every consideration. But, I am also aware, on the part of many commercial men in our community, there is a very great objection to anything in the shape of an Insolvency or Bankruptcy Act. That hostility is very largely due to the fact that the last Insolvency Act worked so unsatisfactorily. I believe that this House gave a great deal of attention to the preparation of that Act. I believe that it was a very good Insolvency Act. It placed the property of the debtor entirely in the hands of his creditors, and provided for an equal distribution of his estate. I think it would be impossible to improve upon an Act of that kind. And yet, Sir, the working of that Act was so entirely unsatisfactory that the commercial men of our community united with the commercial men of Canada in petitioning for its repeal, and it was repealed. Therefore, while I recognise the importance of the measure we are now considering and think we should not deal hastily with it, yet I am not prepared to express myself in favor of a Bankruptcy Act. The very expense of the late Act was a great objection to it, and I am afraid the same objection might apply to the present Act. The last Act to some extent encouraged fraud, and we should be very careful about enacting a measure which might have the same very

injurious effect. At the same time, Sir, coming from a commercial community as I do, and recognising the importance of the measure, I think the House will do wisely to leave it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me are not quite agreed as regards bankruptcies. Some of them say that we ought to have an insolvent law; others, and more especially the author of this Bill, hold that we ought to have a law to discharge honest debtors, and thus shield them from the revengefulness of their creditors. I believe that the hon. members who feel such an overwhelming sympathy for honest insolvent debtors should also extend some of this sympathy to honest creditors and traders who have invested their capital into business enterprise. Such a Bill would tend no more nor less than to manufacture traders, and to make them more numerous than is required by the trade of our country. If that Bill was adopted we would undoubtedly have a multitude of young men, entirely devoid of capital and business experience, who would not hesitate to go into large business enterprises, and to interfere by their competition with those already engaged in the various branches of trade. And, Sir, this is just what happened during the period which elapsed under the Insolvent Act of 1869. A large number of young men, without experience and without capital, launched out into business, established commercial houses alongside of honest traders having capital, alongside of houses perfectly well established, and, by a ridiculous competition, have ruined these houses, have caused them to fail, and have failed themselves afterwards. I repeat it, the hon. members who have so much sympathy for honest insolvents, should above all have some sympathy for those who are ruined by traders without experience and without capital. I think we ought to leave to each Province the power to legislate on this matter and to determine its own mode of distributing the insolvent's estates. I believe, moreover, that it is not necessary to pass a law to discharge insolvent debtors and allow them to release themselves without paying anything to their creditors. There is an axiom which says that fear is the beginning of wisdom, and I consider that the House would be wrong in removing from these reckless and impecunious young men, this wholesome fear which to-day hinders them from going into hazardous enterprises. Besides, Mr. Speaker, the present Bill is absolutely unfair in its principle. It purports that a debtor, in order to have a right to his discharge, must obtain the consent of one-half or three-quarters of his creditors either in number or in amount of claims. Well, if it is absolutely intended to protect honest debtors, it would be better to leave it to the discretion of the judge to determine when the debtor will be discharged from the obligation of paying his debts; because, an honest debtor may sometimes have merciless creditors, and so find it utterly impossible for him to obtain leave to apply to the court. Therefore, it would be better to give the creditor leave to apply before the judge, and to call his creditors before the court, and the judge himself would determine whether the creditor according to the management of his affairs, would or would not have a right to the clemency and to the sympathy of the court. I believe, that the fact of leaving to the creditors themselves the power to determine whether the creditor may or may not apply to the court for his discharge, would be detrimental to those honest debtors which this Bill intends to protect. Besides, as I said a while ago, this law is not necessary, and the immense majority of the country will certainly be opposed to it. As regards the farming community, as my hon. friend the member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) so truly said, instead of rejoicing at the adoption of such a Bill, I think they would be totally opposed to it should it be adopted in this House. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that under this Bill the securing of a discharge is wrought with so many

Mr. KENNY.

technicalities, that should it be adopted in its present form it could only have one result: that of procuring many clients to lawyers while it would be far from profitable to those whom it is proposed to aid through its adoption.

Mr. HESSON. I must regret that it is considered necessary by any hon. gentleman to bring forward a measure of this kind again. Those who have had the advantage of being present in this House for a number of years past must have experienced this fact, that popular opinion is opposed to a measure of this kind. We have had Bills of a similar character, though probably not so far reaching as this one, which applies to agriculturists as well as to traders, presented at each previous Session, but we never considered it in the interest of the country to revive the Act that was repealed some seven years ago. The title of the Bill is: "An Act for the discharge of insolvent debtors whose assets have been distributed ratably among their creditors." Could the hon. mover of the Bill have said it was for the discharge of honest insolvent debtors who have not been met in a fair spirit by their creditors, and who have not been dealt with in a fair, honorable and honest way, after having given up all their assets to their creditors, I could have gone with him in that direction a very long way. But I do not think that the hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure, has shown to the House that necessity exists for the relief of the men whom he proposes to relieve. My experience of thirty years as a business man has led me to this opinion, that creditors invariably deal honorably and honestly with their debtors, when the debtors have endeavored to act honestly and honorably by them. I feel there is not the slightest occasion for the introduction of this Bill; I feel that it is an insult to the farmers of Canada. As an individual representing a very large agricultural constituency, I feel it my duty to protest against the introduction of a measure of this kind. I shall oppose it at every stage. In the committee, I shall, if I am spared, do what I can to prevent its promotion. If it reaches that stage, I shall oppose its reference by the committee to this House, for I do not consider it is in the interests of the honest traders of Canada that such legislation should be put upon the statutes of the country. We know the disastrous effects of the Insolvency Act of the past; we know how dishonest traders made the best use they could of the privileges afforded them by the law to cover up the most careless, even dishonest acts, and take unfair advantage of their creditors. Whilst my hon. friend may find here and there an individual who feels he has been unfairly dealt with by his creditors, he has failed to produce sufficient evidence to convince us there is necessity for the measure. Were there necessity for it, we would have had petitions from those who are laboring under those great disadvantages and under the grievous burdens imposed upon them by their creditors; we would have had complaints from all parts of the country, and more especially my hon. friend who resides in a large commercial city, the city of Toronto, would have been the recipient of a number of petitions to present to the House; but we have had none such, and I feel it my duty, therefore, to oppose this legislation. Our experience has been unfavorable to a measure of this kind, and I repeat it has not been asked for. On behalf of the farmers of Ontario, at least of that part of the country which I have the honor to represent, I must say they do not ask for such legislation, nor would they feel it to their credit to have their names connected with it; and, if my hon. friend were to canvass the rural districts, he would find the majority opposed to the Bill he now proposes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) The question respecting the discharge of insolvent debtors is one which has more than once engaged the attention of former Parliaments since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. The Parliament previous to the last repealed, by a

very large majority, the Insolvent Act which had been on our Statute-books from 1869 to that time. For my part, I have always held that it was desirable we should have some Act on our statutes which would provide for the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors; and whilst it is very true that under the Insolvent Act of 1869, and the amendments thereto, abuses arose, evils existed, and frauds were perhaps committed, my own opinion always has been, and it is still, that many of those frauds were perpetrated through the negligence of creditors themselves. It was not the fault of the Act, but the fault of the creditors who were lax in administering the Act. And, while it may be very true that dishonest people may take advantage of an Act such as that which is now proposed to be placed on the Statute-book, I think there are many honest traders, honest debtors who, from circumstances over which they have no control, from fire or other causes, may have sustained losses that will render it necessary for them to endeavor to obtain a discharge from their creditors. While these causes exist, it is, in my opinion, desirable that there should be some Act upon the Statute-book by which these insolvent debtors, having given up all their property to their creditors, having given them everything they are possessed of in the world, should be entitled to a discharge; and, whilst it may be very true that honest debtors generally meet with consideration at the hands of a majority of their creditors, there are always some creditors who find it in their interest to hold out in order that they may be paid in full, while the majority are willing to take a dividend upon the debts owing to them. It is true that in the Province of Ontario, and, I believe, also in the Province of Quebec, there are local statutes which provide for the distribution of the assets of a person who may have been sued and may be insolvent, but, so far as my experience goes, at any rate in the Province of Ontario, I do not think that that Act has been a success, that is, I believe that in that Province it has not been found to work in such a manner as to distribute equitably amongst the creditors the assets of the insolvent debtor. I have not looked into this Bill with sufficient carefulness to say that the whole of the provisions would meet with my approval, but certainly the principle of the Bill does meet with my approval, and I shall vote that the Bill be referred to a committee, whether the Committee on Banking and Commerce or a select committee of this House, in order that they may examine its provisions and report a Bill which will meet, if possible, with the approval of a majority of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 30) to amend the Companies Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The motion that I propose to make is as follows:—

That the several items stated to have been paid under warrant from the Governor General for the service of the year 1886-87 be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

And, after what occurred in the previous discussion, I propose to add:

Together with copies of the several reports and Orders in Council under which the same were appropriated.

Before I put that motion in your hands, I will take the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to one or

two statements which were made on this subject, which I had not the opportunity of replying to. In the first place, I may say that it might have been as well probably if the hon. gentlemen opposite had followed the wise example of the Minister of Finance, who frankly declared that he thought the practice had been carried to an objectionable extent, and who did not attempt to defend it. It has been attempted to defend the practice on the grounds, not that the arguments that I used were uncalled for or unnecessary, but apparently on the grounds that Governor General's warrants had been used in previous years. It is quite true that the Governor General's warrants were used in previous years, and were used under circumstances which I think I will be able to show to the House were amply justified by the Statute. But the Minister of Finance was in error, I think, when he stated that I, when Finance Minister, had omitted to bring down proper reports to the House on the occasion on which those warrants had been used. I have not been able to get the Votes and Proceedings for the year 1875, but I see that in 1876, one of the years which the hon. gentleman alluded to, on the 14th February, apparently, I laid on the Table of the House a statement showing the expenditure of \$34,000, appropriated for Treaty No. 4, by Order in Council of the 27th September, 1875, for which a special warrant was issued, which I presume was a Governor General's warrant; also a return of expenditure of \$30,000, by Order in Council, for the North-West Mounted Police; also statement of expenditure on a warrant of His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 5th October, 1875, for \$60,000 for the settlers' relief in Manitoba. These were the occasions on which apparently special warrants were issued in 1875, justified, I think, all of them, under the Act to which I alluded, and, as the House will observe, not in all exceeding the sum of \$130,000 or \$140,000. At any rate, that statement for the year 1876 disposes of the question whether or not a proper return was made. Now, in 1877, when the hon. gentleman stated that he could not find that I had made any return of these special warrants, I find that, under date of the 15th February, I laid before the House the statement of expenditure to date on account of New South Wales exhibition, under authority of special warrant of His Excellency the Governor General, dated 21st December, 1876, for \$25,000, a charge which I think was necessary, which could not well have been foreseen at the early date at which our House was prorogued in the year 1876, and which, at any rate, disposes effectually of the question as to these two years. For the succeeding year, the evidence is before the House that a proper statement was made. Now, I will further call attention to this fact. In the year 1878, when the largest number of these warrants was brought down by us, the whole of these warrants were for lapsed balances except two items, one of \$50,000 and one of \$30,000. To the one of \$50,000, caused by the great fire at St. John, no exception, I think, will be taken. To the other of \$30,000 in the North-West Territories, all I can say is that I do not think it was a case in which it was possible, without injury to the public service, to defer the completion of the buildings. But in no one of these cases did the hon. member who is now Finance Minister challenge any of the expenditures. Now, the House will notice that in these three years to which I have alluded—I have not got the returns for 1875, but I have just read the returns for 1878—the Governor General's warrants were exceedingly carefully used; three warrants, amounting to an aggregate of \$140,000, were used in one year, one warrant of \$25,000 was used in another year, and with the exception of the lapsed balances of appropriations carried forward, only two warrants for \$80,000, collectively, were used in the last year. In the present case we find that whereas, almost the whole of the items appropriated by me, or carried forward by me, were lapsed balances, according to the state-

ments laid on the Table—which the Minister of Finance says, however, does not include all the items—out of \$2,313,000, only \$239,000 are put down as lapsed balances, and I do not think there can be found any just ground for excusing the use of warrants for two millions and a half under the circumstances. However, if there are, the hon. gentlemen are perfectly welcome to all the advantage they can derive from it. I took occasion to point out that there were certain circumstances under which the Governor General's warrant could be properly used, and I did not blame the Government for using them. I think, for instance, such a case as the slaughter of cattle in quarantine was a proper and legitimate subject for the use of a Governor General's warrant. What I objected to then, and what I continue to object to, is the vicious practice of allowing the Department to under-estimate the sums required, and to supplement the deficiency by Governor General's warrants. I do not think, in the three years I have alluded to, the hon. gentleman can fairly point to any such cases—and they constitute, in the majority of cases, the points to which I took objection with respect to these other large expenditures. Now, Sir, I think it will be eminently in the public interest, and I think it will be a very proper thing, that the Committee on Public Accounts be allowed to investigate the circumstances under which these several warrants have been issued; and I take the opportunity of repeating the suggestion I made already, that in matters where money is expended without the authority of Parliament it would be convenient and proper that, at the time these warrants are laid on the Table of Parliament, accompanying them should be copies of the several orders and reports under which they were obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not usual, is it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I am not censuring the present Minister of Finance for that, but I think it is desirable the practice should be so. I think that every reasonable care should be used when an extraordinary power is exercised, that the House should be put in possession of all the details at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I intend to occupy the attention of the House but for a few moments on this matter, and I would not have said a single word if this discussion had been confined to the position to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) left it when he made the previous motion. I not only took no exception to that motion, but I concurred, as I now do, in the principle that he laid down as a sound constitutional maxim, that the expenditure of public money by warrant of the Governor General should be entirely exceptional, that it should be used for the purpose of providing, after Parliament has risen, for expenditures that were obviously necessary and required. I certainly, however, took no exception to the criticisms which the hon. gentleman found it his duty to make, and which I am quite sure he did make under a sense of public duty, with reference to the expenditures under the warrant of the Governor General, and detailed in the paper which we laid upon the Table of the House. Had the discussion rested there, I am quite certain we would all have been as one as to the desirability of carrying out in every possible way the objects which the mover of the resolution stated to be his, in bringing the subject under the attention of the House, and that was to draw the attention of the Government and of Parliament to the necessity of strictly confining the expenditure to the purposes to which the law provided that the warrant of a Governor General should be used, and that is, a demand for public money during the recess of Parliament, and the neglect to provide which would be attended with great inconvenience to the public service. I stated in the outset that I had not time or opportunity to investigate the matter before the hon. gentleman made his motion, nor did I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

know the line he proposed to take; but I referred to the action of the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power, and to the action of the hon. gentleman himself when he was Finance Minister, to show that the same practice to which he had taken exception had been adopted and found necessary by them. But, Sir, the discussion would not have taken the wider range that it did take, had not the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) taken the ground that the Finance Minister, who was his colleague, had entirely failed to discharge his duty as Finance Minister in the House, when he held that position. I referred to the expenditure that had been made under Governor General's warrants—not to show that they were wrong; I took no exception to them, they may be entirely within the category, in my judgment, of necessary expenditures. I say, therefore, I did not join issue with the hon. gentleman, but I simply alluded to the practice that had prevailed, and said I was quite certain when all these papers were brought down, that it would be found that the present Government had ample justification, that the course they had pursued was the course adopted by the hon. gentleman when he was Finance Minister himself. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) intimated that the Government were adopting a *tu quoque* argument in order to shelter themselves from wrong-doing, by saying: You have done so, also. My argument was not brought forward in that spirit. It was brought forward to show that the explanations which had been offered in reference to the items contained in the paper laid before the House were sufficient, and that the items not only in themselves were proper, but that they were justified by the practice of the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power. That is a legitimate argument, it is not a *tu quoque* argument, it is not a justification of a wrong on the ground that some person else has done a similar wrong. I deny there is any wrong in the case. I say the warrants contained in the papers laid on the Table, so far as I am able to judge, were properly required, they were necessary in the public interest, and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has given a very vigorous and eloquent defense of the most objectionable item, if that term may be applied to any of the items, contained in the whole—that is the item for the appropriation of the park at Banff. I am free to say that the case, in my judgment, is not so strong for that expenditure by Governor General's warrant, although it is strong enough to justify it, as it is for almost all, if not all, the others; and as the member for Northumberland has eloquently defended the only weak point in our case, I was rather surprised to find him charging us with using a *tu quoque* argument and justifying ourselves for wrong-doing by saying that somebody else had done an equal wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. Allow me to put you right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to conclude, as I have only a few words to say, and I am afraid if I allow the interposition of the eloquent declamation of the hon. member for Northumberland, I may be so far carried away as to be thrown off the track.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was simply because you were representing me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), took the ground that there was no one of those expenditures so indefensible, so utterly in violation of the statute, as a Governor General's warrant for a lapsed balance, the discussion took a wider range, and, of course, it was right for the Minister of Justice to point out that it was not open to the member for Bothwell to take that ground, as the Minister of Finance of the Government with whom he had served, had adopted exactly the same principle, and had brought down lapsed balances by the half-dozen, at the very least, consequently sweeping away that argument. I do not intend to detain the House

further than to say this: I am pleased this motion is made. I should have been glad if the investigation, which the hon. gentleman proposes to make in the Committee on Public Accounts—and I am quite prepared to say that it is a very suitable and appropriate investigation to be made—and the discussion in this House, could have taken place after the investigation by the committee and when the papers were laid before the House. The hon. gentleman very properly and in a right spirit moved not only to bring the warrants down signed by the Governor General during our term of office, but also, and very properly so, during the period which covered his tenure of office as Finance Minister. With all those papers brought down—and I stated at once that it would give us great pleasure to bring them down—and after that investigation had been made, this House would have been in a much better position to discuss the question. I suppose the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will be very much surprised if I tell him that when the papers are brought down it will be found, that not only the Government of which he was a member, but the hon. gentleman, as Finance Minister, in performing the duties devolving upon him did not perform them, as the law imperatively demands, by laying upon the Table of the House a statement of the warrants signed by the Governor General, and with all that fullness which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) so much admires.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman was out of the House when I read the statements from the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I undertake to say that that does not comply with the law. The law declares that the Finance Minister shall lay on the Table of the House within so many days after the opening of the Session a statement, not mixed up with general estimates and public accounts, but a clear statement of the warrants signed by the Governor General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has said that in 1875-76-77 the law was not complied with. I find that in 1877 I laid before the House a statement of the expenditure to date on account of the New South Wales exhibition under the authority of a special warrant of the Governor General, dated 21st December, 1876, for \$25,000, which I think was the only warrant issued in that year. In 1876 I laid three separate special warrants for \$34,000, \$50,000 and \$60,000 before the House—His Excellency's special warrants for such and such date. That, I think, was in full compliance with the law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can say is that I applied to the custodians of the archives and the papers could not be produced, and the statement returned to me was that there was no statement of Governor General's warrants for that year. I say more. The hon. gentleman will perhaps be surprised to learn, that when the papers are brought down it will appear that an appropriation of \$20,000 was made during the recess of Parliament without any Governor General's warrant; and I have the original paper in my hand showing that an appropriation for that amount was made for the sufferers at St. John—and a very proper use of the Governor General's warrant it would have been, if it had been obtained. It was an appropriation of \$20,000 made on the 25th June, 1877, for which there was no report of the Minister of Finance as the law declares there shall be, that it was a matter of urgency and that no funds were appropriated to meet it; but it was an appropriation made and placed in the expenditures of the Public Accounts not as a Governor General's warrant. So I am exceedingly glad that the hon. gentleman is moving for those papers, because they will show that, if there has been any laxity in the practice, it has not been altogether confined to one side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what is that amount charged?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is in the general expenditure, which the hon. gentleman will find in the Supplementary Estimates, I think of 1878. On reference to the archives and the Order in Council, I find there was no Governor General's warrant and no report of the Minister of Finance as the law requires. And certainly the hon. gentleman has not been able to show anything so irregular as that. It must have been an oversight under the circumstances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what year is it charged?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will find it, I think, in the expenditure of 1878; it was made on the 25th June, 1877.

Mr. MILLS. That was for the sufferers by the St. John's fire?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; as I said, it would have been a very proper use of the Governor General's warrant, but unfortunately it was made by an order of the Committee of the Privy Council without any legal authority, such as the law requires to authorise a Governor General's warrant to issue. It reads:

"The committee have had under consideration a memorandum dated 22nd June, from Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, calling attention to the subject of the calamitous fire which has desolated a large portion of the city of St. John, N.B., and recommending that \$20,000 be advanced to the mayor of St. John in aid of the sufferers and for their immediate wants. The committee submits the above recommendation for Your Excellency's approval."

That was authorised by Sir Wm. Ritchie who was Deputy Governor, and the appropriation was consequently made. I only refer to that matter—for I assume it was a mere oversight—to show the desirability of having all the papers brought down, and I shall be only too glad if the result of that examination by the Committee on Public Accounts is effective in any way checking any extravagant use, or inordinate use, of the warrant of the Governor General in these cases.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very much obliged to the Finance Minister for the complimentary manner in which he spoke of my eloquence. Whether his words were actually meant, or spoken in a satirical sense—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL—I am quite unable to say. When I dealt with the question to which he referred, yesterday or the day before, I did it from an honest desire to see an enterprise, which the Government had taken hold of and dealt with, protected in the public interest; and when I referred to the fact, at a more recent time, on a debate on an entirely different subject—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; it was the same day.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend is quite as liable to err as I am. I can tell him that the subject upon which I spoke—as he was pleased to say, so eloquently in reference to the Banff Spring—was the Act which the Minister of the Interior introduced, and which had nothing whatever to do with the question of the Governor General's warrants.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was a discussion of this very question.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let my hon. friend bear in mind that one of the strong points I made in that discussion was this: that, on a question of that kind, I appealed to the House—and I am in the memory of hon. gentlemen who know that what I am saying is true—I appealed to the House that, in a question in which the public interests and the public health might be so possibly concerned, in the future as well as at present, we ought not to mix up a mere political or constitutional or financial question, with what I conceived should be dealt with in a sanitary point of view. I appeal to hon. gentlemen if that was not the stand I took; and when the Finance Minister imputed to me that I had changed my attitude on this question he was entirely wrong. My reference to the fact that the *tu quoque* argument was used did not refer to what was said by the Minister of Finance, but referred to a statement made by the Minister of Fisheries to this House; and when I got up I said that, while it might be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite to attack hon. gentlemen on this side, and say: "You did it, too," and while it might be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen on this side to make use of the same kind of argument towards the opposite party—that while this might be satisfactory to the two great political parties, I occupied an independent position in this House, and it was not satisfactory to me, and I did not think it would be satisfactory to the country. Now, I have never dealt with the question of the Governor General's warrants. I merely made an incidental reference to the question for the purpose of trying to keep the two sides of the House right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I am glad my hon. friends approve, by their cheers and applause, of the position I have assumed. I know there is justice enough on both sides of the House to appreciate a correct position when it is stated, as I have stated it on this question. When the hon. the Finance Minister was speaking, I asked his permission to allow me to make the suggestion that he was misrepresenting me when he made that statement. But he was so carried away with his own eloquence and the powerful arguments with which he was extinguishing an hon. gentleman on this side—his former predecessor—that he would not permit an explanation, and I had to wait to the close of his forcible and powerful speech until I had an opportunity of explaining myself. I repeat again that I did not deal with the question of the Governor's warrants. I made only an incidental reference to it when I defended the policy of the Government in relation to the Banff Springs; and when I made the remarks, which he was pleased to describe in the way he did, I spoke by way of an appeal to the House to dis sever the question of financial interests, as created by the outlay for the Banff Springs—which he says is the most indefensible expenditure of the whole lot of them—from the sanitary question which was then before the House. I never dealt with the manner of spending the money or the amounts said to be expended; but when the question of preserving a great natural remedy, and what would prove to be a great health resort in the future, was before the House, I applauded the Government for the fact that, while they owned that territory and before it got complicated by the claims of private individuals, as had occurred in other places to my knowledge—I applauded them for taking control of these grounds, and asked the House to dis sever the financial interest from the sanitary one, and deal with it purely on the principle of the Bill which the Minister of the Interior had introduced, giving him ample power to carry out a measure which so fully met with my approval, and which, I was sure, would be approved of by a majority of the House. When I referred to the *tu quoque* argument, my hon. friend was wrong in charging me with mixing up the two questions. I wanted to dis sever them; I endeavored to do so, and my attitude will be, I think, in the

Mr. MITCHELL.

recollection of the House, and the Minister of Finance did wrong in attempting to put me in the wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The \$20,000 to which the hon. gentleman referred as having been paid illegally and irregularly, although for a desirable object—the relief of the sufferers by the St. John fire—I find was charged, and I think correctly charged, in the accounts of 1877, to the \$50,000 for unforeseen expenses, which we had the authority to expend.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find, on further investigation, that he is entirely mistaken. I would like to ask him, if it was charged to the \$50,000, why it was necessary on the 25th of June, 1877, to have an Order in Council to appropriate the \$20,000?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, I had no right, nor has the hon. gentleman any right, of his own proper motion, without the authority of the Governor General in Council, to spend any part of the \$50,000. I think he will find that is so, if he consults his advisers.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman think that any individual Minister has the right to cheek out \$50,000 on his own individual authority?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly not.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it must be done by an Order in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I think he will find that it was for the construction of buildings.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is unforeseen expenses of any kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is getting rusty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to make a remark or two with regard to the observations addressed to the House by the Finance Minister. I think the hon. gentleman has to some extent misapprehended the position I took yesterday, with regard to the same question. The hon. gentleman said there was a difference of opinion between the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and myself: Now, that is a mistake. I cordially subscribed to the view put forward by the hon. member for South Oxford, but, because my hon. friend did not discuss certain expenditures of the Government to the extent he might have done, the hon. gentleman assumes that my hon. friend from South Oxford did not call in question the propriety of those expenditures. Then the hon. gentleman's friends took another position which I commented upon, but to which the hon. gentleman has to some extent misrepresented—perhaps unintentionally—but nevertheless the hon. gentleman has not correctly represented the statement I made. Now the hon. gentleman and his friends took this position. He said if an appropriation had once been made it was quite right and proper for the Government, subsequently, notwithstanding the fact that it had lapsed, to provide by Governor's warrants for that expenditure. It was that general proposition that I called in question, and I pointed out that the Act provided that the Administration might extend the period beyond the period of the year for which it was voted, for a period of three months, and that if it were in the power of the Government to extend the period indefinitely then such a provision of the law was altogether unnecessary, and in fact altogether inoperative. Therefore it was impossible to put the construction on the law which the hon. gentleman had put upon it. Now, an appropriation once made by Parlia-

ment for a specific public work, and for which the country has entered into a regular contract and incurred certain specific obligations, stands upon a wholly different footing from an ordinary appropriation which Parliament may have voted and which may not have been expended. That was my position. Now, what do the facts show which the hon. gentleman has laid before the House, and to which the Minister of Justice called the attention of the House yesterday? He read certain Orders in Council, and showed that certain warrants signed by the Governor General had been issued; but in every case they were for appropriations of this particular class, or for unforeseen calamities. They were not of that class which the hon. gentleman's friends have advised the issue of warrants to cover. Now, I called attention yesterday to the fact that a number of these warrants had been signed after Parliament was in Session. The hon. gentleman and his friends seem to forget that the clause of the Audit Act relating to these is an enabling clause—that it is not a limitation on the power of the Government, but a power positively conferred upon the Government and determined by the words of the statute. If it were not for this statutory provision, no Governor's warrants could be issued; no such expenditure could be legally incurred which had not the prior sanction of Parliament; but it is because the statute confers this power in certain cases that that can be done. The statute provides what? That if, when Parliament is not in Session, certain emergencies arise, certain acts can be done. But Parliament was in Session, and therefore Parliament ought to have been consulted.

Motion agreed to.

THE WELLAND BRIDGE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all petitions, memorials, correspondence, orders and reports, whether made by the resident engineer or Mr. Page, in connection with the bridge across the Welland Canal at Welland, lately removed, and the construction of a new bridge in lieu thereof.

He said: I am informed from the locality by the person who requested me to make this motion that a bridge existed across the canal for a period of about seventy-five years, in relation to which the town was in fact built up, and that a large portion of the principal structures are upon the streets connected by that bridge. The removal of the bridge some time ago in connection with the works on the canal has caused great loss to the owners of the buildings which still exist, and application both personally and by letter have been made to the Department with a view to having these grievances remedied, but is yet without success. I am very anxious that the hon. Minister should, if he can, make any statement on this occasion which would be calculated to inform the House, and those interested, as to what the intentions of the Government are with reference to the restoration of this means of communication between the two parts of the town, and the principal portions of it, that I have described.

Mr. POPE. I can inform the hon. gentleman that this bridge was placed some 600 feet from where the old one was because it could not be placed on the old site to any advantage. According to the report of the resident engineer and accepted by Mr. Page, if placed on the old site, it would have completely stopped the old aqueduct, leaving only the new one to be used. The complaint is not just from a village of that neighborhood, but from a farming community settled over a considerable distance, that they have to go over this 600 feet. The Government, when they changed the location, made a road from Main street down to Division street, where the bridge now stands. Those people made some complaint that there was damage to their property;

but the reason the change was made was what I stated. I will give the hon. gentleman the report of the resident engineer. That is all I have got.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Before this motion is put, I wish to say a few words. It is a hardship to the town of Welland that this bridge should be removed. The road upon which it stands has been in existence 75 or 100 years. It is not an ordinary street laid out by a municipality. It is an old township line, and upon it all the important business structures of the place are built; in fact, all the business of the county town of the important and intelligent county of Welland is done on that street, and I deny entirely that it is simply a country place. So far as inconvenience to the aqueduct is concerned, I understand that the placing of the bridge on the old site is merely a matter of expense. Whether this is so or not I am not prepared to say. I know that during the time of the Government of which the hon. gentleman for West Durham was a member in 1877, when Mr. Page made this report, that Government made the change of the structure from the original location to where it is now. From that time to last fall I never heard anything about this bridge. The people did not realise the inconvenience that would arise from its removal until the structure was actually taken down. They then found that it was a great inconvenience. A deputation was sent to Ottawa, which I accompanied, and I found to my astonishment that the change had actually been determined on ten years previously, and that the contract for the new bridge was let in the fall of 1877. However, as a great injury has been done to the town, and particularly to individuals who have large and expensive buildings constructed on that street, which will certainly be reduced in value by reason of the removal of the bridge, I believe, if it is at all practicable, that the bridge should be constructed on the original township line. If it is not practicable, then I say the people who have been injured are fairly entitled to compensation at the hands of the Government of this country. If this change has been made for the purpose of saving the public exchequer, a few individuals in that locality should not be called upon to suffer loss by reason of the change; and if it was necessary to make the change for the general advantage of Canada, then I say the individuals ought to be compensated by the Government.

Mr. POPE. That is another part of the story altogether. The question is whether this bridge could be placed on the old site. I assert that my hon. friend, who was Minister of Railways, found by the reports of his engineers that it could not be placed there, and I find from the report of my own engineer that if it were placed on the old spot it would completely stop the old aqueduct. Apart from that, the complaint has not come from that section of the country to which my hon. friend refers, but from the other side where there is a sparse population, and not from the town itself, so that, in that respect, he has not quite represented the thing as it is, but he has represented it perfectly right so far as the site is concerned. The site was fixed by my hon. friend from East York, and I believe he was justified in so doing.

Motion agreed to.

BLUE-BOOKS AND DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved:

That the rule now in force requiring the withholding of blue-books and Departmental reports till the assembling of Parliament—results in the suppression, often for periods of many months, of information relating to public affairs which the public interests require should be promptly made public.

That the blue-books and Departmental Reports for each fiscal or calendar year should in future be made public as soon as practicable

after the same are prepared, and that no unnecessary delay should be permitted to interfere with the issuing of the same.

That the Finance Department cause to be inserted in the *Canada Gazette* at the close of each month a statement of revenue and expenditure for the month, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year, distinguishing between expenditure upon capital account and expenditure on account of Consolidated Fund, and giving statement of gross debt and net debt.

That the Customs Department cause to be inserted in the *Canada Gazette* at the close of each month a statement of exports, of imports, of immigration and of navigation for the month, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year.

That the Department of Railways cause to be inserted in the *Canada Gazette* each week a statement showing the gross and the net earnings of each of the Government railways for the preceding week, and also for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask that this be allowed to stand over in order that we may see whether it is necessary there should be some legislation. Looking at the Act, I do not think there is, and that the resolutions can be adopted as they are. I would suggest, however, that the word "rule" should be altered to "practice" in the first line. I do not think there is any rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no objection, and I would ask also that the word "unexpired" which is a clerical error should be changed to "expired."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DEPUTY SPEAKERSHIP.

Mr. FISHER moved :

To rescind the Standing Orders respecting the election, at the commencement of every Parliament, of a Deputy Speaker and Chairman of committees.

He said: In moving for this change, I do not wish to deprive you, Sir, of that relief which, no doubt, is necessary for anybody who fills the position you occupy in this House. But, Sir, I take it for granted that you intend to follow the example of your predecessor, not only in the fairness and impartiality with which that hon. gentleman performed his duties as our Speaker, but also in the assiduity, the close attention, he gave to those duties, and by which he earned the respect and confidence of every gentleman who had then the honor of a seat in Parliament. I take it for granted you, Sir, will not call upon your deputy, should you have one, very frequently to occupy your position. During the short experience I have had in Parliament, both before and after the Deputy Speaker was elected by this House, I did not perceive that the Speaker on many occasions or for any long time, was forced to call on the Deputy to take his place in the Chair. In fact, from what I saw during the two years we had a Deputy Speaker, the chief duty that devolved on him was to act as the Chairman of our Committees, and not as the Speaker in the Chair. This being the case, I am sure, Sir, you will relieve me of the imputation of any desire to prevent your having that relief which I am sure is necessary to one charged with the onerous duties you have to perform. I feel that in making this motion I may, perhaps, count on the support of the Ministry of the day. Although coming from an humble member of the Opposition, I find that this motion has, if not by the direct action of the Ministry of the day, at all events, by their inaction, obtained a certain amount of endorsement and support. What says the Standing Order? I will not attempt to read the whole of it:

"That the House do elect a Chairman of Committees of this House at the commencement of every Parliament, as soon as the Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's speech."

Now, we have been some three weeks since the opening of Parliament. I think it is about three weeks since the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was agreed to, yet I find that the hon. gentlemen who are responsible for the conduct of business in the House, have not seen fit to take the initiative, which belongs to them, in proposing

Mr. CHARLTON.

the name of an hon. member to occupy the position of Deputy Speaker. I do not know why this has not been done, but am almost disposed to hope the Government have thus been inactive through a desire to accept, if not to support, the proposition I have put before the House. There are a good many reasons why it is not necessary we should have a Deputy Speaker. This country, we all know, is subject to very heavy charges in the annual expenditure, charges which are in a great degree due to the effect of the multiplication of officers and the large salaries paid to the various officers connected with the Civil Government. I believe that the only justification that can exist for the multiplication of these offices, or for our continuing their existence, is paramount necessity, and I do not consider that in this case there is any such paramount or absolute necessity. For a long time, I think for about eighteen years, the Dominion Parliament did not feel the necessity for this office, and the Ministers of the day did not think it necessary to adopt this procedure. In my own short experience, it was my good fortune to sit here for two years during which we had no Deputy Speaker, and I have sat here since that officer has been introduced. I confess that, from what little I saw of the proceedings of this House before the office was created, and from what I have seen since, I have not been led to believe that this was a necessary innovation. The Deputy Speaker's duties, as I have already said, are chiefly those of Chairman of Committees. In fact, he is called Chairman of Committees in the Standing Order. Ever since the Parliament of Canada has been in existence, it has been the custom to call upon one of the members of the House to act as Chairman of Ways and Means and Supply, and I believe there is a concurrence of all who are acquainted with the mode of parliamentary procedure that this custom is a right one, that one gentleman who is accustomed to the work should be asked to carry on that committee; but there are other committees in which it is usual to call upon other experienced members of the House to act as chairman, and I do not think there has been any difficulty in finding members capable of performing the duty. This being the case, it is evident that our business can be carried on perfectly well without this new salaried officer. For eighteen years, we were able to get on very well without him, and this Session of Parliament is now three weeks old, and we have been able so far to get on without this officer. It may be said that up to this time the House has hardly been in Committee of the Whole, but, if it is necessary that we should have a Chairman of Committees, it is not therefore necessary that he should be Deputy Speaker or should have the power and authority which the Deputy Speaker has. Judging from the short experience we have had of this official and of the gentleman who occupied the position in the last Parliament, it is better, in my judgment at all events, that the same gentlemen should not be continually harassed by being continually called upon to occupy this position. We know it is an onerous position. We know that often the committee sits for a length of time, and that the one who is called upon constantly and continuously to fulfil this duty has a much more onerous task than anyone would have when the duty is divided up, as it used to be, among the experienced members of this House. If you, Mr. Speaker, are able to call upon one gentleman at one time when the House goes into committee, and a few minutes afterwards, or an hour or two afterwards, to call upon another gentleman to occupy that responsible position, it is less likely that one member would be exhausted by the work or would feel the onerousness of this duty. Without wishing to reflect upon the hon. member who occupied the position in the last Parliament, who certainly devoted great attention to his duties and displayed great consideration in the fulfilment of those duties, still those who were present, as I was, during the long debates of the Session when the

Deputy Speaker was first chosen, can recollect the fact that, in consequence of the long sittings of the committee, the one hon. gentleman, whose duty it was to fill that position, was and must necessarily have been exhausted, and found his patience and his physical endurance tested beyond his power to sustain the test. It would be obvious that, were it within your competency to call upon any member to fulfil that duty, the case might be different, but when one member has to perform that duty, I can well understand the delicacy of Mr. Speaker in calling upon other hon. members, when that one member is paid a salary for performing that duty. If we had no such official, and if you, Sir, were at liberty to call upon any member whose experience is sufficient to justify his filling that position, no hon. member would have that feeling. There is another reason why I think we should refrain from continuing this office. The Government of the day are creating new offices in the civil government. There is a new Minister of Trade and Commerce to be created with a large salary, there is a proposition to create a Solicitor General with a large salary, and in the Public Accounts and in the *Official Gazette* we find that the expenditure has become alarmingly great. We believe that any officer who can be dispensed with ought to be dispensed with, and I have not yet heard any argument showing that it is necessary that this particular office should be continued. I suppose the First Minister and those who were responsible for the creation and for the continuance of this office, will say that we are adopting the English procedure, that we are following the example of that Parliament which we take for our model, and that, as they find it necessary to have a Deputy Speaker, it is necessary for us to follow their example. In the debate when the First Minister proposed to establish this office, he referred to the fact that in various other colonies there were Deputy Speakers who had large salaries. I think the circumstances are different. I am not going into an elaborate argument in reference to the existence of a Deputy Speaker in England. We can refer to our own experience in this matter. We can look back to the eighteen years which elapsed before the institution of this office, in order to show that we can get on perfectly well without this official, that it is unnecessary in our Parliament, and we need not take the example of any other legislature or country. I trust the desire will be shown by gentlemen sitting on both sides of this House to curtail our expenditure and to do away with what is unnecessary and decrease the burdens on the tax payers of the country, and that, therefore, we may hope that an end will be put to this leak, small though it may be, but occurring in regard to an office which I believe to be entirely and absolutely unnecessary. As the First Minister has not proposed a gentleman to fill this position and as it is incumbent on him to propose some one to fill that position, I hope he may have changed his mind and that he does not feel the same desire as was felt by the Ministers at the time to propose the filling of this office. I trust that this motion will be accepted by both sides of the House, not only by those who have experience of the past and have seen something of parliamentary procedure here, but by the new members who, coming fresh from their constituencies, will feel that they will fulfil the wishes of a large portion of the people of this country by showing their desire to economise and to carry on the business of Parliament with as little expense and as little formality as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure the House will not adopt this retrograde step suggested by the hon. gentleman in his motion. The last Parliament, after full consideration, and with the general acceptance of the majority, came to the conclusion that the establishment of this permanent officer, with all the powers and duties con-

ferred upon him was necessary for the efficient performance of our duties as members of Parliament, and for the purposes, in the first place, of assisting and protecting the Speaker from the consequences of having no such support, and in the next place, to have an officer under the supervision of yourself, Sir, armed with the same powers, and called upon, by holding office permanently, to pay the same attention to the rules and practice of Parliament as the Speaker himself. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman says, that when the debate on this Deputy Speakership took place, I alluded to the practice of the English Parliament. It may be well said, I admit, that there may be a great deal more business there, that Parliament sits much longer in England than it does in Canada, and that, therefore, it is straining the point a good deal in the matter of imitation, to adopt the notion simply because it is English. But, Sir, we pay great respect to the practice in England, and they have found it absolutely necessary to have such an officer. I think any one who has watched the progress of parliamentary proceedings of late days in England, must see that whether that Parliament sits for three months or for six, the appointment of an officer of that kind, the Speaker in every respect, I may say, except in rank, and supposed to possess the same qualifications, supposed to devote himself to the study of the practice of Parliament, and to train himself to the overseeing, in fact, not only of the House, but when the Speaker is out of the Chair, the innumerable cases in which the House is in Committee of the Whole—I say, all these things show the absolute necessity for a Deputy Speaker. And that necessity, as the hon. gentleman reminds me, was felt in our sister colonies, situated in the same conditions, very much as we are, with sessions not longer than ours. I think that in almost every one of the Australian colonies, they have found it necessary to appoint a deputy, with the powers of Speaker, and holding the position of permanent Chairman of Committees. All the colonies in Australia, and I think New Zealand as well, have such an officer. You may remember, Sir, how much the first Speaker suffered from the fact of not having such an officer. Mr. Cockburn, in fact, contracted the disease of which he died from being obliged to preside over long sittings for so long a period of time. And then we were obliged, as it will be remembered, to pass an Act for the purpose of giving additional powers in the way of having an officer to sit in the Chair during the enforced absence of the Speaker from ill-health or otherwise. But, Sir, it is quite clear that the casual appointment of a member to sit on a particular occasion, to sit in committee when a particular Bill is before the House, is not satisfactory. He has not of necessity given any particular attention to the practice of Parliament, it is not his duty to make himself acquainted with the practice of Parliament, and it would be improper and unwise to clothe with the authority of Speaker a casual Chairman of Committees appointed from time to time, varying every time, and therefore in no way fit to assume your position and have your authority, or to have the control or influence with the House of Commons which such an officer should have. The mere statement that the very moderate allowance given to the Deputy Speaker should be an impediment to such an officer if he is wanted, I think is too penny-wise to be worth consideration. I have no doubt that the House will sustain the opinion so strongly expressed in the last Parliament, of the propriety and expediency, and the importance of having such an officer. The hon. gentleman says that the Deputy Speaker ought to have been appointed before. Well, he will be appointed as soon as he is wanted. He was not wanted really until the committees that had been appointed had got to work, and until this House was called upon to go into Committee of the Whole. But, I tell my hon. friend that he would have been appointed before we went into committee at all if it were

not that I asked the hon. gentleman to postpone his motion. I intended to move the very next day for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker, but as I was apprehensive that hon. gentlemen might say: Well, the leader of the House has got the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) to postpone his motion in order to give him an opportunity of moving for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. I have deferred it until now, but I will now give the hon. gentleman and the House notice that it is my intention to move to-morrow for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees.

Mr. BLAKE. You must give notice of that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not necessary to give notice.

Mr. BLAKE. I think so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it has been decided otherwise.

Mr. BLAKE. It could not have been decided otherwise as yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it will be so decided.

Mr. BLAKE. That I dare say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure that it will be decided rightly, and if it is decided rightly it must be decided that this motion may be made without notice. I am altogether opposed to the motion of the hon. gentleman, and I call upon the House to reject it.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the hon. gentleman for not having taken advantage of the postponement of this motion, which I am glad he did not do. While commenting upon the fact that the Chairman of Committees was not yet appointed, I drew the attention of the First Minister and the House to the words of the Standing Order, which said, not as the First Minister would like to imply, that the Chairman of Committees should be appointed when he is needed, but that he should be appointed as soon as the Address in answer to His Excellency's speech is agreed to. This shows no connection with his duties as Chairman of Committees, and has nothing to do with the delay to which the First Minister has alluded. As regards the remark of the First Minister that the office was created only after the subject had received full consideration and full discussion, I think the hon. gentleman, in making that statement, is going a little beyond the fact.

Mr. SPRAKER. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order. I have no means of discovering who is making that noise, but it ought not to be done.

Mr. FISHER. I have no desire to waste the time of the House, but after the remarks of the First Minister I think I am in order in replying in a few words. I was alluding to the way in which the Deputy Speaker's office was created, and when the First Minister said it was done after full consideration and with deliberate intention, I think that he was going a little beyond the fact. While in England when the Deputy speakership was instituted there was very full consideration of the question and a full discussion, and the report of a committee which took evidence and examined a large number of the leading parliamentarians of the country, we know perfectly well that that action was taken here without any investigation on the part of the House or any of its committees. The First Minister took the responsibility for the action taken after I suppose consulting his colleagues, and probably consulting his own party, but without consulting the House. I do not consider that can fairly be called full consideration and investigation. It may be partisan investigation, it may be partial consideration; but I do not think it can be considered to be full investigation on the part of the House

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of Commons or Parliament. The hon. First Minister also alluded, as he did when he first brought the question before this House, to the unfortunate affliction of a former Speaker. I am glad to believe that the Speaker of the last Parliament has escaped any such disastrous result, and I believe that if we were to follow the rule adopted by the First Minister at the opening of this Parliament, namely, that the same gentleman should not be twice consecutively chosen Speaker of the House, such disastrous results would be very unlikely to occur. I understand Mr. Cockburn, the Speaker alluded to, was twice consecutively Speaker of this House, and it is evident that at the close of the first Parliament he did not consider that he was so ill as to be unwilling to receive a second appointment. Had his health been impaired and a Deputy Speaker required, then would have been the time to have appointed this additional officer. But that course was not taken until last Parliament. I cannot believe that the First Minister had any conception that the Session was going to last so long—or that the sittings were going to be so tiresome and so long—unless, indeed, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were aware that the iniquitous contents of the Franchise Bill would be stoutly opposed by hon. members on this side of the House, and they prepared at the very commencement, before the Bill was known to members of the Opposition, for a prolonged struggle, and they therefore believed it to be necessary to establish this office to provide for the contingency they expected, and which really did come about. I believe the argument of the First Minister is no justification for this office and I trust the House may be so far independent of the leader of the Government on this occasion as to support my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when the Government proposed to appoint a Deputy Speaker, the House did not oppose the motion; on the contrary, it seemed to be their desire that the appointment should be made, and I do not think that we have ever had any occasion to complain of the fact that there was a second officer to preside at the proceedings of the House. Your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, would certainly not have been able to perform his duties had he not had a deputy to fill the Chair on more than one occasion, and now that the House has decided to have this officer, I do not see anything in what the hon. member told us when he made his motion nor in what he has just told us, which might induce the House to adopt his motion. As the hon. Premier has said a while ago, when the Speaker was obliged to choose an ordinary member of this House to discharge the duties of Chairman of Committees of the whole House, he indiscriminately took a member from one side of the House or the other, and none of these chairmen knew the rules of the House as well as the Speaker knows them, or as well as the Deputy Speaker knew them when he discharged these duties during the two last Sessions. Surely we the old members of Parliament should remember the scenes which often took place when the Speaker called upon an ordinary member of the House—a member who was not the same for all the committees, since it was the privilege of the Speaker to choose a member from either side of the House, and, as a rule, he did not always choose the same member—to discharge these duties. We have seen, on many occasions, members of this House rather deficient in respect for the Chairman of the Committee, and scenes which were certainly not a credit to the House of Commons. But on the other hand, I must say that under the new system inaugurated by the appointment of a permanent Chairman of Committees, we have seen no repetition of such scenes. The Chairman of these Committees had evidently, in the opinion of most of hon. members, the same powers and the same authority as the Speaker, and was consequently listened to and obeyed with more respect than the old Chairmen of Committees. Under these circum-

stances, I do not see why we should change the rule which was adopted. The hon. member who made this motion, I did not give any truly valuable reasons to induce the House to contradict itself, and to rescind the rule which now forms part of the regulations of this House. The question of salary, which is really a very small salary, owing to the permanent duties of this officer, cannot be an important matter for this House, for, after all, two thousand dollars are not a large sum for an officer who is bound to be constantly here, and to preside at all the committees of the whole House, aside from the fact stated by the hon. Premier, that this officer is obliged, in order to properly discharge his duties, to study the rules of the House, in the same manner as you study them, Mr. Speaker, in order to preside as you do at the proceedings of this House. Therefore, I do not see why we should change the practice of this House. On the contrary, I hope, that this House, desirous to see order and harmony prevailing in our proceedings, will maintain the position which was taken during the two last Sessions, and will not vote for the motion of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), but will be willing to assist you in your duties as Speaker, by making it possible for you to leave the Chair with a certainty of having, to fill your place during your absence, a member familiar with the rules of the House, and who, on this account will be respected by the members. Mr. Speaker, I will say no more, I thought it my duty on this occasion to use my mother tongue, in order that those hon. members who do not understand the English language as well as the French language, might be posted on the question now before the House.

House divided on motion of Mr. Fisher (p. 296):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dessaint,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Edgar,	Mallory,
Beausoleil,	Edwards,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bécharé,	Eisenhauer,	Mitchell,
Bernier,	Ellis,	Mulock,
Blake,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Fisher,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gauthier,	Préfontaine,
Bowman,	Geoffrion,	Purcell,
Brien,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Guay,	Robertson (King's, P E I),
Campbell (Kent),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Jones,	Scriver,
Casey,	Kirk,	Semple,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Somerville,
Charlton,	Lang,	Trow,
Cimon,	Lavergne,	Turcot,
Clayes,	Livingston,	Watson,
Cook,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John),
Davies,	Macdonald (Huron),	Welsh, and
De St. Georges,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin).—66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Guilbault,	Porter,
Bain (Soulanges),	Guillet,	Putnam,
Bergeron,	Hale,	Reid,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Boyle,	Hesson,	Robillard,
Brown,	Hickey,	Roome,
Bryson,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Burns,	Jamieson,	Rykert,
Cameron,	Kenny,	Scarth,
Campbell (Digby),	Kirkpatrick,	Shakespeare,
Cargill,	Labelle,	Shanly,
Carling,	Landry,	Small,
Carpenter,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Caron, (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Smith (Ontario),
Chapleau,	MacDonald,	Sproule,
Chisholm,	McCarthy,	Stevenson,
Cockburn,	McCulla,	Taylor,
Coulombe,	McDonald (Victoria),	Temple,

Coursol,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Thérien,
Couture,	McKay,	Thompson,
Curran,	McKeen,	Tisdale,
Daly,	McLellan,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Davin,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Tupper (Pictou),
Davies,	McNeill,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Madill,	Vanasse,
Denison,	Mara,	Wallace,
Desjardins,	Marshall,	Weldon (Albert),
Duchesnay,	Masson,	White (Cardwell),
Dupont,	Mills (Annapolis),	White (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Moncreiff,	Wilmot,
Ferguson (Welland),	Montague,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Foster,	Montplaisir,	Wilson (Lennox),
Freeman,	O'Brien,	Wood (Brooknox),
Girouard,	Perley (Ottawa),	Wood (Westland), and
Gordon,	Pope,	Wright.—109.
Grandbois,		

Mr. GRANDBOIS. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) has voted and I have in my hand a note from the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) stating that he has paired with him for to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain, explain.

Mr. DOYON. It is true the hon. member for Gaspé, when he left asked me if I should vote. I told him that I thought of leaving myself. I forgot the thing; I did not think I had paired. If it is considered as such I am prepared to withdraw my vote. It was not a private conversation; it was merely while passing here.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) say that he has paired or that he has not paired?

Mr. Fiset. He does not say that he has paired.

Mr. DOYON. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish that there should be a misunderstanding. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) was passing here, and he asked me if I was going to vote. I said: "No; I think I am going to leave." He said further: "If I should stop here, necessarily, I should vote with the Government." I said: "As for me, I should vote against them." He said: "All right, I am going away." From that I do not understand that I had paired.

Mr. GRANDBOIS. I must say this: That the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) only left on the express condition that the member for Laprairie should not vote.

Mr. Fiset. How does it happen—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Laprairie says that he has paired, and desires to withdraw his vote, I believe that the practice in this case is to allow a member present in the House to abstain from voting, or, if he votes, to withdraw his vote. But if he does not say that he has not paired, and does not wish to withdraw his vote, the Speaker cannot interfere.

Mr. DOYON. So that there should not be any misunderstanding, I prefer to withdraw my vote.
Motion negatived.

RETURN AND GAZETTING OF MEMBERS.

On the Order, to refer the return laid upon the Table of the House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, relating to the return and gazetting of members, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to make enquiry into the conduct of certain returning officers and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, &c. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell).

Mr. BLAKE. The Order which has just been called is one upon which there will be considerable talk. My hon. friend will make a statement, and there will be speeches by

several others, I think it is rather a late hour to commence such a discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on; adjourn, adjourn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman says there will be a discussion—

Mr. BLAKE. I have said it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, if the hon. gentleman says it in that kind of tone, perhaps we had better go on.

Mr. BLAKE. I am willing that it should go on, if it suits the convenience of the House. I said that my hon. friend was going to speak at some length, and that some others would speak, and upon that ground I suggested that this was not an hour to begin the discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I got up as gracefully as I could to accede to the suggestion, and then the hon. gentleman—as is his habit—made that remark in a very curt way.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure I am very sorry, for I can assure the hon. gentleman I did not intend to apply it in that way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All right. I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company.—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company.—(Mr. Scriver.)

Bill (No. 58) to terminate the trust respecting the South-Eastern Railway, to authorise its sale, and to incorporate the South-Eastern Railway Junction Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act incorporating the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 60) to further amend the Act incorporating the Western Assurance Company, and other Acts affecting the same.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Acts incorporating and relating to the British Canadian Loan and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 62) to reduce the stock of the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited), and for other purposes.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

THE BUDGET.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the Minister of Finance, I beg to say that the Estimates will be laid on the Table on Monday night, and that the Minister

Mr. BLAKE.

has communicated with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who has consented to waive his motion, which is the first Order on Thursday, and, with the consent of the House, the Minister of Finance will deliver the Budget Speech on that day—Thursday.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT ON THE 18TH INST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire also to say that I have received a memorandum from a member of Parliament, handing me the names of a number of hon. members on both sides of the House, I believe some fifty-eight on the other side and a large number on this side, the two together composing a majority of the members I think, asking that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, the 18th, it shall stand adjourned until the following Wednesday. Thursday is a holiday—Ascension Day—and the House cannot sit. Friday it can sit. Saturday and Sunday we do not sit. Monday we can sit. Tuesday is the anniversary of Her Majesty's birthday, when we do not usually sit; and it has been suggested that as there are only two days, Friday and Monday, on which the House can sit, unless by being over-zealous, the House, when it adjourns on the Wednesday, should stand over until the following Wednesday. I throw this out now for the consideration of the House. I think the majority of the members have presented this proposition to the Government.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT REPEAL.

Mr. CARGILL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) to repeal the Canada Temperance Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CARGILL. As I am a new member of this House I hope hon. gentlemen will pardon me if I commit any breach of parliamentary etiquette. I may give a few reasons why I propose asking for leave to introduce this Bill. My riding, the east riding of Bruce, opposed the introduction of the Scott Act. In the whole county it was carried by a considerable majority. The east riding of Bruce was opposed to it, but had to submit, owing to the majority of the whole county being in its favor. Now, these people feel aggrieved, and my own convictions are that the beneficial results anticipated from the introduction of the Scott Act have not been realised, and, therefore, the general interests of the county would be advanced by its repeal. I know that municipalities which formerly derived a revenue from hotels now get no revenue from that source. In consequence of the passage of the Act, municipalities have had to reduce the assessed value on hotel property about one-half, and when this is the case in municipalities where the people are opposed to the Act, it is a very serious grievance. I, therefore, ask for the repeal of the Scott Act. Some people, of course, consider that the Act will ultimately bring about beneficial results in the interests of temperance. For myself, I do not think that legislation of this kind is at all conducive to temperance—moral suasion is much better. I know that, in driving through municipalities where beer is very largely used, I find the agricultural population in a much better condition, financially and otherwise, than in municipalities where they have adopted the Scott Act, and accept this as evidence that the use of beer is no obstruction to the progress of the agricultural or any other class of the community. As I have introduced this Bill at the request of my constituents, and in accordance with my own convictions, at present I have nothing further to say, but hope the House will give it their serious consideration, and at a further stage of the discussion, after hearing the *pros* and *cons*, I may be able to give the House some more information on this subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the Banff National Park.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No 20) respecting Public Stores.—(Mr. Thompson.)

SALARIES OF PENITENTIARY OFFICERS.

Resolutions reported from Committee of the Whole (May 4) respecting the salaries to be paid to officers of penitentiaries (Mr. Thompson) were read the first and the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Penitentiary Act.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman promised to lay on the Table a detailed statement of the savings. I do not ask him to do it this moment, but before the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have it and will send it to the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE N.-W. T.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 17) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Senate of Canada.—(Sir John A. Macdonald)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. I invite the attention of the First Minister and the Minister of Justice to the wording of the clause that constitutes the Bill. It provides that the North-West Territories shall be represented in the Senate by two members, and that the provisions of the British North America Act shall apply to them. I have looked at the provisions of the British North America Act empowering the Parliament of Canada to give representation to the North-West Territories, and I find that there is nothing in that Act beyond an enabling clause authorising Parliament to grant such representation. Under the terms of the British North America Act of 1867, the moment representation is given, the whole provisions of the Act apply to any representatives of the Territories, either in the House of Commons or in the Senate. It is quite impossible by any legislation of this House to restrain the operations of the British North America Act. Its provisions operate absolutely. In 1868, when we were invited to determine upon what terms and conditions those Territories should be admitted to Canada, I called the attention of the First Minister and the House to the meaning of the words in the 146th section of the British North America Act. I pointed out that it was necessary to state in those terms and conditions upon what terms those Territories were to be erected into Provinces and to have representation in the Senate and the House of Commons, and that when the terms were set forth, and were by Order in Council made part of the British North America Act, then all the machinery necessary to give representation to those Territories in either House would be provided in those resolutions. That opportunity was allowed to go by. The Territories were embraced in the territorial limits of Canada without any such provision for their representation either in this House or in the Senate. When the hon. gentleman proposed to give representation to Manitoba, I think I called the attention of himself and of Parliament to the fact that the legislation we adopted did not constitutionally admit Manitoba to representation in the Parliament

of Canada—that it did not establish a Federal relation, and that any law of ours admitting Manitoba to representation in this House, no matter what terms we might set forth, would only make Manitoba a municipality. We could give the Province representation here, but not a constitution that could not be altered or amended. The hon. gentleman admitted the soundness of that contention. The British North America Act of 1871 was passed on a Bill prepared by Parliament. I think the hon. gentleman was at Washington at the time that measure was prepared. I know his colleague, Sir George Cartier, consulted me with regard to its terms. That measure was passed, and Manitoba was granted a Federal constitution. The hon. gentleman last year took another step, I think in a somewhat irregular way—I think it was unfortunate that he did so—and the Imperial Parliament was invited to legislate without being informed by this Parliament what were the precise terms required; and so we have a third British North America Act supplementary to the Act of 1867 and the Act of 1871. In that Act we have a provision made for representation in the House of Commons. Apart from the fact that we had legislated in advance, whether we could give to the Territories representation other than representation based upon population, I need not here discuss. They have a larger representation than their population would warrant, and that representation has been confirmed. I apprehend that the provisions of the British North America Act regarding that representation are in operation, and it would not be in the power of this Parliament to increase or alter that representation in any way. But so far as the Senate is concerned, there are no limitations on the power of appointment; there is no general rule to guide this House that would operate in the way of restraint as to the number of senators to be appointed, other than there would be for the representation in the Commons. But the provisions of the Imperial Act, empowering us to legislate, do not alter or interfere with the general powers and restrictions imposed by the British North America Act of 1867. Therefore, it does not enable us to make operative certain sections of that Act, and to leave others without their due influence or their necessary operation. The fact that these particular sections apply to the Senate does not depend upon any declaration by this House or Parliament; it does not depend upon the sections being set forth in this particular provision of the Act. They depend altogether upon the necessary and paramount operation of the British North America Act itself. We may say that there are to be two senators, we are authorised to say that; we might say there should be more when we make that provision, and the Crown may make the appointment, but what shall be the qualification of those senators we cannot say. The British North America Act says what it shall be. We cannot elude or confirm that by any declaration we may make; what may be the power of those senators does not depend on anything we say. If the provisions of the British North America Act here referred to depended upon this declaration for their operative effect, it is quite clear that, beyond making those men members of the Senate, nothing would be done. If it is necessary to refer to these particular sections to make them operative in the matter, these men would be created members of the Senate after they were appointed, without having any power at all. They would not have the power to vote, they would not have the power to perform any of the functions of members of the Senate, because those powers are not given them. That would, of course, be an absurd contention, but its absurdity depends upon the fact that the clauses of the British North America Act operate absolutely, and require no act upon our part to bring them into operation. So the hon. gentleman will see it is not necessary to refer to any particular sections; if it were necessary to refer to

these, it would be necessary to refer to every other, to the 91st as well as to these. Therefore, it seems to me that this clause ought to be recast, and that we ought to rest content with the simple declaration that we propose to give to the North-West Territories two representatives in the second Chamber.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was kind enough to mention to me in private, when this Bill was up before, the objection he has made. I think there is value in that objection. I quite agree that particular reference is not required, and perhaps might encumber the Act, and be liable to the inferences which the hon. gentleman says might be drawn from it. The particular clauses of the Bill were put in by the Law Clerk, but I quite agree with the argument of my hon. friend.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Mr. POPE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to take into consideration a certain proposed resolution respecting the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman ought to explain his resolution.

Mr. POPE. The object of the Bill which will be founded on this proposed resolution I will explain. It will be with the recollection of the House that a contract was made with what was called the Short Line Railway Company to build a railway from Oxford to New Glasgow. It did some work for a portion of a year. It finally abandoned its work and its charter expired. The work now remains in that position. Considerable work has been done. I think, if I remember rightly, that the first twenty-two miles are graded, twenty miles more are about two-thirds graded, and there is a little done on another twenty miles, but very little, I think. The men on this road, the laborers and others who had done this work, remained unpaid by the company, but two years ago, or thereabouts, a vote was taken in this House, and a second vote was taken about a year ago, which completed the payment of these laborers. Before this was done these people gave a mortgage to the laborers, or to a portion of them—I forget exactly what the arrangement was—as a lien upon the road, and that remained a lien upon the road. That road was transferred to the Government when the Government paid up the laborers. That is the condition in which this matter now stands. The Government, feeling that this road was going to ruin, that the grading that had been done, and the dump which had been made, were all going to ruin, and also a good deal of the other work, bridges and so forth, felt that they must attempt some way of completing the road. They are now proposing to introduce a Bill based upon these resolutions to give them authority to complete this portion of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be well, as this is now become a Government railway, if the hon. gentleman would give us some statement of what the length of the line is, what the estimated cost is, what the outcome is expected to be, and whether we are to work the road as well as make it, and also as to when this new policy was inaugurated.

Mr. POPE. There is no new policy about it. The new policy is forced upon us, if we are to save the work at all. It is the intention of the Government to work this as a Government railway. The supposed cost of the railway, though we have not a very close estimate yet, and we do not know exactly what remains to be done, is something like \$1,000,000 in addition to the appropriation.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. BLAKE. That is \$1,250,000 altogether?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the mileage?

Mr. POPE. Between sixty and seventy miles to build.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is without equipment?

Mr. POPE. No, that is for an equipped road.

Mr. JONES. I understood that, during the recent interesting period in Nova Scotia affairs, there was a purchase made by the Government of a piece of road from one of the railway companies to form part of this line. Is that embraced in this Order in Council, or is that extra?

Mr. POPE. No, this does not embrace that. That was for another purpose. That is part of the Pictou Town Branch. It may form a part of this road, or it may not, but the purchase was made for another purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When was it made?

Mr. POPE. Two years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Two years ago?

Mr. POPE. No, it was completed a year ago.

Mr. BLAKE. When was this arrangement, which it is now proposed to sanction, made?

Mr. POPE. The Government have, since they were obliged to pay off these men, supposed that in the end they would have to take over the road and complete it.

Mr. BLAKE. At what date was it decided?

Mr. POPE. I should say it was decided some time last summer, but I cannot say positively.

Mr. JONES. I am not going to oppose this proposal, but this seems to have been made under a Minute of Council of the 31st January in this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. That is not summer.

Mr. JONES. One would suppose, naturally, that this is carrying out the Minute of Council which is dated the 31st January of the present year, and, during the course of the debate the other evening, when I drew attention to that fact, I was reminded by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) that it was only done in pursuance of the policy of the Government at a previous period.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. I reminded him then that the only legislation on the Statute-book was in the shape of a subsidy which had been granted to that Short Line Company, and that, in consequence of their inability to complete their work, the work had in fact, as is now stated by the hon. the Minister of Railways, entirely collapsed; and it would seem that it was only in view of the elections which were coming on that an Order in Council was issued on the 31st January, only twenty-two days before the election. I am not taking exception to this expenditure at all, but I repeat that it does seem a very fortunate circumstance that these hon. gentlemen, after four or five years, were only brought to a sense of their responsibility to carry on this work a fortnight before the elections came off. I congratulate the Government on having arrived at such a proper conclusion, although at such a late hour, and although the circumstances under which it was arrived at might be regarded with some sort of suspicion. Still, the completion of the road is a very desirable work, no doubt, and I hope it will go on now, as it will be of very great advantage to that part of the country.

Mr. POPE. I thought my hon. friend looked very much pleased about something, but I did not know what it was. I now understand it. But he is very much mistaken. We had decided early last summer that we would complete this

work. We supposed, when we made the last arrangement to pay these men, that the road would have to be completed by ourselves.

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friend from Halifax has alluded to the discussion which took place in regard to this Minute of Council the other evening, and referred to the argument which occurred between himself and myself on this particular question. I would like to explain, in answer to the hon. gentleman's remarks, both then and now, that, as I understood the question, I challenged a statement made by him, which he seems to believe still, that this policy, as now presented to Parliament in definite shape, was first considered advisable and necessary, and decided upon shortly previous to the last general election. Now, what escaped the hon. gentleman's attention, evidently, in connection with the history of this very important railway matter in Nova Scotia, was the action taken in reference, not merely to the road between Oxford and New Glasgow, but in reference to the whole question of the extension of our railway system to Cape Breton. This work is specially one of the most important features in connection with the extension by Government, to which Parliament was pledged before the last Parliament ended, that could possibly be imagined, as it shortens the distance between this part of Canada and the Island of Cape Breton by about forty-five miles, making a short cut through the three finest counties in Nova Scotia, and crossing the Intercolonial Railway, and making a branch which would be remunerative to the Intercolonial Railway from one end of it to the other. I would point out to the hon. gentleman opposite that the reason I challenged the statement that this policy was first mentioned in the Minutes of Council was because Parliament, having taken up this question, first undertook to deal with it by granting very large subsidies, both a money subsidy and again a subsidy formed partly of the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to Canso, for the construction, not only of that portion now being built in the Island of Cape Breton, but also for the construction of this piece, forty-five miles in length. When a company failed to carry on that great public work and complete it, Parliament deemed it wise to take the necessary steps to construct as a public work the portion in the Island of Cape Breton, and the reason at that time, I take it, that Parliament did not make arrangements to build, then, this piece of forty-five miles between Oxford and New Glasgow, a portion of that general system, was because that portion of the line was involved in difficulties. The company to which I have referred, and which had already begun to build the piece of forty-five miles long, having a contract in reference to it, and having done certain work, failed, and left this matter in a tangle, as far as this portion of the work was concerned. Well, when Parliament took this definite action in reference to the Cape Breton extension, these difficulties existed upon a portion of the seventy miles—I think I alluded incorrectly to it as forty-five miles; it shortens the distance by forty-five miles, but it is about seventy miles long. Parliament had already sanctioned the construction of that portion of this seventy miles as a public work, the piece lying between the town of Pictou and New Glasgow, which, as I explained in the discussion when that matter was before Parliament, is a part of this piece between Oxford and New Glasgow. Therefore, I say that when Parliament having first of all attempted to build this piece of railway, and the portion in Cape Breton by a company, and that arrangement having fallen through, Parliament then took up the very portion to which allusion has been made last, lying between Oxford and New Glasgow, and having built that part of it which was not involved in the title of the company. Since then the rights in that piece formerly owned by the company have passed from the company. The Legislature

of Nova Scotia, understanding the great value and great importance of this railway to Nova Scotia, took such action as to ratify a mortgage given by that company to the sub-contractors, and the leader of the Nova Scotia Government, Mr. Fielding, himself introduced a Bill which passed unanimously in that House, arranging for a sale of these rights under this mortgage which had been given informally, to some extent, by the company themselves. But, under a vote of this Parliament, and by authority of the legislation of this Parliament, the Government of Canada obtained the title that was in the sub-contractors under that lien, and under the authority of this Parliament the money was paid for the acquisition of those rights, and therefore all the rights of the company are now almost completely in the Crown. Steps were taken in the courts of Nova Scotia by the company to resist the sale, but the decision of the court has been on two occasions in favor of the Crown against the company. But be that as it may, the matter simply stands in this position through the inability of the Short Line Company that began this work to go on with it, the importance of which the hon. gentleman from Halifax has acknowledged. The Parliament of this country having recognised that, I am glad the Government is now making an application to Parliament which will enable them to go on and construct this work, in which so much of the money of Canada is already invested, and for which there is every justification to induce Parliament to sanction this legislation—legislation which I called, the other evening, the consequence or outcome of legislation already passed, and which may be found in the Acts of two or three Sessions of this Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. This is another but a striking example of the necessity of the Parliament of the country demanding an entirely different course from the executive Government of the day, with reference to the financial proposals which they lay before Parliament. I very well remember the time at which the first proposal was made with reference to assistance to be given to the construction of this piece of railway—I cannot now recollect the exact denomination, but it was a very large one. The Minister of Finance, no doubt, remembers it, whether it was the Great Short Line, or the European and American Short Line; but it was some magnificent name, very long and very expensive. When the hon. gentleman, then acting as Minister of Railways, proposed to Parliament that they should grant \$3,200 a mile as a subsidy, I enquired what grounds there were to believe that the object which he stated would be accomplished, would really be accomplished by the grant which he proposed, apprehensive as I was, that in that, and in many of other cases, the hon. gentleman would lead us along into an expenditure manifold that which he presented to the House as the total expenditure to be incurred, when he asked us to engage in that transaction. The hon. gentleman stated with the greatest positiveness that he had had communications, representations and negotiations with capitalists and able men who were concerned in the company we were to subsidise, and he pledged himself that the results would be satisfactory. The results were very far from satisfactory, and other proposals were afterwards made, and great difficulties, to the bottom of which we have never been permitted to look, were encountered, as to the contract and the relations of the Government to the company; but in the end it happened that some work I believe was done. I know of no law under which the company incorporated for the purpose of constructing the work and failing altogether to perform its work could have a lien upon the enterprise in reference to which some grading was done. But that is by the way. Then after a year or two or three we were appealed to *ad misericordiam*. We were told there were certain unfortunate persons, laborers and small contractors, along the line, who had invested

money in labor or supplies for those people and were unpaid, and were asked to pay those poor suffering people; and we agreed to a vote, which, with the fine sense of humor in which Parliament sometimes indulges on those occasions, was said to be a lien or charge on the \$224,000. It was only a charge on our subsidy. And it happened after a time, a little later, we were asked to repeat the operation—I think last Session—and we had to make a second advance on our subsidy to pay many debts on construction. Now we learn, if the hon. gentleman in the statement which he has made has based it on an accurate recollection of the facts, that so long ago as when he proposed to Parliament, last Session, the second grant on account of the subsidy of \$224,000, the Government had come to the conclusion that they would have to take up the enterprise and build it themselves. But, although the hon. gentleman tells us that the Government had come to that conclusion, he did not tell us then. He did not state there was any such policy, he did not in the slightest degree indicate to Parliament that that which originally had been a proposed aid of \$224,000, not complicated by any question of running the road afterwards, was to be turned into a grant of one million and a quarter dollars, and we were to have the blessing of running it after it was built. There was not a word, a whisper or a suggestion made to Parliament, when it was asked to make this additional advance on account of the subsidy, that the Government saw that their whole plan failed and they would have to execute it as a Government work. Nay, I am almost inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman was not guilty of that surprise upon Parliament, of that undue reticence towards Parliament of which his statement to-day would lead us to suppose he was guilty, for I claim that it was his duty, if the Government had resolved on a change of policy, to have announced it then. There are circumstances which seem to indicate that that was not really the state of affairs. I will now tell the hon. gentleman why I say so. I remember to have read a speech delivered by the Minister of Finance in Cumberland when he sought to woo the suffrages of that constituency once again, just a few days before nomination day, and in that statement—I will not pledge myself to the exact words, because I have not seen it for some time, since very shortly after it was delivered—the hon. gentleman appealed once again to his former constituents and told them that, at Ottawa, when he was asked to join the Government, he made but one stipulation, which was that an Order in Council should be passed and effect given to it for the building of this work as a Government work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. If that was done in January, if the Minister of Finance made it a stipulation in January, and it was the only stipulation and condition of his joining the Government, I want to know how was it all settled the summer before? Why, there was nothing to do. The hon. gentleman boasted to his constituents that he had secured this boon for them. He told them, wooing their sweet voices: "I was asked to leave my fine office, my handsome house, my position of ease, dignity and consideration, and engage once more in the turbulent atmosphere of Canadian politics, and when I was invited to do so, what did I do? Did I make any stipulation for myself, did I say anything about office, about any arrangement of any kind? Yes, one thing only, and that was with respect to your business. I said I wanted this matter settled." But, Mr. Speaker, it was all settled before; there was nothing to settle. The Government had decided on it six months before, and the hon. Finance Minister, if the statement of the Minister of Railways is correct, was claiming credit under false pretences with his constituents for having accomplished a result which had already, in secret, been decided on by the Government six months before. Now the Minister of Railways

Mr. BLAKE.

tells the House that he does not know the length of the line. Not he—he does not trouble himself about twelve or fourteen miles of railway; he said it is sixty or seventy miles long. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) told us at one time it was forty-five miles, and another time seventy.

Mr. TUPPER. I corrected that.

Mr. BLAKE. I know the hon. gentleman corrected it: he said it was to build seventy, say forty-five miles, or something of that kind. However long it may be, the Minister of Railways said there were sixty or seventy miles to build. When asked as to what it was going to cost after all these years, after we had made payments so long, and made agreements with one company and with another company, and given one subsidy, and settled with one set of people and then with another, and after six months repeated the operation, and when the Government, according to one Minister, determined, in January, to build it, and according to another, arrived at that conclusion a year ago, the Minister of Railways made no reply. We are told that the Government have not got the cost, but that it may be one million or so in addition to the subsidy. It is a matter of no consequence—it is well to leave these matters elastic—what does it matter how much it costs. It is under such circumstances as these that we are asked to proceed. It does seem to me, as I stated in the opening, that Parliament in past days has been wholly remiss in its duties to require close investigation and full information from the Executive with respect to its pecuniary proposals, that information which would enable us to judge intelligently whether the undertaking could be carried out approximately, for the money which is proposed, that the scheme is a feasible one. We have it stated here now by the Minister, that the work, which was to cover a distance of between sixty and seventy miles, would cost about \$20,000 a mile. We were told that it was going to be built for \$3,200 a mile. Before it is completed the cost will, no doubt, reach \$25,000 a mile, six times as much as it ought to have cost, and there is to be set off the profits we are to make on the running of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never listen to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, without envying his powers of special pleading, and without envying him the ability he possesses to make the worse appear the better reason. If ever there was a case presented to this House that on its own merits should at once commend itself and receive the candid consideration and the approval of this Parliament, it is the question that is presented to-day. Several years ago I proposed to this Parliament to aid in the construction of seventy-five miles, I will call it, of railway—I have not measured it exactly, I have not the measurement under my hand, but as far as my recollection serves me it is about seventy-five miles long. I proposed to Parliament to grant a subsidy to the European and Short Line Railway Company of \$3,200 a mile, for the purpose of constructing a railway from Oxford Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, to New Glasgow. I can best illustrate to the House the position if I say that that corner of the chamber is New Glasgow, that corner is Oxford Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, and that corner is Truro. At present the people of the whole of the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, the whole of the great county of Pictou, the county of Guysboro', the county of Antigonish, and the whole of the Island of Cape Breton in addition, have, in order to reach Moncton in New Brunswick, to travel to Truro, and this intersection, taking the hypotenuse of seventy-five miles—that the construction of the road which I proposed to this Parliament to secure—shortens the distance between the whole of that great portion of Nova Scotia and the rest of Canada by no less than from forty to forty-five miles, for every pound of

freight and every passenger that is carried. But that is not all, Sir. It brings the Pictou coal fields into nearer communication with Canada, and gives them in distance an advantage of forty-five miles over that they now enjoy, in competing with the Springhill coal fields, which at present monopolise, to a great extent, the supply of the Intercolonial Railway and of these upper Provinces. I say, Sir, if there ever was a case presented to Parliament in which the interests—not of a section or of a small portion of the country, but the interests of the whole of this country—were involved, it was in that proposal to aid in the construction of those seventy-five miles of railway. The hon. gentleman says I was very confident that this company with a very high-sounding name, would be able to accomplish the work. Well, Sir, I was very sanguine. I took the trouble to go to New York with Mr. Schrieber, the Chief Engineer. I availed myself of every means in my power to satisfy myself that the company, with Dr. Green, president of the great Union Telegraph Company of the United States, at its head, would be able and were prepared to carry the work through. I do not profess to be infallible, but I do not expect the hon. gentleman to suppose that, when I make a statement of that kind, I make it on any other than the best information I can give, or to suppose that I am making any other than a candid statement to the House of what I then believed. This company proposed to carry on a grand scheme of communication, intersecting Newfoundland. They had already made a contract for a line across that island, and this was a portion of the scheme for which they were prepared to make a contract. They did make a contract, and I must say, in justice to the company, that the mode in which they expended some \$200,000 or \$300,000 of their own money, shows that they did it in good faith, and that they intended to complete the line. The contract enabled them to draw a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, on the completion of every ten miles, but they have never drawn a dollar of that subsidy, for, instead of building it in such a way as to be able to avail themselves of the subsidy, they expended between \$200,000 and \$300,000 of their own money—they say the larger sum—in such a way as not to entitle them to a dollar of the subsidy. They failed in carrying out that great enterprise in which they were engaged; they were unable to obtain the means of carrying it forward, and they stopped work, leaving some \$150,000 due to the sub-contractors which they owed to the men who furnished the labor, the food and the materials which had gone into the line. Under these circumstances, the Government of Canada, feeling that this work must be completed at some time, as the Minister of Railways has said, that it was too important not to be carried out, if it could not be carried out by the company—and they were a long time in making the arrangements in France and England, endeavoring to negotiate the bonds, and professing that they would be able at an early date to carry to completion—my hon. friend the Minister of Railways felt that it was right, as no portion of the subsidy had been drawn, to ask the House to allow him to appropriate \$150,000 of the subsidy for the company to pay the contractors and the laborers. Not only that, but before I left I came before Parliament again and, after the failure of the company to go on, I obtained a large additional subsidy from this House for the purpose of completing this very road. The House placed in the hands of the Government power, not only to pay \$3,200 a mile, but on a full statement of the case to Parliament they authorised the Government to agree to pay \$3,200 per mile for the eighty miles in Cape Breton, they authorised this House to give eighty miles of completed railway and its equipment, and the sum of \$30,000 a year for fifteen years, for the completion of the road from Oxford to Louisburg and Sydney in Cape Breton. Now, I think if there ever was a case in which the Government had the assurance that they were carrying

out in good faith the views and opinions of this Parliament to provide for the construction of a road, it was under the circumstances I have stated. The hon. gentleman knows that Parliament at its last Session provided for the construction of eighty miles of road from Sydney, in the Island of Cape Breton, through to the Strait of Canso, as a Government work, as a portion of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that Parliament purchased from the company the road from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, and he knows that these seventy-five miles between New Glasgow and Oxford Junction would interpose—provided the company were to take it up and complete it on any terms—would interpose a company in the line of Government railway, extending from Quebec on the one side to Louisburg on the other. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he would think of a proposal to have a company on the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Ottawa and Pembroke, and whether he thinks that would be likely to promote either the interests of the public or the interests of the road. I would like to ask him whether he thinks that interposing a company between Prescott on the Grand Trunk Railway and some point seventy-five miles up towards Toronto—another independent company—would be for the benefit either of the company or of the public. He would at once say no: that at any cost and hazard, under these circumstances, the company must secure this link which would break their connection. So, the Government, in order to be consistent, in order to consider its own interests, the advantage to the road and the advantage to the public, must take into their hands this portion of the road from Oxford to New Glasgow. The hon. gentleman wants to know why that was not stated to Parliament. Well, Sir, there were difficulties in the way. When the money was paid the Government took over a mortgage, which had been given to the sub-contractors, for the sum of \$150,000. That mortgage turned out to be not a legally and duly executed instrument. The company denied the right of their agent to execute it, and so important did the Government of Nova Scotia consider this road, that at once, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has said, a resolution was passed unanimously by the Assembly of that Province, to entitle the Government of Canada to sell under the mortgage for the money which had been expended for labor to the amount of \$150,000. I give these facts to show that in the Province of Nova Scotia, as the senior member for Halifax has said, there are no two questions as to the importance and value of this road. When the hon. member for West Bruce (Mr. Blake) takes exception to this, I think he ought to rely on the statement of a former colleague of his own who sits behind him, and who says that he is extremely glad that the Government have taken steps to make this section of the road between Oxford Junction and New Glasgow a portion of the Intercolonial Railway. Well, Sir, the Government were met with a further difficulty. The company served an injunction, stopped the sale and stopped the Government of Canada from getting possession of this work and putting them in position to ask Parliament for the necessary means of completing it; and when I came out here last summer, when I had not the most remote idea of occupying a seat in this Parliament again, feeling a deep interest in this road, and regarding its importance to Nova Scotia and to the whole of this country—for there is not a portion of Canada that has not an interest in securing this connection with the great coal fields of Pictou—I went to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and asked him what step he proposed to take. He said: "We are taking the necessary steps as fast as we can, but we are prevented by the courts." I said: "Now that you have undertaken to build the road in Cape Breton as a Government work, it will be absolutely necessary to make it a portion of the Intercolonial Railway;" and my hon. friend assured me that although he did not know what view

his colleagues would take, he himself had arrived at that conclusion, and that the moment the legal difficulties were removed he intended to present that view to his colleagues.

Mr. JONES. What date was that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that took place when I was here last summer, when I had not the smallest idea of again occupying a seat in this House, and was looking at the matter purely in the interests of the country.

Mr. KIRK. It was after the June elections.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot help that. I am sure the hon. member for Guysboro' will say that from the first down to this hour I availed myself, both in this House and out of it, of every possible means of securing the completion of that road. When this matter broke down I came back here and asked for a larger subsidy—for what I then believed would be sufficient to secure the completion of the road. I gave every evidence of my interest in the undertaking, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that it was not by the June elections that I was stimulated in the slightest degree to do what I did in this matter. But when I came back to Canada I felt that the first question that would be asked in the county of Cumberland, in the county of Colchester, in the county of Pictou, would be, what do you intend to do with this road? It was very natural that they should do so; a large amount of money had been spent on the road, and they were promised that it should be completed. And I did say to my colleagues, "I want this matter brought to a determination; I want this important question settled, so that we can say to Nova Scotia what the Government intend to do with regard to it." I meet at once the insinuation that there was the slightest desire or intention to use that question in the least degree as an inducement for political support. If I wanted to use it to do that, I would have done as the hon. member for West Bruce (Mr. Blake) did; I would have sent a man of high standing and character in the party down to the country to tell the electors that if they did so-and-so the road would be built, and make it contingent on the success of the Government and the party. The hon. gentleman looks up in surprise. Let me ask him to read the speech delivered by the Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin, when he was sent down to Nova Scotia to organise that Province in the interest of the hon. gentleman. I say that if I wanted to bribe the constituencies of Nova Scotia, to bribe the counties of Cumberland, Pictou and Colchester, I would have adopted the astute policy of the hon. member for West Bruce as delivered to the people of Nova Scotia by the mouth of one of the leaders of the party, who announced that he felt it incumbent upon him to go down there at such an important crisis and speak with the authority that a man should who had taken so prominent a part in the party as himself.

Mr. JONES. He did not come down for that purpose at all. He came down to attend a mining meeting, of which he was secretary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I will allow him to speak for himself. He says:

"I felt, Sir, as you happily expressed it, that in the present emergency"—

That is, on the eve of a great general election—

"we have all a common duty to perform, and that if I could, by anything I might be able to say, render services to the great Liberal party in this Province, it was my duty, as a sincere Liberal, and as one who has held a somewhat prominent position in the ranks for some years, to endeavor to discharge my duty to the best of my poor ability."

That is the way he announced his mission to the people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia. He proclaimed on the housetops that he held a prominent position in the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

party, and that in this emergency he felt it necessary to go there and discharge his duty—by doing what? By propounding the policy of the hon. member for West Bruce.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman his words, and then he will see whether he can find breath for a derisive cheer. I say, Sir, you will search the records of public speaking in Canada in vain to find a more glaring, indecent attempt by a party, through an influential member, professing to speak for the leader of that party, to bribe constituencies and provinces wholesale. Sir, we know what the hon. member for West Bruce has done for the Province of Nova Scotia in this House. We know that his policy and the policy of his party has been to do what he is doing to-day—doing his little best to obstruct anything and everything that has been propounded on the floor of this House to advance the interest of the people of Nova Scotia, or to remove that sentiment of dissatisfaction that his party succeeded in creating at the time of the Union. What does he do now? After having done all that he could do here, after having obstructed, after having taken a course that was calculated to intensify whatever dissatisfaction existed in that Province, after having adopted a policy that was calculated to bring about the very thing that every patriotic Canadian of any shade of opinion deplored—that is, a proposal for the secession of one of the most important Provinces in this Dominion from this great Confederation; having, I say, adopted a course that resulted in that, that kept alive that hostility and dissatisfaction, the hon. gentleman, on the eve of a general election, sends down to the Province of Nova Scotia a man who declares himself to be one of the leaders of his party, and who is so intimately associated with the hon. member for West Bruce that he is able, *ex cathedra*, to propound to the people of Halifax and the Province of Nova Scotia the policy that the hon. gentleman will pursue in the early day when he has control of the public affairs of this country. This, the hon. gentleman does, speaking by the voice of one who could not use the language that he ventured to use unless he had the authority of that hon. gentleman to use it. And I say that alive, keenly alive, as that hon. gentleman is, to the utterances and declarations of the policy that was ascribed to himself, ready as he is to criticise the most minute reference to his public policy, made by whoever it may be made and wherever it may be made—I say it is too late for the hon. gentleman to disclaim the language that I am now going to read, as placed in the mouth of Mr. Anglin, in propounding his policy to the country. He says:

"I am satisfied we could re-distribute the burden so as to make it bear less hard upon the people of Nova Scotia, and so as to bear more fairly upon all the Dominion. We could sweep away the tax upon flour."

Was that the policy of the hon. member for West Bruce?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it was his policy down to a certain period to declare the tax on flour one of the most odious that ever a Legislature fastened on a people, but the time came when the hon. gentleman found himself face to face with the millers of Ontario, and then he altered his policy. Then he found the tax on flour must not be repealed, but should be modified. He would go the full length on corn meal, but flour should stand as before.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better read his speech at Malvern, and see whether he there denounced the tax upon flour as one of the most odious imposts ever placed upon a people. He will find there he qualified all that, took it all back, and was prepared then for modifications, not only on flour, but on coal. The man who for seven long years had made this Chamber echo and

re-echo with his denunciations of the tax on coal as a frightful injustice to the people, especially to the people of Ontario, no sooner found himself in the presence of the great coal interests of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia than he also took back what he had said for seven or eight long years. It was no longer an odious tax, but a tax that would have to be modified; and as for abolishing it, the gentleman who ran in his interest in Nova Scotia declared he would be prepared to support a duty on coal, and I believe made that declaration with the hon. gentleman's authority. The hon. gentleman's speech at Malvern certainly gave him that authority.

"We can change the character and tone of the whole fiscal policy, so as to materially encourage and revive the commerce of the country, and in that way render important service to the people of Nova Scotia. We can do a little more than that."

That is a general policy that would not appeal quite so strongly to the minds of the electors as the hon. gentleman wished, so he proceeds to add:

"We can do a little more than that. There are some questions between the Dominion and Local Governments as to subsidies, and as to the means placed at the disposal of the Local Government for the carrying out of important railway works."

Would anyone suppose that the hon. gentleman, one of whose principal men goes down to propound his policy to the people of Nova Scotia and tells them if they will put the hon. member for West Bruce in power they will be treated with greater liberality than ever with reference to subsidies—would anyone suppose that, sitting still in the cold shades of Opposition, the hon. gentleman would be the first to raise his voice in denunciation against the application of the hon. the Minister of Railways to carry out the very pledges Mr. Anglin was giving. "They were to have more money placed at the disposal of the Local Government." The gentleman who has been here voting against every increase of subsidy to Nova Scotia; the gentleman who denounced at the very outset the better terms obtained by Mr. Howe and by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McLelan); the gentleman who at that time endeavored to close the door against the people of Nova Scotia, ever obtaining another dollar, by bringing in a resolution himself to that effect; the gentleman who put forward on the floor, by one of his then ablest lieutenants, the declaration that we required no better terms, and who rewarded that lieutenant with the Chief Justiceship for his able support given on that occasion—for, I say Mr. Wood in this House declared Nova Scotia required no better terms, and he moved a resolution, which received the support of the hon. gentleman, in opposition to anything being done—this gentleman, after all that was done, after everything this Parliament had honestly, fairly, and faithfully done to give fair and efficient support to the great railway interests in the Province of Nova Scotia, sends down his first lieutenant to proclaim that they shall have more subsidies and more means put at their disposal for the promotion of railways, if they will return him to power. He says:

"When Confederation was formed, there was no idea entertained that the Provinces would have to subsidise their railways very largely or undertake the construction and completion of those railways. The idea was that for a long time we should not require those railways that we now have or require. But an entire change in the circumstances of the country must render a change in the financial regulations a necessity also. A Liberal Government, I think, if in power during the next five years, will be able to arrange that question somewhat to the satisfaction of the people of Nova Scotia. Mr. Blake has been accused over and over again of being opposed to Nova Scotia."

So that the hon. gentleman did not content himself with giving his opinion, with giving the views of his party, but he came down to particulars; he used language which he could not have used unless he stood there with the authority of the hon. member for West Bruce, prepared to propound the views with which that hon. gentleman would consent to be bound.

"Now, I have no doubt whatever that if the Liberal Party were in power to-morrow, Mr. Blake would be willing to reconsider the whole plan of Confederation, and not only give you more for your railways, but, according to your necessities, all that you are entitled to. He would be willing to look at the whole question fairly with the eye of justice, not too exacting to the smaller Provinces, but to give them, if possible, a little more even than they are strictly entitled to."

I ask this House if, taking the policy and action of the hon. gentleman in the House on every occasion in which the interests of Nova Scotia have been at stake, on every occasion on which there has been a proposal to do anything to promote the interests of that Province, or to satisfy the expectations of her people—I ask those gentlemen who in this House have known that, from the first hour of Confederation down to this hour, the friends of Nova Scotia have met with nothing but hostility from the hon. gentleman, I ask them what they think, on the eve of a general election, when it is necessary to get—seventeen, was it, that the hon. member for Halifax promised the hon. member for West Bruce? Seventeen if not twenty-one—and, Sir, when it was necessary, when the hon. member for West Bruce was reading from platform to platform in the Province of Ontario the assurances that he had received, assurances from so high and so reliable a source that they could not be doubted for a moment, when he was pledging the support of from seventeen to twenty-one members from Nova Scotia to support the Administration of which he was soon to be the honored leader, he felt it necessary that that past hostility that he had exhibited to that Province, that refusal to do anything that was calculated to promote the progress and prosperity of that important portion of the country, should be modified, and he felt that, as a foundation for obtaining that large support, he must radically change not only his attitude to Nova Scotia, but must go back on the very questions, the very items, that for eight long years, in this House, he had denounced the hon. gentlemen on this side for advocating. He had denounced us for imposing taxes on flour and coal, and he was ready for the sake of office—no, I will not say for the sake of office, because, perhaps, that he does not care much about—but for the sake of power he was ready to go back on his record and to say one or two things: either that he had been wrong for eight years, or that being right, he was prepared to be wrong now for the purpose of obtaining power.

Mr. MILLS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says I am a special pleader. Which of us is the special pleader? What were we discussing? What proposition was it that I ventured to lay down, in a speech of a few minutes, to the House a short time ago? Why, I pointed to the history of the course that this Administration had pursued with reference to its pecuniary proposals with reference to railways in general, and with reference to this railway in particular. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman himself, who accuses me, forsooth, of special pleading, had told us, had pledged his reputation as a Minister of the Crown, that the scheme he brought down to us would be carried out, that the success of that scheme, which involved an expenditure of only \$3,200 a mile, would be assured. It seems that this wonderful scheme was a part of the great European and North American Railway, which rolled out of his lips on that occasion, which he rolled between his lips as a sweet morsel, and he dazzled our eyes and dinned our ears with the wonderful things he was going to accomplish for the expenditure of \$3,200 a mile. I told him that the Administration had failed to fulfil the pledges in which they had asked the country to engage in, in that instance, and I told him that, on a second occasion, I had pointed out that he had failed on a former occasion to fulfil the promises which he had made, and that now, at any rate, he had no right to ask us to increase the arrangements for these railways, but that once again a too confiding Legislature had accepted the word of a

man who had deceived them once, and had granted what he asked. I told him that that was followed up by a more conspicuous and a more ignominious failure, and that then it was contended that we were obliged to provide a subsidy for the poor sub-contractors and for the laborers along the line, and that was to settle the matter for a Session or two; but then it is well known—what is the use of discussing it—that hon. gentlemen were brought under pressure from the hon. members for Pictou and the other counties in that section to provide for the dissatisfaction which existed in consequence of the failure of the promises of the hon. gentleman. Those that trusted that company trusted it on his certificate. Sitting here as a member of the Government of Canada, he had declared that that company was competent and was responsible, and would build the road, and the people said: We trusted you, we did not trust them, we have lost our money, supply the deficiency, or we will vote against you; and, under that threat and under that terror, Parliament was asked again to supply the money. We did it, but once again a system of deception was practiced, because the Minister of Railways says it was then decided practically that we should do much more, that we should not confine ourselves to the amount which was voted to complete this link, but he had come to the conclusion and had pressed it upon his colleagues and upon the Minister of Finance—he says in the summer—that it was plain, it was inevitable, it must happen, if we were going to do the other thing which this Parliament had voted to do, that we could not leave this undone, that we could not leave the broken link, and that we must have all understood that. I said that Parliament was not supposed to act without any exhibition of frankness and candor by those gentlemen, that Parliament was not supposed to be governed by them as autocrats and commanders, but that they were simply a committee of this House and could not command Parliament without giving sufficient information. But then again we were to be led on by degrees to build the railway in Cape Breton. They said: Build the railways you shall know the rest some other day.

Mr. POPE. When we ask for the money.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but when the hon. gentleman asks for the money, he says that there was a policy which would involve a further expenditure, but he keeps the rest to himself because he does not want to tell the electors of Canada what the matter is when he seeks their suffrages once again. I strove to draw the moral as to our course in the event of the Minister of Railways of Canada, under these circumstances and at this day, coming down with his record of broken promises, of violated faith, of want of candour and frankness, and being unable to tell us within ten miles what the length of this road is, whether it is sixty or seventy miles, or what it will cost, and calling upon us with a well-grounded confidence, I admit, from the experience of the past, to go it blind, as he would say, once more. The hon. gentlemen says I have always been admirably fitted for special pleading. He has bettered my instruction. He came dangerously near the point once or twice, but he travelled far away, and adopted every recourse to obscure what the plain and simple issue is, what the story of the past and the issue of the present is. He says I was obstructing and opposing this grant as I had obstructed and opposed everything of the kind. I deem it my duty in every case to present to the Commons of Canada what I think is their duty to adopt in regard to any demand of the Ministers, to ask for that full information which will enable them intelligently to judge of the propriety of the ministerial proposals, and to vote as men and not as automatons. That I have done in the past, and, to the best of my poor ability, I shall do the same in future, notwithstanding the failure of past times, in reference to transactions in which I consider it necessary; and I am to be misrepresented as obstructing and

Mr. BLAKE.

opposing, because I call for that information which it is well known is always given in such cases in the Imperial Parliament. I will go on; I will bear the misrepresentation and the misconstruction; I will continue to discharge my duty. The hon. gentleman has said the road is very important. Did I say it was not important? Not at all. The hon. gentleman spent a long time and gave us some of his old speeches, almost in the old words. I remembered them as he rolled them out, about this "Grand European and North American Railway." Some of the old phrases came again as he described the importance of this road. Well, then he says that, last summer, he spoke to the hon. Minister of Railways about it. The Minister of Railways, according to his statement—we have got witnesses now upon this subject—told him that he, himself, had thought it was necessary: he had about come to that conclusion, but he had not presented it to his colleagues. He was not the whole Government, though rather an important wheel, I think, myself, but still, not the whole Government. Of course, he could not say more, so that the thing was not settled, except in so far as the mind of the hon. Minister of Railways had settled down in that direction. The thing was not settled by the testimony of the Minister of Finance; it was not settled by even more than his testimony, by that which makes his testimony absolutely certain—by his own acts six months later; because this happened in the summer. But in the winter, when he came in, he did ask that this question might be raised; he asked for a decision of his colleagues; he called for it, as he acknowledges, and asked that it should be put in proper form; and I trust that what was done in the shape of any Order in Council last January or February, will be laid upon the Table before we go much further with this resolution, so that we may see it. Well, it was the doing of the Minister of Finance, after all. The Minister of Railways decided six months before that he would propose it, but with greater caution, and consideration, and care, than he has sometimes exhibited, he had not done it until the Minister of Finance came up to Ottawa and had accepted a seat in the Government, and was going down to Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou. And, said he, I want to bring the Order in Council down with me to show the electors. And this was his demand, an extraordinary demand it was, for he was in that position that he could have taken almost everything. Do you remember what Lord Clive said, in the course of his trial before a Committee of the House of Commons when they were accusing him of having taken a trifle of one or two hundred thousand pounds from the servile populations amongst whom he was. "Good God! gentlemen," said he, "when I think of it I am astonished at my own moderation;" and in the position of the Minister of Finance I think he might well repeat that observation. Am I certain that that is all? No, Sir, I am by no means certain. If I could only be sure that it was the only Order in Council—I would not merely advise the Minister of Finance to make that his own exclamation, but I would almost re-echo my own expression of surprise. But I expect to have some other and less pleasant surprises; I expect to hear something more. For example, I have another little telegram here. It was not to Nova Scotia this time, it was to New Brunswick. It is dated from Parrsboro', a classic spot in the county of Cumberland, Nova Scotia:

"February 11th, 1887.

"To R. O. WELDON, Hillsboro', N.B.

"I intend to submit to my colleagues a proposal to consolidate the branch railways with main line, by which greater economy in administration will be effected, and much greater utility to the country secured.

"CHARLES TUPPER."

In the county of Albert there is a railway or two; there is the Albert Railway, which does not pay its working expenses, but which is furnished with an ample lot of ballast—in a word, with stocks and bonds which are upon the Lon-

don market at present, although not very quotable. There is another little railway called the Elgin and something railway; but for one or both of these railways, the people of the county of Albert, not a very large county, had given municipal bonuses, and they were interested in the keeping up of the road, and they were interested, also, in being relieved of their bonuses. It was rather a burning question, I believe, in the county of Albert, down to, and sometime before, the 11th February. We are familiar with the road, we know it in the way in which the Parliament of Canada knows a great many concerns—we have loaned it some money, a small sum—I am again astonished at the moderation of the Government—I think it was only \$15,000 at that time, a trifle hardly worth spending ten seconds of the clock to talk of, but still we loaned the road \$15,000. The road and the general condition of railway facilities were rather a burning question, and consequently it was a very important thing that the people of Albert should know that something was going to be done; and in this case, as it did not concern Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, which had to be attended to, *coûte que coûte*, and as to which there must be a decision arrived at, but as it was not quite so important, an Order in Council was not passed, but the proposal was to be submitted to the colleagues of the hon. gentleman, and the hon. member for Albert read, I have no doubt, with that correct emphasis and admirable punctuation of which we have had experience, this telegram, and I dare say he received a round of enthusiastic cheers and very much support from the people of Albert, as having been the happy medium or instrument by which these good things had reached Albert. Now, therefore, I think, for these and for some other reasons, it will be premature for us to congratulate ourselves just at this moment upon the moderation of the Minister of Finance. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman then proceeds to say that I sent Mr. Anglin down to Nova Scotia, and he used a number of his old adjectives and substantives with reference to Mr. Anglin's mission, and what he did, and what he said. Now, it may be surprising, Sir, but it is a fact, that up to the moment the hon. gentleman read some passages from Mr. Anglin's speech, I had never seen or heard of the matter. It may be surprising, but it is a fact, that, so far from my having sent Mr. Anglin to Nova Scotia, we neither had any communication on the subject of his proposed visit there, nor was I cognisant of the fact that it was to take place, nor did I know that it would take place until one day—for it seems I am to relieve myself of the impeachments of these hon. gentlemen by making disclosures which one need not, ordinarily, be called upon to make. His son happens to be a student in my office. I sent a dinner card inviting Mr. Anglin to dinner. His boy came to me with the card, and he said: "Sir, here is the note; I was just going to send it to my father, but he has gone down to Nova Scotia. He has been away a week." That is the first I ever heard of Mr. Anglin going, or intending to go, down to Nova Scotia. But the hon. gentlemen are determined to make Mr. Anglin my deputy. They say he is my ambassador; they say I sent him there. Well, I have told you the literal fact. Now, I do not know, except what the hon. gentleman has read, as to what Mr. Anglin said about it. All I can say is, I repeat that I never had the slightest conversation with that gentleman as to going anywhere, as to his doing any such business, or as to his saying anything of the kind, and whatever he said, whatever he did, was, as I presume, stated from a knowledge of my public utterances of the past, as I know it was not said from any private communication or personal communication to him by me. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman declared that he had there in Mr. Anglin's speech the proof of bribery. Sir, I know Mr. Anglin well. I know him to be a man of judgment, of sober sense, of honor, of candor, and I was amazed to see that even the hon. gentleman's

powers of imagination should be supposed capable of constructing any such *imago* from any words that Mr. Anglin might have uttered. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I believe—as he read, I happen to have a book here which gave me the clue—I will tell the hon. gentleman whence, I presume, Mr. Anglin derived his statement of his views. He derived them from former unworthy speeches of mine, I have no doubt. I have here the statements which I have made each year, which I, the great enemy of the Province of Nova Scotia, have made, not merely amongst my people and on the platform elsewhere, but in this Chamber as well. We had a discussion, I think it was in the year 1884, upon the subject of the proposed railway grants, including an additional grant in respect of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the Province of Quebec, and I said this:

"Now, Sir, I think that the position of the Province of Quebec, as I have pointed out, has demanded for some time past and is now demanding the attention of this Parliament; and for my part I have always been prepared to deal fairly by that or any other of the Provinces, but on the condition of equal and fair justice to all. And I do not suppose my hon. friend from the Province of Quebec, will ask more; all those sitting on the other side though they might view my proposition differently from what I view I do not think they will dissent from the spirit in which I now address myself to them; namely that it is fair and reasonable under these circumstances when a new policy of this kind is being proposed to consider what its real basis is, to consider what the real condition of the other Provinces is relative to that basis and otherwise, and to see whether what is being proposed as it stands, and without applying proper remedies for the application generally of the new principle you propose can be called just. I say, Sir, that for my part I should desire and it is one of the things which is most important for us to consider next to the constitutional character—I should desire that we should address ourselves, very early and very earnestly, to the solution of the question, by the adoption of some plan whereby once for all the question of the Provincial subsidies should be placed on a permanent and lasting basis. I believe it to be destructive of the independence and autonomy of the Provinces that they should be looking to Ottawa for favors, that they should be dependent on the central Government for carrying on their affairs. I believe it to be destructive to confederation itself that a system should continue under which it might be said: 'Oh we will go on, we will expand more, we will go into debt, and when we get to a pass that we cannot carry on any longer, the Ottawa Parliament must relieve us.'"

Then I said this:

"If it be the fact that the Provincial Governments and Legislatures, after an experience of seventeen years, are not in a position financially to discharge those functions which belong to them, the whole subject ought to be reconsidered. If in consequence of their impecuniosity they are unable effectually to discharge their own functions, you may do one of two things. You may say: We propose to alter the constitution so that the Central Government shall take this, that and the other, and so relieve you both of important dignity, power and provincial autonomy, and of expense at the same time; or you may propose a new adjustment of the financial question which will enable you efficiently to continue the discharge of those functions which for seventeen years you have been discharging."

Again I said, referring particularly to Nova Scotia:

"Quebec is in a condition which demands the serious consideration of the Confederation. But she is not alone in that condition. You will find statements made from the Province of Nova Scotia for example, and those who have endeavored to analyse—I know with difficulty, with very great aptitude to her, for want of information—those who have attempted to analyse the expenses of that Province will, I think, find that there has not been a very great deal to complain of in the way of extravagance. At least that was the result of such cursory investigation as from time to time I have been able to make into the expenditure of that Province, and I am not singling out any one Government from another; there has been alterations of government. I do not find that there has been much extravagance or that the expenditure has been in excess to a large amount, if at all, of the demands of that Province. We know, however, that its resources are cramped, that it is more or less in a state of distress, locally."

I have spoken also at other times and in other places, here and elsewhere, on this subject in the same strain. So that I think I have shown that the views I held with respect to the Province of Nova Scotia, the views I held as regards the Provinces, were views not applicable to Nova Scotia alone, but they were views which I stated on the floor of this Parliament, in the presence of my assembled colleagues from all parts of Canada, as open to general discussion, and as applicable to the general condition of affairs. Then the

hon. gentleman declares that my policy has always been a very bad policy for Nova Scotia—that I have always been obstructing it. I am not going to enter to-day into a discussion of matters twenty years ago or eighteen years ago, which have been discussed and threshed out so often, and which the hon. gentleman, being so far removed from a special pleader, thought it fit to drag into this discussion. But I have spoken for a long time in one sense and in one voice with respect to the fundamental constitution and rights of the Provinces. I have not proposed any special plan for relief applicable to one, no principle which I did not think just to all. I believe this, as I said as long ago as 1883 and 1884, is a serious condition, and we ought to address ourselves to it. I think, with one exception only, which I will not complicate this discussion by even naming, it is the most serious difficulty that we in this Confederation have to meet; but I hold myself absolutely blameless from the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that I have been at one time unjust by the denial and at another time unjust by the proposal of a bribe or undue favor, either to the Province of Nova Scotia or to any other Province. Well, then the hon. gentleman, by the way once again of confining himself to the subject and showing that he is no special pleader, drew a red herring across the track; it was not a red herring, but a barrel of flour and a ton of coal. He discussed my Malvern speech. I could not help thinking that there has been a sort of premature delivery—that a portion of the hon. gentleman's Budget speech had been extracted by a sort of caesarian operation. It seemed so to me, at all events, for it did not appear to come out the natural way, and I thought it was by a very extraordinary operation that he was delivered. I am not going to discuss that point at length just now. The hon. gentleman put words into my mouth which I did not say. I stated the condition of things as to our fiscal and financial position earlier than in my speech at Malvern. I stated it in Toronto at the Adelaide street rink. In my speech at Malvern I opened what I said by declaring that I had nothing new whatever in point of principle to state, but having been grossly misrepresented by those opposed to me in politics, I proposed to speak with greater fullness and to explain more amply what had been my policy for the earlier periods and what continued to be my policy. In the course of that statement I repeated and enlarged upon the proposition to which I had alluded briefly in my speech in Toronto, the serious complication that the condition of our finances imposed on us with respect to duties in any proposed alterations of tariff. I showed that in my speech at Toronto I had used different expressions from those I had used in my address to my electors in 1882, and I showed in that respect and I gave the reasons. I did not in my speech use the word "modify," I used the word "reduce," in regard to taxation on coal and flour. The hon. gentleman said I used the word "modify."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Reduce.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman declared that I said that the flour tax was to continue as it was, and now he acknowledges that I said it was to be reduced. But he is not a special pleader, and so we must excuse him. I declared the reason. I pointed to the deficits which the year before last, and last year, hon. gentlemen opposite had imposed on the country, and I pointed to the circumstance that reductions and abolitions of duty which, when there was an overflowing surplus, running from four millions in one year to six millions, the second year and seven millions in the third year, we could fairly and were bound to propose, but which it was absolutely impossible to propose when the finances had been scandalously managed and changed for the worse. That was the condition and that was the circumstance, and any hon. gentleman who will

Mr. BLAKE.

calmly read what I said at Malvern, will see that in no respect did I depart from the settled principle I have mentioned, in no respect did I depart from the single view I have taken, and that only changed conditions and circumstances necessarily for the time modified the application of those principles. Now the hon. gentleman says that I took back my policy, that I declared there was still to be a duty on flour, and on coal, because those two duties were no longer odious. No, I never did so. I have declared both taxes odious, and in the very speech to which the hon. gentleman refers, or to the speech immediately before it, I forget which, but I think it was the one to which he referred, I repeated the language used by me in 1882 with respect to taxes on articles of prime necessity, such as breadstuffs and coal. But, Sir, the people who, by the mal-administration of their rulers, are reduced to a position in which double expenditure and a depleted Treasury oblige them to bear undue burthens, will readily understand that those who are called to consider what the responsibilities of Government are, and who know that the maintenance of the credit of their country is the first object, cannot, under such a condition, do things which they would be glad and willing to do in the condition in which they proposed them and at the time when they ought to have been done. Now, I do not propose to complicate the discussion of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway by a general discussion. A brief answer was necessary out of courtesy to the hon. gentleman, speaking as a special pleader to a plain man. That brief answer I have made, and I trust I have made it so plainly to him that he will not consider that I deserve a continuance of his criticism with regard to this subject.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. KIRK. The question of constructing this railway has been before the House for a good many years. I think this road was first spoken of in a bye-election in Pictou in 1881. In order to carry that bye-election the people of Pictou were promised that, as soon as possible, a railway would be built from Oxford to New Glasgow. When Parliament met after that election a proposition was made to this House to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile to construct the road. The Minister of Finance, who was then Minister of Railways, led the House to believe that that amount per mile would be sufficient to construct the road, that it would be all the House would ever be called on to vote for that purpose. Well, Sir, we know that although the hon. Minister of Finance declared that the company to whom the contract was given were sufficiently able to go on with the work, they did not prove to be able to do so, and the road was not built. At the next general election the road was promised to be completed in 1884, but 1884 passed and 1887 came, and yet the road was not built. We all know the difficulties that occurred with regard to that road. We all know that the company failed to build the road with the subsidy and that Parliament was called upon to make good to the contractors, or to the laborers, the money expended on the road, and to pay those men for the work which they had performed. The Minister of Finance says this is an important road. There is no doubt at all about the importance of this road, but to whom is it important? It is important to the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, to the districts through which the road passes, but I deny that it is of any such importance as the Minister of Finance pretends it is, to any other section of the country, to Antigonish, Guysboro', Prince Edward Island or Cape Breton. The hon. gentleman says the length of that road is seventy-five miles. I do not know what the length of it is. He has told us it will shorten the distance from Oxford to New Glasgow or Pictou on the present line by 45 miles. I do not know how much it will shorten it, but I have been informed by some of the best and most truthful men of the county of Pictou that it will not shorten it more than be-

tween fifteen or twenty miles. Now, when we consider that this road is to be a competing road to the line of railway now built and running by the country it will show the great importance and advantage it is to this country. The seventy-five or eighty miles which are to be built are to shorten the distance between fifteen and twenty miles at the most, according to the best information I have been able to gather with regard to it. I have no objection to the Government building the road; I approve of their building it. When the measure was introduced for the purpose of building a branch line from Stellarton to Pictou, I thought that it was the intention of the Government to abandon the building of this line altogether. I believe that was the intention at the time, and that if the Company would not build it for \$3,200 a mile that part of the country was to do without the road. I think I stated my opinion last year when this question of the Pictou branch was before the House in that regard. We know that the Government have been pressed to construct this line from year to year, and that they have refused up to the present to build it. As I have stated, I do not object to their building the road as a Government work, but I claim that it was a corrupt act to pass a Minute of Council before going to the country, pledging the people of Pictou, Colchester and Cumberland that this road was to be built as a Government work. Why was it the Government refused last year to build it as a Government work? How was it that they so suddenly ascertained that it was necessary to build the road? I will tell you what I think about it. It is known that there was an election held in the Province of Nova Scotia for the Local Legislature in June last. That election was run upon the question of repeal, and the Minister of Finance claimed that the leader of the Opposition was the cause of the agitation for repeal in Nova Scotia. I tell him, Sir,—and no man knows it better than he—that that was not the cause. The cause of the dissatisfaction in Nova Scotia was the high taxation imposed on the people; it was the fact that the country was in the first place forced into Confederation without the consent of the people and against their will, the fact that the people were dissatisfied with the financial arrangements at that time, and the fact that those financial arrangements were proved to be insufficient for the public works of the Province. Those were the reasons for the dissatisfaction in the Province of Nova Scotia. Appeals have been made to this Government, time and again, asking for relief from the distress in which the Government of Nova Scotia found itself. Application was made in the fall of 1879, or the early part of 1880, by the Government of Nova Scotia, of which the hon. Minister of Justice was a leading member, if he was not the actual leader. That Government memorialised this Government on the question of better terms or an additional subsidy to enable the Government to carry on their local works. The Government pointed out truly that they were hampered for want of means, that it was necessary to have quite a large accession to the revenue, or otherwise they would require to resort to direct taxation to carry on their public works. This Government paid no attention to the appeals of Nova Scotia at that time, and the Government of Nova Scotia, which was a Conservative Government, did not renew those appeals. They went to the country in 1882, and were defeated. A new Government came in, and they renewed the appeal for better terms. No attention was paid to it by this Government. The last appeal was in 1885, when they pointed out that the dissatisfaction with regard to the terms of Union was greater than than it had been in 1867; but this Government, after taking twelve months to consider, returned an answer to the Nova Scotia Government to the effect that it was not true that the people were more dissatisfied with the terms of Union than they had been in 1867. Then, the Local Legislature, during the Session of 1886, passed a resolution asking the people of Nova Scotia

to decide at the polls whether they wished to continue in the Union or not. Under those circumstances, on the 15th of June, 1886, the people declared by an overwhelming majority that they wished to withdraw from the Union. Well, Sir, I think that had something to do with the action of this Government in afterwards passing those Minutes of Council in reference to railroads. The Government of the Dominion could not avoid seeing that something had to be done, in order to carry the elections if they were brought on soon. What did they do? They had sent down in June, from here, two members of the Cabinet, the Minister of Justice and the then Minister of Finance, who is now Postmaster General, in order, if possible, to defeat the Local Government at the polls. Those gentlemen went into several counties, made their speeches and used what influences they could. They sent their officials to the agents of the candidates opposed to the Government with bounty checks for the fishermen; and those agents went into the polling booths on the day of the election, presented the fishermen with their bounty, telling them it would be the last check they would ever receive if they supported the candidate favoring Mr. Fielding's Government. But notwithstanding all the influences these Ministers and their officials could use throughout the Province, they were overwhelmingly defeated at the polls. Therefore, something had to be done, and what was done? They sent to London and brought over the Lord High Commissioner, who had been luxuriating in pleasures and palaces, and sent him to Nova Scotia to retrieve, if possible, the falling fortunes of the Government. He was shrewd enough to see that something must be done, and he came to Ottawa and got this and other Orders in Council passed containing promises to build railways here, there and everywhere in the Province of Nova Scotia in order to carry the election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman let me say that this was the only one?

Mr. JONES. For that purpose?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no; this was the only Order in Council passed after my arrival touching any railroad in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KIRK. When was the Order in Council passed with reference to the Western Counties Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Long before I came; certainly not after.

Mr. KIRK. It may have been long before the hon. gentleman came, but it was not made public until after the writs were issued, and it was not intended that it should be made public until the proper time came. It is not against the Order in Council being passed for this work that I protest, but the time that it was passed and the purpose for which it was passed, that, is to corrupt the electors of the three counties through which it would pass. But the hon. Minister of Finance did not consider that even that was sufficient to carry the county of Pictou. During the election he went down into New Glasgow in that county. Perhaps he went there from natural love and affection for one of the young gentlemen who was running in the interest of the Government in that county; and I understand that the hon. gentleman made other large promises there. I have been told, I do not know how truly, that the Minister of Railways had promised to keep the ferry running in Pictou harbor; and every hon. gentleman who was in this House last Session knows that the condition under which the Government undertook to build a branch railway from Stellarton to Pictou was that the ferry should be taken off, and that the line from New Glasgow to Fisher's Grant was not to be run in the same expensive way that it is now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I assure the hon. gentleman that I never uttered a word in reference to the ferry at Pictou harbor, nor was the matter mentioned to me or anybody while I was in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KIRK. I am well aware that the hon. gentleman made no such statement on a public platform, but I am told that in a private room, among his leading friends—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I assure the hon. gentleman that he has been misinformed. Pictou harbor, so far as my recollection serves me, was not mentioned while I was in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CASEY. His recollection may be at fault.

Mr. KIRK. I know that the hon. gentleman's memory in cases of that kind is quite treacherous. Other promises were made, and made for what purpose? Corrupt promises to induce a candidate who was in the field to withdraw and allow the election to go by default. Will the hon. gentleman deny that he promised in a room in New Glasgow that the terminus of the Short Line Railway, and the branch from Pictou to Stellarton should be made at or near New Glasgow, and not at Stellarton, although there had been already built at Stellarton quite an extensive building for terminal purposes? It is said that the hon. gentleman did make such a promise, in order to induce a candidate who was then running to withdraw from the field in the interest of his party. But the hon. gentleman did not succeed. Now, while I approve of the Government building this line, I do not do so because I believe it to be of such great advantage to the whole country as the hon. gentleman makes out, but because it will be a convenience to the three counties through which it passes. It is of no advantage that I can see to any other county at all. I live in Guysboro', and I know that the people of that county do not regard it as of any value to them. The genial member for Pictou the other day approved of the passing of this Minute of Council and making it public during the time of the election. I consider it a corrupt act, and I believe in the words of a reverend gentleman who support hon. gentlemen opposite, that you might as well defend Sodom as defend such a transaction as that.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Regina and Wood Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

Bill (No. 39) to authorize "The Grange Trust (Limited)" to wind up its affairs.—(Mr. Masson.)

OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on resolution (p. 273) respecting the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, Nova Scotia.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say he has a survey of this line.

Mr. POPE. We had a survey deposited with us.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it an exploratory or location survey?

Mr. POPE. About two-thirds of it location.

Mr. KIRK.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the estimate which the hon. gentleman mentioned about \$20,000 a mile?

Mr. POPE. About that.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion for equipment?

Mr. POPE. The usual proportion, about \$2,050.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman formed any idea as to the length of time the work is to take, and how soon it is proposed to let the contract?

Mr. POPE. We will go on with the work this summer gradually and hope to have it completed by the time the other parties have completed the work in Cape Breton.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman lay the Order in Council on the Table, as we may have to refer to it.

Mr. POPE. Certainly.

Mr. KIRK. Is it the intention of the Government to pay the right of way for this railway?

Mr. POPE. So far as built along our location in Cape Breton, we pay the right of way. I do not know whether this right of way has been paid for or not, but if not we shall have to pay for it.

Mr. KIRK. Has the Government decided where the terminus is to be at the New Glasgow end?

Mr. POPE. No.

Resolution to be reported.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 21) to amend the Act respecting Public Morals and Public Convenience.—(Mr. Charlton.)

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION BILL.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act to punish seduction and like offences, and to make further provision for the protection of women and girls, be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

TELEGRAPHING SHIPPING NEWS FROM POINT ESCUMINAC.

Mr. CHARLTON in the absence of Mr. MITCHELL, asked, Whether the Government have issued instructions to the proper officer at the Port of Miramichi to report ships and vessels arriving off Point Escuminac, as well as general shipping news, over the Government telegraph line between said Point Escuminac, as was done last year? And if not, whether they intend to give the necessary order to report such vessels and shipping intelligence, between the said Point Escuminac and the town of Chatham and Newcastle, in the said Port of Miramichi; and if not, why not?

Mr. FOSTER. I answer the question in the affirmative.

BREAKWATER AT FIFTEEN POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. LANDERKIN in the absence of Mr. PERRY, asked, What is the sum estimated by Mr. Perley in 1879 as the probable cost for building a breakwater at Fifteen Point, in Prince county, Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$5,500.

THE DAVID J. ADAMS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Has the case against the David J. Adams, in the Admiralty Court at Halifax,

been heard? Has any judgment been given? If not, what has been the occasion of the delay?

Mr. THOMPSON. The case had not been heard. The occasion of the delay is this: The evidence was taken in the cause during the early part of last summer, and, at the instance of the counsel for the Crown, a day was fixed in the month of July, before the judge of the Court of Vice Admiralty, when the trial should take place. When the trial was fixed, application was made on behalf of the defence to have a commission issued to take the evidence of a number of witnesses who would not return to their homes, being engaged in fishing, until the fall. Therefore, the commission was delayed until late in the year, and then the engagements of the judges and the counsel made it impossible that the case could be heard. In the meantime, it was agreed between the counsel for the Crown and the defence, that the cause should stand until the day was fixed for hearing the case of the *Ella M. Doughty*. The evidence in the latter cause has just been completed, and I have been informed that an application has been made for the two cases to be heard together.

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

Mr. BROWN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to enlarge the St. Lawrence Canals, so that vessels of as large a capacity as those passing through the Welland Canal can proceed through the St. Lawrence Canals without breaking bulk?

Mr. POPE. Some considerable work is being done every year on the St. Lawrence Canals. It is not the intention of the Government just now to bring down a very large appropriation after the very large expenditures we have been making, but the Government have every interest in continuing the enlargement of those canals.

TOBACCO DUTY.

Mr. BOURASSA, in the absence of Mr. BEAUSOLEIL, asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a fair measure of protection to the tobacco-growing industry by abolishing the duties and license fees now imposed, and allowing farmers to sell their tobacco to manufacturers of tobacco and cigars, who also make use of foreign tobacco, without an increase of duty, or by granting a bonus for the cultivation and manufacture of Canadian tobacco, or otherwise?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to make any statement affecting the Tariff before the Budget is brought down.

THE "JAMAICA" PULLMAN CAR.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved for:

Return showing the expenses, if any, in detail with dates incurred, by the several members of the Government, and any other person or persons accompanying them, charged on account of travelling expenses while journeying in the "Jamaica" Pullman car, together with a statement of all sums paid by Ministers to any, and to what, railway corporations for use of said car, and transport of same over their roads, and all incidental expenses of any description connected therewith, from the 30th day of June, 1886, to the 1st of April, 1887; also a return showing all other travelling expenses, in detail, of the several members of the Government, and of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner, from the 30th June, 1886, to 1st April, 1887.

He said: The people of Ontario are pretty well aware of the number of trips which were made by the right hon. the leader of the Government and his colleagues during last summer and autumn and winter in this well known Pullman car "Jamaica." I have no desire to have a minute statement of the expenses incurred by the hon. gentlemen in their trips through the country for the purpose of making converts to their particular political views, because I do not think it would be well to enquire into the details

very closely. I would not care, for instance, to know whether the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refreshed himself with high class wines, or was satisfied with Carling's ale, or took pure water during the trips he made on those occasions. I do not wish to have the details of the expenses incurred by the First Minister when he visited the Indian reserves for the purpose, as Superintendent General of the Indians, of influencing them to record their votes in favor of what he supposed to be good government in this country. But I think if expenses were incurred by members of this Government in those trips throughout the Province of Ontario, which were not only intended to influence the Dominion elections, but which were intended to influence the Local elections which took place prior to the Dominion elections—I say, if such expenses were incurred, the people ought not to pay them, but if expenses were incurred which the people of this country would have to pay, I think it is due to this House and to the people of the country that we should know the amounts which were expended by these gentlemen in their peregrinations throughout the country in what was known as the celebrated chestnut combination. I believe that was the title bestowed upon the hon. gentlemen on that occasion when they visited the rural constituencies in Ontario for the purpose of influencing the elections. I think it is due to the people of this country and due to the members of this House, that we should have as soon as possible, details of the expenses of those excursions which were made. I know that Ministers of the Crown ought to be allowed all reasonable travelling expenses when they are discharging the duties of their several departments; I do not think this House or the people would expect a Minister of the Crown to incur expenses connected with his Department in travelling over the country, without meeting the bill. But if these hon. gentlemen expect that the country ought to pay their personal expenses when they are on electioneering tours, I do not think that the idea will commend itself to the people who have to foot the bill. Then, with regard to other expenses of the Ministers, I think it is well that we should have a return brought down at as early a date as possible. Last Session I asked for a return in connection with such expenses, and up to this time, at least according to the report of the Secretary of State, that return has not been brought down. I do not think that is paying proper attention to the requirements of Parliament, because if we pass an order that a return should be brought down, I think that we ought to have it brought down in some kind of season. And then with regard to the High Commissioner, I think it would be interesting to the people of this country to know something with regard to his travelling expenses. We all know that since he has been appointed to that high position in England, he has made several flying trips to this country. We know that on the last trip he made to this country, when he came over, as he stated to a reporter in New York, he had no idea that an election was impending in this country. Since that time we have learned that he took an active part in the election, and I think it is due to the people of this country to be made aware of the facts in connection with his visit here. If he came here as an official of the Government, as High Commissioner in the discharge of the duties of that office, of course we ought to pay his expenses; but, if he came here with the purpose of assisting in the election campaign, I think it is right that he should pay his own expenses. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the High Commissioner enjoys a very handsome salary in his office in London. He gets \$10,000 a year, and I see by the Public Accounts this year that he is paid no less a sum than \$3,609 76 for contingencies. Now, if he sees fit to come to this country to assist the right hon. leader of the Government in his electioneering campaign, he ought to pay his own expenses. Altogether

I think that this return which I am asking for, if it is brought down at an early stage, will prove an interesting return, and will afford this House and the country information which they are desirous of obtaining. I, therefore, urge on the members of the Government to see that this return is not delayed, that we have it early in the Session, and that it is not treated in the same manner as the motion which I made during the last Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the motion will be granted, because it is quite right the hon. gentleman should have his laudable desire of knowledge gratified. The return will be brought down immediately, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will find great satisfaction in perusing it. My other colleagues may speak for themselves, but I may as well say that between the dates mentioned, the Government has neither paid, nor will pay, for the use of that car, or any car, or for travelling expenses of any kind, nor for my food, or clothing of any kind. I paid my own expenses.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOHN CREIGHTON, INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved for:

Return showing the date of Mr. John Creighton's appointment as Indian agent at Saugeen; the date of his removal from office; the nature of the charges preferred against him, and all correspondence connected therewith.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The date of Mr. Creighton's appointment was 20th September, 1882; the date of his ceasing to be a public officer, was the 22nd of April, 1885. As to the charges that were made, if the hon. gentleman will give an explanation, and the reasons why he asks for the charges, I may, perhaps, agree that he shall get them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would say that we have heard a great deal in connection with North-West affairs about the misconduct of Indian agents, and I have been informed, I do not know how correctly, by parties on the ground, that this gentleman, who has some eminent connections in this country, has been guilty of similar offences to those which have been charged against Indian agents in the North-West. For this reason I was requested to ask for this return, and I cannot see that there can be any objection to bringing it down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it had been a complaint made by the party who was removed, a complaint made to the House, and an appeal to Parliament, I might, perhaps, yield to it, but I do not see there is any reason why I should agree to this portion of the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. That seems to me a very extraordinary doctrine. I think we have a right to know what the conduct of a public officer has been. I think the Parliament of the country has a right to know what has been the course and the conduct of the officials whom we authorise to act in our behalf. Under the same general doctrine of the hon. gentleman, we may not know what the misconduct of any public officer has been if he has been removed from office, unless the hon. gentleman himself chooses to say that we shall know, or unless an application is made on his behalf. I say the public has a right to know in what manner the public affairs have been conducted. And the hon. gentleman's statement is that we should be kept entirely in the dark, unless the person presumably in the wrong should himself ask that an explanation be given as to his removal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This House desires to know whether this officer has been properly or improperly dismissed. It is not an impertinent action on our part to seek to know what has been the conduct of the Government in regard to one of their officers, and the reasons why he was dismissed. If a competent officer performs the duties of an office efficiently, we naturally want to know why the Gov-

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

ernment dismissed him. If it was not for improper conduct on his part, we want to know why he was dismissed; and it is the duty of the Government to allow members of the House to know the grounds on which they remove public officers. It was not an unreasonable but very proper request, and the Government should grant it, not only in the interests of the country but in their own interest.

Mr. MILLS. I think the doctrine laid down by the First Minister is one which is altogether untenable. The statement is made that a certain public officer has been improperly dismissed. The officer may have committed a wrong; the Government may be justified in dismissing him. But the Government are discharging certain public duties, they are trustees of the public, and they are responsible to this House and the country for the proper discharge of their duty. It is a reasonable proposition that the House should be placed in possession of certain information in regard to the dismissal of that officer. The position taken by the First Minister is that if the party himself complains, he is willing to disclose the grounds of his dismissal; but, if not, it is none of our business and we are not entitled to know. I do not think that the hon. gentleman when on this side of the House propounded that doctrine. My impression is that he insisted upon having information with respect to every public act of the Government and the dismissal of public officers, such being a public act, which the Government might be called upon by the House to justify.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be found that when persons hold office during pleasure, the Crown can exercise its pleasure, and the House of Commons is not to be a court of appeal.

Mr. MILLS. The dismissal of a county court judge could not be questioned in this House under that doctrine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that the Home Secretary, Sir James Graham, opposed a motion of this character, giving, however, an explanation of the matter complained of, while protesting against such a course being followed, and as the result the motion was withdrawn. Hon. gentlemen will find that in respect to officers holding office during pleasure, the Crown exercises that pleasure, and the House of Commons is not to be a court of appeal. If hon. members will look into the authorities they will find that such is the case. If any hon. member will rise and state that the public officer committed a crime, and move for the papers, we will bring them down; but this is a mere matter of curiosity on the part of the hon. member. The language of the hon. gentleman shows why he made the motion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman is laboring under an erroneous impression in regard to my motive in making the motion. It is not from any feeling of curiosity whatever. I consider I am discharging a public duty in moving it, and the members of the House, the people resident in the constituency where that gentleman held office, and the people of the country generally are entitled to the information which I ask. It is not, I repeat, from mere curiosity or any such motive, but in the discharge of a public duty, that I move the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the duty? If the hon. gentleman will state in his place that this person has committed any crime, we will bring down the papers; or that he is informed that he has committed any defalcation, or the party himself complains and states that he has been improperly used, if there is a *prima facie* case, then we will bring down the papers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is quite evident from the trouble taken by the First Minister to attempt to conceal the information I am desirous of obtaining, that it is advisable the

House should secure it, and therefore, I think, the motion should be carried.

Mr. DAVIN. The contention of the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion is, that after a public officer has been dismissed and after he has ceased entirely to be connected with the Government, if from any motive, wholly apart from the man, a motion of this sort is made, it ought to be agreed to. That is the contention of the hon. gentleman and it is also the contention of a far higher authority in this House, the leader of the Opposition. It is palpable that a great and grievous wrong might be done to a public officer if such a contention were allowed to prevail. A public officer who had served his country faithfully for some years might be guilty of an error or offence and be dismissed and have afterwards entered into some new undertaking and prospered in life, and yet from other motives altogether, because the hon. gentleman who has brought forward this motion says it has no connection with Mr. Creighton—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives.

Mr. DAVIN. I imputed no motives.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I claim that no hon. gentleman has a right to impute motives to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to impute motives to the hon. gentleman, the mover of this resolution. On the contrary, I understood that the hon. member was complaining that the hon. the mover of the resolution had stated no motive or reasons for the production of the papers voted for.

Mr. DAVIN. I imputed no motives whatever to the hon. gentleman. If he remembers the language he used when he proposed this motion, it was this. I will quote it from memory and I think I will quote it with tolerable exactness. He said that charges had been made against the Indian agents in the North-West; that this man Creighton had, according to rumor, been guilty of similar offences, and he wanted to have the information as to the circumstances attending the dismissal of Creighton brought down to the House. For what purpose? For any purpose connected with Creighton? Not at all. It was to throw some light on a question wholly apart from that. I say that if the principle that is behind the contention of the hon. gentleman were to be adopted in this House, a great wrong might be done to persons who would be placed in the position that their case might be dragged here on the floor of Parliament for no other purpose than to hit some body over their mangled carcase. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) laughs. On the question in the interest of which the subject is brought forward, he is about—I do not think it is an unparliamentary expression—the most benighted hon. member on that side of the House. Now, Sir, the hon. the leader of the Opposition takes what at first sight appears to be an unassailable position. I consider that the leader of the Opposition, in standing up and saying that this House has a perfect right to learn all about its officers, that it has a perfect right to know why an officer is dismissed, that it has a perfect right to know all about his conduct, to know what motive has governed Ministers in taking a given course, occupies an unassailable position. But when he is buttressing up the motion made by the hon. gentleman who brought forward this question, when he does not dissent from the reasons given by that hon. member for bringing forward this motion, he must be assumed to have adopted the reasoning of the hon. gentleman, and therefore he is in the same vulnerable position as that occupied by that hon. gentleman. That is to say, he occupies the ground that it is a fair and proper and right thing to ask for an enquiry into one circumstance in order to affect an end wholly apart from that.

This man Creighton has been dismissed from the service now for two years. It is perfectly clear that the position taken by the First Minister is a sound and wise and humane position; and not only that, but I venture to say it is a position which will be supported by parliamentary precedent. The right hon. gentleman says that if any one comes forward in the interests of Creighton, if Creighton complains, it would be a proper thing to accede to the request of the hon. member who brought the matter before the House; and although he does not go as fully into it, it is palpable that this was in his mind—that it would be an unjust thing if we were to go into an enquiry of this kind in order to accomplish a side issue. Now, Sir, I hope the House will not consent to the motion of the hon. member. If he wants to get the information on this subject that he seems to be so anxious about, the proper thing for him to do is to make a motion straight and above board. And let me say this: that if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to go into that question, there are now three or four members in this House that thoroughly understand it. And I can tell you that nothing helped to elect the four members who have been sent down here from the North-West Territories more than the mendacious, foul, unjust charges—

An hon. MEMBER. Draw it mild.

Mr. DAVIN. I really cannot draw it mild, because the offence was not mild.

Mr. WELSH. Go it strong then.

Mr. DAVIN. Nothing helped these members more in their election than the charges made against the Government policy in the North-West—and above all the charges with regard to Indian matters—by an hon. gentleman who is no longer in this House.

Mr. RYKERT. Ananias.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that what you call him here? I call him the late hon. member for Huron. His fate is to some extent deeply tragic; there was a sort of irony in it too, because his charges were the battle cry of the Reformers in the late election. He flung forth the boldest banner of all the lieutenants of the hon. gentleman opposite, and to day instead of crossing swords with the hon. member for Cumberland, or fighting the right hon. Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, he is politically dead.

Mr. MCMULLEN. He will rise again.

Mr. DAVIN. Will he? At present he has been stretched on his bier in consequence of having had too much Porter—a most unheroic ending for a gallant political knight.

Mr. MCMULLEN. It was the gerrymander.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, let hon. members go into that question, and I can promise them that before they are through with it they will be heartily sick of the matter. But if the hon. gentleman wants information on these points let him boldly come forward and move a resolution which will bring them up. If I am not travelling beyond the record—and this point was raised by the hon. gentleman who brought forward this motion—I can tell the House that when those charges were first made about the conduct of these officials—charges with regard to the management of Indian affairs, starving Indians and so on, I went myself on a reservation, I saw the food which they had received, I had it cooked and I ate it, and all I can tell you is that the charges were excogitated out of the moral consciousness of Mr. M. C. Cameron.

An hon. MEMBER. Immoral consciousness.

Mr. DAVIN. I don't know whether it was immoral or not; I don't pry into these matters. I haven't the curiosity that excites the bosoms—the extremely fine bosoms—of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better if the hon. gentleman would confine himself to the question which is before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad you called me to order, because I do not like to travel outside the record. To return to the question before the House, I may say that if the motion goes to a vote I will certainly vote against it, because I believe that by passing such a motion we would be setting a precedent following which we might one day do great and grave and most unjustifiable wrong to an officer who might have served the Government well, but having committed some fault, and been dismissed, might be doing well in private affairs, and who would thus be done an incalculable injury by the matter being brought before the House in this way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Looking at Todd, I find the doctrine recently laid down, and acting within the text, I think the hon. gentleman might, by putting this question in the right way, get all the information it is proper to give him. Here is what Todd says:

"But while, as a rule, any direct interference by Parliament with the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in the appointment, control, or dismissal of public servants, would be unconstitutional, unless under the peculiar circumstances already indicated, when it may become the duty of Parliament to tender advice on the subject; it is nevertheless agreeable to usage for enquiries of Ministers, or desultory discussion to take place in either House, in reference to the appointment and control of office holders, in particular instances, when a direct motion on the subject would be objectionable. In this way opportunity is afforded to the Administration to explain and defend the propriety of appointment which may have been subjected to misrepresentations by the press or the public at large."

I suppose that truly lays down the doctrine that no motion of this kind should be made, except for the distinct purpose which is indicated in the text. If the hon. gentleman will put it in the way of a question I may say, to end the discussion, that Mr. Creighton was removed because he was irregular in his habits, and because he was trading with the Indians, although he was an Indian agent.

Mr. BLAKE. I had no idea that the hon. gentleman was about to dismiss the motion, so that I have not had an opportunity of refreshing my memory as to precedents. I remark, however, that what the hon. gentleman read from Todd, has reference to a different branch of the whole subject, namely, to the somewhat fine distinctions, which I think are getting a little more out of date as democratic notions are prevailing, as to cases of interference with the discretion as to appointments and removals. But this is not a proposal which will, as I understand it, invite the Crown either to appoint or remove a particular individual. It is simply a proposal to obtain information as to the grounds on which the Crown has acted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I think is wrong.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says he thinks it wrong, and he has just now given us the grounds. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) seemed to suppose that there was some ulterior motive in this matter. All I have to say is that I heard of Mr. Creighton for the first time when I heard the hon. gentleman read his motion. I know nothing but what I have heard in the House, and I am concerned only in what I regard as a legal principle. As the hon. leader of the Government has stated his view of the principle, I would recommend my hon. friend to ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion, which will prevent our setting a precedent one way or the other, and will leave him free to move it again at an early day if he should be so advised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All right.

Motion withdrawn,
Mr. DAVIN.

THE CLOSE LOBSTER SEASON IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. FLYNN moved for:

Copies of correspondence in connection with the lobster fishery and close season in the Province of Nova Scotia.

He said: In making this motion I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to the difficulties and drawbacks under which the lobster fisheries are carried on in Nova Scotia in consequence of the impossibility of the fishermen taking advantage of what is considered the fishing season. Under the regulations of the Department they are allowed four months to fish, and the close season lasts eight months. The fishing season commences on the 1st of April and terminates on the last of August. On the southern coast of Nova Scotia it is practically out of the question to fish at all in April, during which month the coast is, as a rule, completely surrounded with ice. It is even rare that they can commence their fishing operations on the 1st of May, and frequently they cannot do so even then. Not long ago they could not commence until near the 1st of June. This very season, even to this date, according to late advices I have received, the ice is on the coast, and the fishermen are unable to get to the fishing fields. Therefore, while they are supposed to have four months in which to fish, they do not really have more than two and a half months in any year. In consequence of a similar statement having been made to the Department some time ago, I believe the people of Prince Edward Island were allowed an extension to some time in the month of August. The very reasons which exist for giving an extension of time to the fishermen of Prince Edward Island exist also for giving an extension of time to the fishermen in the southern part of Nova Scotia. I know that when the Minister enquires into this question, he will remove the evils which exist, and give the people at least four months' fishing season.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to say that, in my opinion, the whole fishing business ought to be put a stop to for a number of years. I speak from personal observation. I have been in a great many factories in Prince Edward Island and in several in New Brunswick, and I have found that the lobsters in them are very small. Where it used to take one or two lobsters to fill a can, it now takes six or seven, and it is really disgraceful to go into one of those lobster factories and see the thousands of little fish that are taken out of the sea. While the fishermen are asking for more time, I will not say whether they should have more or not, but my own opinion is that the Minister of Fisheries will have to devote a great deal of attention to this subject, or the whole lobster industry on our coasts will be destroyed in a few years.

Mr. FLYNN. I do not know anything of the character of the lobsters on the Prince Edward Island coasts, but I think I can speak with some knowledge of those on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, and the lobsters there are to day as plentiful and as large in size as they were ten or fifteen years ago. There is a regulation of the Department that no lobster can be taken under a certain size, and the fishery overseers are very careful in watching that that regulation is observed. If the fishermen get lobsters into their traps which are too small, they are obliged to put them into the sea again, or are subject to a fine. But what I complain of is that while the Department fixes a close season of eight months and leaves four months in which to fish, the month of April is practically out of the question, because if the fishermen set their traps in that month, they are in danger of losing them.

Mr. DAVIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this subject to the notice of the House as it is a very important one to the Maritime Provinces. I am also glad to

learn from him that the fishery is maintained as well as he says it is in his Province. I wish I could say the same for my Province. The lobster fishery in my Province, which is very valuable, is gradually becoming poorer, the lobsters are getting smaller, and some of the manufacturers do not think it worth while to keep open at all. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the regulations which have been enforced, fixing the close season in Prince Edward Island, and, I presume, in Nova Scotia also, are very unsatisfactory indeed. I am aware petitions have been forwarded to the Department, praying for a change in the regulations, and I wish to state I have made it my business to enquire from a large number of those engaged in the trade, what regulations would suit them best. I have ascertained that hard and fast regulations applied to the whole Province would not do, that while between certain specific dates it may suit very well for the southern parts of the island, where, owing to calm weather, they can fish almost every day, on the northern part where they are exposed to rough weather the same dates will not suit. This is a matter which calls for immediate action. I know that those engaged in the trade look for the decision of the Minister with great interest, and I hope before the season progresses further the hon. gentleman will have made up his mind to some change in the existing regulations, and that that change, whatever it may be, will not be an arbitrary one for the whole Province but one that will deal with the different conditions of affairs in the northern as distinguished from the southern part of the island. I believe that those in the southern part would like a close season in midsummer. I know the hon. gentleman has a large mass of information in his Department on the subject, and all I press for is that a conclusion may be come to as speedily as possible. If the regulations are enforced in Cape Breton, all I can say is that there is laxity, and consequently a different state of facts prevailing elsewhere.

Mr. KIRK. The lobster fishing business is one of very great importance to the Maritime Provinces. It is a very large and growing industry. Last year there was about \$1,750,000 in value of lobsters exported from the Dominion, and this business is of such importance that it demands the particular attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The close season, as it now exists, does not give satisfaction to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, or at any rate to those of the county of Guysboro'. We have a good many lobster establishments there. We have twelve in the county of Guysboro', employing hundreds of men and thousands of fishermen. I find the consensus of opinion among the fishermen is that the close season does not begin at the right time. The fishermen of the county of Guysboro', as was stated by my hon. friend from Richmond, have not an opportunity in the spring of commencing fishing early, in consequence of the ice and bad weather. However, I find that they generally agreed the fishing season should be extended. They all agree that there is a necessity for a close season, but that close season, according to the present regulations, does not begin at the right time. They claim that lobsters, after the middle of July, are not fit to be eat, and that the close season should commence about the middle of July and last to the end of August. They think that a season of six weeks in the year is quite sufficient, and that after the end of August they ought to be allowed to fish to the end of the year. The fishermen say that there are more lobsters destroyed during the two weeks after the middle of July than during the rest of the year, from the fact that the lobsters are then spawning. They claim it is in the interest of lobsters that they should be protected when in a spawning condition, and the lobster itself then is not suitable for food. The Government has been in the habit of extending the close season from the first to the middle of August, I believe, in the eastern part

of Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island. There they do a very wrong thing, for that is the very season they should not allow fishing at all, namely, from the middle of July to the end of August; but after the end of August, fishermen tell us, you may fish as much as you like and you cannot destroy the fish. It is only necessary to protect the fish during the spawning season from the middle of July to the end of August. So far as the size of the lobster is concerned, I do not think I can say anything, but I do know that the fishermen of my county are very anxious that the Government should allow fishing in the fall of the year, and they maintain unanimously it is quite sufficient to have the close season from the middle of July to the end of August.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no objection at all to the papers being brought down. I am afraid, however, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) will not find them very voluminous. There will be an opportunity later to discuss this question of lobsters, when we shall be very glad indeed to have the opinions of hon. gentlemen present on both sides of the House who are building up this industry. As many different men write about it so there are as many different ideas with reference to these lobster fisheries as to the close season, as to when it should commence, and the time when the spawning season is on. It is a difficult subject, and a little later I shall be glad to have the co-operation of all who understand anything about this question.

Mr. LANDRY. No doubt the opinions offered by hon. gentlemen to the Minister of Fisheries will be of great value to him, but I suggest to the hon. Minister that he himself should make a visit to the portion of the Province where these lobsters are, and study the situation for himself. I think he will then find as many different opinions as there are letters written to him on the subject, and I think it would be a very wise thing indeed for the hon. gentleman to visit the localities himself during the next season and try to ascertain the facts for himself, from information obtained on the spot and from personal observation. I think that is the best way for him to obtain the information, because there is a considerable difference of opinion, and very often information is given by persons who are interested in the lobster fishery, not perhaps for the benefit of the fishery interest itself so much as for the benefits which they themselves hope to derive from the carrying out of the views they express. I do not accuse all the fishermen of being prompted by that interest, but naturally they must be prompted by it more or less. They look to the fisheries for the profits which they yield to them, more than to the actual protection of the fish itself. In view of all this, and believing that the Minister takes a deep interest in the matter, and desires to do the best which is possible for the fish, I advise him to visit the localities himself.

Mr. DAVIES. I would suggest that the motion be amended, so as to embrace the papers and correspondence in regard to Prince Edward Island as well as Nova Scotia, and then we will have the whole question before us.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the motion being so amended. I thank my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) for his suggestion, and I hope that, when I go around that coast to visit these fishery grounds, he will defend me afterwards from any charges of junketting.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LANDS SOLD.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) moved for :

Return of lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company up to 1st April, 1887, in the North-West Territories; when sold, and to whom.

He said: I make this motion with the assurance that I will have the sympathy and support of every hon. member in this House. We are all quite aware of the fact that, in the

district which I have the honor to represent with my hon. colleague, a large portion of the lands which were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as a bonus, were selected; and while we do not claim that we want any portion of the contract which that company violated, not even that which exempts their land from taxation for a number of years, yet there is a provision in the contract that when that land is sold it shall be subject to taxation. It is well known that certain companies have purchased certain portions of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that they are seeking to have their lands still exempted from taxation, while they are selling them and otherwise receiving a benefit from them. This is a great detriment to the settlers. I think this House is quite conversant with the fact that it is very important in the interest of every community that all the lands should be open to taxation for the support of schools, roads and bridges, and other purposes for which lands should be taxed. We are all aware that the progress of that country must depend upon the contentment and satisfaction of the settlers. But, when you find that a large portion of the land has been sold to companies who have come in under an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a very great injustice and a very great wrong has been done to the settlers of that country. While we are not desirous in any way to alter the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, nevertheless we are of opinion that some pressure should be brought to bear on that company to give information to the settlers as to whom these lands have been sold to. In the North-West Territories we are very short of funds. We have not the advantages of Local Government so as to be able to impose taxation in the same way as other portions of Canada, so that our people are unable to secure schools to the extent they otherwise would, and they are unable to obtain a very large revenue for the support of roads and bridges, because we have not the money and have not the people from whom to get the money. It is very important for the well-being of that country, in regard to which every member is deeply interested, and which every member is looking to with hope and pride, as likely to become a prosperous land, that the contentment of the people should be secured, and that can only be done by their having facilities for local self-government and enjoying those privileges which they are entitled to. In conversation the other night with a gentleman who represents one of the great corporations in that country, I was informed that they own \$1,500,000 worth of land in the North-West, and, when I expressed surprise at this, he told me that the bargain was so ingeniously made that his company was exempt from taxation. If there is any question which affects the people there it is this. The land is set off on the checker-board system. The people are a mile apart at best, and, when the odd sections are sold to these companies and to different individuals in such a way that they cannot be taxed, because the people cannot find out to whom the land has been sold, a great injustice is done. That is one of the reasons why I ask that this information should be brought down and should be brought down fully, so that our municipalities may be enabled to find out to whom the land belongs without going to law and having to pay costs, because the land may have been sold to some one other than those from whom they seek to recover the taxes. I believe the House will agree that, in justice to these settlers, they are entitled to this; and I may inform this House that nothing upon which it will legislate this Session will be more to the advantage of that country than to make those lands, when once they are sold, subject to taxation, and to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to state to whom the land is sold. I want you to understand that we do not desire that one iota of the contract shall be violated in any respect, but after the land has been sold, we claim that this large corporation shall be

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia).

compelled to tell who owns the land, in order that the person may be able to have a fair share of the benefits that will accrue to the land and to the country in the way of improving it, as the settler is now doing. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for your kind attention to this, my first speech, and I am glad that I have not been called to order.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the accounts of the revising officer for the electoral district of Kamouraska, including the cost of printing the electoral lists, the account of the revising officer's clerk and that of his bailiff, with a statement of the amount paid by the Government to each of the said officers.—(Mr. Dessaint.)

A copy of the Chief Engineer's report on the construction of a harbor of refuge at or near Port Rowan, Ontario; also a copy of a memorial signed by George Stewart, M. D., and others upon the subject, and also copies of such correspondence between other parties at Port Rowan and the Government on the same subject as has not already been brought down.—(Mr. Charlton.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1888, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867" the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 9th May, 1887.

INCORPORATION OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. TISDALE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the South Norfolk Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS. What is the object of the Bill?

Mr. TISDALE. It is an ordinary Bill to incorporate a railway company.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state between what points the railway will run.

Mr. TISDALE. From Port Robinson, in South Norfolk, on the shore of Lake Erie, to some point on the Canada Southern Railway, probably Waterford.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SMALL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Massawippi Junction Railway Company. He said: This Bill is to incorporate a company to build a railway from a point in the township of Magog, or township of Oxford, on the Short Line Railway from Montreal,

to the maritime ports, where a connection can be made with the Short Line Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

Mr. WELDON. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in his place, but I understood that the whole of the proceedings of the committee in the Queen's County election case were to be reported. I notice, however, that it simply contains the resolutions which were adopted and the report of the sub-committee. I think all the proceedings should be given—the motions which were lost as well as those which were carried, as I think that is the usual course; at any rate, it was done in the Prince Edward Island case. I think the report should be amended by including the proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe that this report is neither one thing nor the other. One would have supposed that the committee would have adopted either the one course or the other—either report only the resolution to which the committee came, or report all the proceedings. But besides the reporting the resolutions adopted by the committee—and none others—the report includes the report which was made by a sub-committee created by the committee. Either this should not have been reported or all the motions should have been included, and I think the report should be amended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The chairman of the committee will be here this afternoon, and I will speak to him on the subject.

Mr. EDGAR. I am a member of the committee, and I distinctly understood that all the proceedings should be reported. There was a little confusion about the time the committee adjourned—most of the members were standing when the motion was put, but I think it was clearly understood that the proceedings were to be reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think all the proceedings are usually reported.

Mr. BLAKE. There is generally a motion to that effect, and in compliance with it, it is generally done. I was informed by one member of the committee that the proceedings were to be reported, and now the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) states that that was his impression.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the motion was that the resolutions should all be reported, but it was a verbal motion, and was probably not understood by the clerk of the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. We had better have all the resolutions and the votes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly, I think they should all be reported. I think I mentioned in the motion that just the resolutions should be reported.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that either too much or too little has been reported. Either the sub-committee's report should not have been reported, or else all the proceedings should have been included.

Mr. McCARTHY. Quite so.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 68) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: I may just say, in explanation of this Bill, that one of its objects is to simplify the proceedings when a petition is presented for the repeal of the Scott Act, or, as the Act puts it, the revocation of the Order in Council bring-

ing the Act into force. As the law now stands the proceedings and forms that are given are applicable to introducing the Act into a county or city, but they are to be changed, the Act says, to suit the proceedings for the revocation of the Order in Council. But on the ballot, difficulties may arise with regard to these forms and proceedings, and difficulties have arisen. The ballot says those who vote one way are to vote for the petition, and those who vote the other way, against it; but doubts may arise—and I understand that, in several cases, difficulties have already arisen—as to whether voters were voting for the Act or against it, when the Act was submitted for repeal. I propose also by this Bill to repeal a very important clause, or rather one which has just come to be very important, and that is the one compelling a man and his wife to give evidence. As first interpreted by the courts it was held that a defendant was not to be compelled to answer questions which would criminate him, but a recent decision of the Chancery division of the High Court of Justice for the Province of Ontario has decided otherwise. I think, therefore, this provision is one which ought not to remain, and I propose to change it by saying that the husband may be a competent, but not a compellable, witness. I propose, also, to change the sub-sections of the Act with regard to the sale of beer and cider, in the direction in which I had the honor to move in the Session of 1885—that is, to permit those who are entitled to carry on the business of brewers to sell to parties in their own county. We know, that as the law is at present, while such parties may sell to those living out of the county, and while people living in the county may buy outside the county and bring it in, those carrying on the business of brewers in which the Act is in force cannot sell to people in that county, which I think is a very absurd provision. These provisions, along with others with reference to druggists—these latter also having been before Parliament—are the principal matters with which the Bill deals.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT ON THE 18TH INST.

Mr. BLAKE. There was a statement made in the House a few days ago with reference to a suggestion that an adjournment for a week should be made on the 18th inst. I think it would be to the convenience of the House that some announcement of the views of the Government should be made, and the earlier the better, so that hon. gentlemen could make their arrangements accordingly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I threw out the suggestion for the consideration of the House. The members of the Government are, of course, obliged to be here to go through their work; but the paper which was handed to me shows that a large number, in fact a majority of the House, were in favor of the adjournment; and, if it be the decided sense of the House that we should have a recess, of course we will submit. I may repeat what I stated before, that Thursday the 1st is Ascension Day, upon which there can be no House sitting. Friday we could sit; Saturday and Sunday we would not sit, and Monday we could sit; so that there would be Friday and Monday as working days. Tuesday is the Queen's birthday, and we generally have adjourned upon that day. It was therefore proposed that the House should adjourn on Wednesday night, and that it should stand adjourned until the following Wednesday night. We would only lose, as it was stated, two days, unless we sit on the Queen's birthday. I would like to hear the general opinion of the House on the subject, but so far as this irresponsible paper handed to me is concerned, it would appear that a majority of the House is in favor of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Practically, you lose the Wednesday as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We could adjourn till Wednesday, and members will be all here by eight o'clock on the second Wednesday. There are, according to the memorandum handed to me, thirty-three members of the Opposition besides all the Quebec Opposition members, and forty Ministerial members besides all the Quebec members on this side, in favor of the adjournment.

Mr. CHARLTON. As this is the Jubilee year, I would ask whether it is proposed, in the event of the House not adjourning, to observe the Queen's birthday? A holiday will probably be held on the 21st of June.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to say to the Prime Minister that some of our friends on this side have not heard a word about this matter. I never heard a word of it until I heard it in the House, though I do not object to the adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The paper handed to me begins with the Opposition members, and then gives the names, headed by that of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was never spoken to on the subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I took the responsibility of this paper, I may be allowed to explain it. At the request of a few of the members I undertook to see what the feeling of the House was, and I spoke to almost all the Ontario members, who, without signing any paper, agreed, on consideration, that there would be no time lost. That was the almost unanimous expression of opinion. The members from Quebec to whom I spoke said they would be almost all in favor of it.

Mr. TISDALE. I will explain the paper for this side of the House. I spoke to more than fifty, not one of whom objected, and Mr. McMillan spoke to the members for Quebec, and said they were all for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps we had better bring the question to a vote. I move that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, the 18th inst., it stand adjourned until the following Wednesday at 3 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called I desire to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the statement made on Thursday that the motion for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees would be made on Friday. It was not made on Friday, and we have now passed the time when that motion could be made to-day. It would be well to know what the hon. gentleman's intentions are as to making the proposal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will move it to-morrow, which is a Government day.

UPPER COLUMBIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MARA moved second reading of Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Upper Columbia Railway Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Some of these Bills are not printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. If my attention is drawn to the fact, of course I cannot allow the Bills to be read. It cannot be done without the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I will say to my hon. friend that we have adopted perhaps a rather lax practice in allowing the Bills to be read, if they are printed in either language, at the earlier part of the Session, and do not appear to be objectionable, so that they might get to the committees as early

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

as possible. I do not consider that if any hon. member has an objection to a measure, he is to be precluded from insisting on the absolute rigor of the rule. However, I think it would be for the advantage of the House if we winked at the irregularity.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Niagara River Bridge Company.—(Mr. McCarthy for Mr. Rykert)

Bill (No. 45) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy for Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act incorporating the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Shanly for Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Acts incorporating and relating to the British Canadian Loan and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 62) to reduce the stock of the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited), and for other purposes.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

SCRIP TO VETERANS OF 1837.

Mr. PURCELL asked, Is it the intention of the Government to make provision, during the present Session, for the payment of pensions or the granting of scrip to the Veterans who served the Crown in 1837, as has been done in the case of the Veterans of 1812 and in the case of those who served in suppressing the recent North-West Rebellion?

Sir A DOLPHE CARON. It is not in the power of the Federal Government to grant scrip or pensions to the Veterans of 1837. It is a matter which properly comes under the purview of the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, as it occurred previous to Confederation.

POST OFFICE AT CORINTH.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to open a post office at Corinth, in the township of Bentinck, at an early date?

Mr. McLELAN. That matter was under the consideration of the late Postmaster, and the decision was that it should stand a while.

DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a Customs duty on leaf tobacco imported? If so, what will the duty be?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a question which cannot be answered until the Budget is brought down.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RATES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA asked, Have the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the Province of British Columbia been submitted to and approved of by the Governor in Council?

Mr. POPE. They have not; but having been called on once or twice to submit rates, they informed me a few days ago they would do so shortly.

WHARF ACROSS THE RICHELIEU.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, Have the Government ever given power to the "Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company," or their successors, "the Vermont Central Railway Company," to build a wharf alongside of their bridge across the Richelieu river, near the towns of St. Johns and Iberville?

Mr. POPE. We can find no trace of any permission having been given. I think, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, we made enquiry in 1883, and could find nothing of the kind. We wrote to these people and have no reply.

JOSEPH DIONNE.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether Joseph Dionne, of St. Denis, county of Kamouraska, is an employé of the Government; if so, in what capacity, in what Department, since when, and what is his salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Joseph Dionne, of St. Denis, is employed in the Department of Public Works, and has been employed for about three or four weeks in the accountant's office of that Department. His salary has not yet been fixed, but will probably be \$1.50 per day.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, GUYSBORO'.

Mr. KIRK asked, On what date did A. F. Falconer resign the office of Collector of Customs for the sub-port of St. Mary's River, in the county of Guysboro', Nova Scotia. Has his successor been appointed? If so, who is he?

Mr. BOWELL. No resignation of Mr. Falconer has been received at the Department, and in consequence no successor has been appointed.

COLLECTOR AT ST. GERMAIN DE RIMOUSKI.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether the regulations of the Customs Department have been modified in relation to the holding of the office of collector at a port, in such manner as to permit the holding thereof by a merchant, as in the case of J. A. Martin, collector, appointed and acting for the port of St. Germain de Rimouski for some years past?

Mr. BOWELL. This question goes a little beyond the rules of Parliament by affirming the fact of which the Customs Department has no knowledge. Even if it had, I am not sure the question is put in proper shape. I may say, however, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that no regulations of the Customs Department have been changed in that respect.

OFFICIALS IN NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Has the Government, or any of its Departments, received any recommendations for the superannuation or removal of any official or officials in the county of Northumberland, New Brunswick? If so, who made such recommendation and who are the parties whose removals or superannuation is recommended, and what are the reasons alleged for such removals or superannuation; and has any person or persons been recommended for appointment in their places, and if so, what are the name or names of the party or parties so recommended for appointment? Has any report been made to Council by the head of any Department for the removal or superannuation of any such official, and if so, state grounds therefor, with the names

of the party or parties on whose representation, oral or otherwise, such head of Department acted, with the names of the party or parties so recommended for removal or superannuation; and has any report been made to Council for the appointment of a successor or successors to said party or parties, and if so the name or names of the party or parties so recommended?

Mr. POPE. I speak for my own Department, which, probably, has more employees than any other in that county, and I will say no one has asked for any people to be removed that I know of. No one is suggested as his successor, and we have heard nothing from anyone about this.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no recommendation of that kind as far as the Customs Department is concerned. The hon. gentleman knows there is a vacancy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nor yet in the Indian Department.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government, so far as my Department is concerned, has not received any recommendations for the superannuation of any officials in the county of Northumberland; consequently there has been no recommendation for superannuation. With reference to removal of officials, I think some conversation has passed, and I will enquire and be able to give the hon. gentleman a fuller answer later.

BRAE HARBOR, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. YEO asked, Is it the intention of the Government to dredge the Brae harbor in Prince county, Prince Edward Island, during the present season, as prayed for by petitioners?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Brae harbor, there is a depth of two feet at low water, which must be increased to eight feet to permit a dredge to work, otherwise it will be impossible to open any kind of a channel. The length of cutting to be opened will be 1,500 feet, width 50 feet, quantity to be removed 15,000 cubic yards, probable cost \$5,000. There is no probability that this cut will remain open. So says the chief engineer, so there is no intention to do this work.

RICHELIEU RIVER BUOYS.

Mr. CLAYES asked, 1st. To whom was the contract in respect to the buoys of the Richelieu River, &c., awarded? 2nd. For what length of time and for how much? 3rd. Were the contractors the lowest tenderers? 4th. Who are the sureties? 5th. Has the Government received complaints from navigators regarding the buoy service on the Richelieu River?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that, 1st. The contract in respect to buoys of the Richelieu River, and River des Prairies, has been awarded to Louis Henry Hébert, machinist, of St. Johns, P.Q.; 2nd. The contract is for a term of three years, and the contract price is \$400 per annum; 3rd. The contractors were the lowest tenderers; 4th. The sureties are John Black and Henderson Black, private bankers, both of St. Johns, P.Q.; 5th. No complaints have been received from navigators regarding the buoy service on the Richelieu River.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN PICTON.

Mr. PLATT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates for the ensuing year for the construction of Customs and Post Office buildings in the town of Picton, Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer that question authoritatively, because the Supplementary Estimates are not yet completed.

MURRAY CANAL.

Mr. PLATT asked, Has an extension of time for the completion of Murray Canal been granted to contractors? If so, when was extension asked for, when granted, and to what date has the time been extended? What is the date for completion in original contract?

Mr. POPE. The date of the completion arranged for in the original contract was July 1st, 1885. The date of the contract with J. B. Silcox & Co. was 24th August, 1882. No written extension of time has been given.

POSTMASTER AT MILFORD.

Mr. PLATT asked, Who is at present postmaster at Milford, Ontario? When was appointment made?

Mr. McLELAN. That office is at present vacant.

FISHING LICENSES IN EAST AND WEST LAKES, PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. PLATT asked, Have fishing licenses for net and seine fishing in East and West Lakes, county of Prince Edward, been refused to any or all applicants? if so, upon whose representations and for what reasons?

Mr. FOSTER. Fishing licenses for net and seine fishing in East and West Lakes, county of Prince Edward, have been refused to all applicants. They were refused upon the representations of the District Inspector, who said they were destroying the fish.

CONDUCT OF RETURNING OFFICERS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved :

That the return laid upon the Table of the House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, relating to the return and gazetting of members, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to make enquiry into the conduct of certain returning officers and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

He said: I regret that I have to bring the misconduct of certain public officers under the attention of this House, but I think the duties assigned to them under the law are of such immense consequence to Parliament and to the country that it is absolutely necessary that this House should exercise the most careful scrutiny over their conduct. The duties that are imposed upon these officers who are referred to in this motion are not onerous, they are not difficult to perform, but they are certainly of very great consequence, and, being of great consequence to the constitution of Parliament itself, it is of the utmost importance to this House, and to every member of the House, to look to the conduct of these officers with the most jealous care. If there is any matter about which this House should be careful, if there is any subject more than another about which it should divest itself of everything like partisan bias, and should think only of the honor, the dignity and the fair constitution of Parliament, it is with reference to the conduct of these officials who are connected with the elections, and who constitute in some degree the machinery by which the House of Commons is called into existence. The conduct of the officers who are necessarily connected with a parliamentary election, and by whose faithful and honest conduct this House may in some degree approach accurately and strictly to the character of a representative body, can never be a matter about which Parliament itself can be indifferent. The writs that are issued by the Crown, upon

Mr. PLATT.

the advice of the Administration of the day, for holding a general election are not the only authority which governs the actions of either the returning officers or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The returning officers look to these writs for their authority to hold an election, but the manner in which that election is to be held and the duties which devolve upon them are not derived from the writ, but are derived from the statute law by which their conduct is regulated, defined, and clearly set out. In fact, the legislation in this matter is so clear and so precise that no officer of ordinary intelligence, who is disposed to discharge his duties honestly and as the law directs need make any mistake. In the case of the returning officer, he has not, as formerly, any discretion with regard to the day of election or with regard to the day of nomination. He is entitled to receive the nomination of candidates in a certain way and upon certain conditions. The day on which he has to sit for the purpose of receiving nominations is set out. The hour when he is to cease receiving nominations is set forth. After the nominations have been received, it is for him to issue a proclamation and to name with the utmost definiteness the places at which votes are to be polled. He appoints the deputy returning officer, he names the poll clerks, and the statute sets out the duty of these clerks with as much definiteness, with as much fullness, with the same freedom from any ambiguity or doubt, as it does his own conduct, and does not leave him any discretion as to when he shall make his return. It provides with the utmost precision when that return shall be made. It says that if certain events do not happen, then he is to make it at the end of six days from the day of polling. He is not to do it after that, but on the expiration of that particular period, and on the contingency of a recount, then he is to take immediate action after that recount is completed. There is no room for discretion, there is no authority for delay. Even in England where there is no such precision—at least there was not formerly—in the statutes, yet Parliament intervened in case there was the least exhibition of a want of due diligence on the part of the returning officer in the discharge of his duty. When he has made his return, then the law provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery upon receiving that return shall gazette the member so returned and having a majority of votes, in the next ordinary issue of the *Gazette*, so that there is, in his case, the same precision, the same definiteness, the same absence from any discretion left him, that there is in the case of the returning officer. He is not permitted to make any delay. Those who framed the law know what the duties of a Clerk of the Crown in Chancery are. They know that they are not arduous. They know that they are not complicated. They know that it is possible for him to take action immediately after the receipt of these returns, and so it is provided that he shall, on the receipt of these returns, gazette the party so returned in the next ordinary issue of that paper. Now, what I have to complain of is, that this duty, which is set out with the utmost clearness and precision, about which no man of ordinary intelligence need err, was grossly neglected in certain cases by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, as it was grossly neglected in certain cases by the returning officer. Now, Sir, the members of the House stand here upon a footing of equality. There is no superiority in rights or privileges of one member over another. If the officers who were appointed to conduct the elections, to make the returns, and to gazette the members, discharged their duties as the law directs then there is nothing of which any member can complain. Formerly the officers who were connected with elections were named in the law itself. Some of those might sympathise with the Opposition, and some of them with the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. If there was a disposition to go wrong, if there was any bias influencing the

officers in one direction, there might be a bias influencing another officer elsewhere in the opposite direction. The possibility of bias being exercised on both sides had thus a tendency to prevent any such bias being exhibited, in most cases. Now, at the present time, the Ministers advise the appointments of returning officers. These officers are creatures of the Government, and it is, therefore, all the more necessary that those who are in opposition to the Government should watch with attention the conduct of these officers; it is all the more necessary that the gentlemen who are elected on the Opposition side should insist upon the law as it stands, being strictly obeyed, for their own protection. I know that the hon. First Minister, when I first moved for this return, was disposed to question my statement that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or any of the returning officers, had been guilty of dereliction of duty. Now, I will just mention that in my own case the returning officer delayed the return for eight days, and after it was received the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery delayed the gazetting of that return for twenty-three days, so that, in fact, the time within which it was possible to petition against my return, was extended thirty-one days beyond the time fixed by the law, if the law itself had been obeyed. Now, I say that it never was intended, the law never contemplated, that the members of the House should stand in this respect upon a footing of inequality, that it should be in the power of the Government, or of its friends, to contest elections on this side of the House, in a large number of cases, after the time had gone by, or after it was possible to file petitions against hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. The law with regard to corrupt practices fixes and limits the period within which petitions may be filed. It does so for a purpose. The law does not expect in the conduct of an official, any more than in any other case, an ideal perfectability. It seeks to discourage corrupt practices. It assumes that if corrupt practices exist, they will, to some extent, be notorious; and therefore it provides that if action is taken it must be taken within a certain limited period of time. It is not intended vindictively to pursue a member because here or there a wrong may be done, or the law may have been departed from or disregarded by some over-zealous supporter, as long as the general results of the elections have not been affected by what has been done. But if it is in the power of any officer indefinitely to protract that period of time within which action may be taken, by refraining from returning the candidate, or by withholding his name from the *Gazette*, then it is possible for him to prolong the time, to enter into minute enquiry with a view of hunting up evidence which may be technically sufficient to unseat the member. It may be that he has time to take all the necessary steps to enable him to file a petition, and thus on account of the improper conduct on the part of the officers who are not officers of the Administration, though appointed by the Administration, the members on both sides of the House may stand in a wholly different position. That was not the intention of the law. Then the First Minister said: "There was no disadvantage in having your name omitted from the *Gazette* for an indefinite period of time; on the contrary, it was rather an advantage to a public man to get time for the feeling that was evoked during the election excitement to cool down, and the probability was that petitions in those cases would be abandoned." It is very extraordinary that the position of the Government is altogether against such a notion—I had almost said the conduct of the Government, for I can scarcely believe that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery adopted the course he did without consultation with or any advice from any member of the Administration, and I am more confirmed in this view by the actual position of the First Minister himself, with respect to this matter, not only by what was done, but by what was omitted to be done, not only by the promptness with which

the law was obeyed in one instance, but by the fact that it was slightly disregarded in another. I find that the First Minister was returned for Kingston on March 4th; he was gazetted on March 5th. I am assuming in these particulars that the statement brought down to the House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is correct. I find that the Minister of Militia was returned on the 11th and gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Finance was returned on the 11th—or his return was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 11th—and he was gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Agriculture was returned on the 9th and gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Justice and the Postmaster General were severally returned on the 8th and gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Interior were returned on the 9th and gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Public Works was returned on the 5th and gazetted on the 12th. The Minister of Customs was returned on 16th and gazetted on 19th. The Secretary of State was gazetted the same week he was returned. So that there is not a gentleman sitting on the Treasury benches who was not gazetted within the week in which he was returned, such being according to the provisions of the law. Now, the First Minister and his colleagues certainly exhibited very extraordinary courage if it be true that the danger of being petitioned against was increased on account of the promptness with which they were gazetted. But even if this were the case, in their case the law was but complied with. The law says that it is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on receipt of the return to gazette the member as returned. But the qualifying words are "in the next ordinary issue of the *Gazette*." But, apart from those words, the construction is immediate action. I find the First Minister was returned for a second constituency. He was thus returned on 4th March, just as he was for Kingston on that date. Somehow or other in that case the gazetting of the right hon. gentleman was delayed until 12th March; that is to say, one *Gazette* was omitted, and instead of having his election entered in the next *Gazette* it did not appear until the week following. I suppose every hon. gentleman knows something of the party divisions in the county of Carleton, and are aware that the hon. gentleman's party is overwhelmingly strong in that constituency, I do not know, but I suppose, the hon. gentlemen did not even hold a meeting in that constituency after the issue of the writ, that he did not feel much in danger of being unseated, and that there was not much danger of his being petitioned against even though the law was disregarded in a single instance by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. So that when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received his instructions, if he had such instructions, to disregard so far as regards hon. gentlemen on this side, there was some advantage in his being able to say that in even one instance, and that of the First Minister, the gazetting was delayed for a single week. So we find the First Minister the only member of the Cabinet who was elected to a second seat in this House, and that the announcement of his return for Carleton was omitted from the *Gazette* a single week. That fact goes to confirm the impression which the fact has made upon my mind, and I think will make upon the minds of hon. members, that the Government were not altogether ignorant of what was being done by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I am inclined to think that if the Secretary of State and hon. gentlemen opposite had had the frankness to answer the question which I put to them a few days ago, perhaps the Secretary of State would have been able to tell us how it was that over a hundred members on that side were gazetted as the law directs, and that, out of ninety and over on this side, only fifteen were gazetted as required by law. We would be able to know why the law was in this respect so flagrantly disregarded, that the deliberation and design manifested, about which

there can be no doubt, admit of no explanation but one—that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery deliberately withheld the names of hon. members on this side from being gazetted immediately after they were returned. The House must bear in mind that ministerial pressure is no excuse for the flagrant disregard of public duty by a public officer. The rule of municipal and constitutional law in this particular is wholly different from what prevails with respect to political offences against a foreign State. A citizen of one country, if he commits a crime against another Government or subjects of another country, and if his act is assumed by his own State, it ceases to become his offence, but becomes the offence of the Government of the country to which he belongs. There is no such rule applicable to the conduct of public officers. The law imposes upon them certain duties. They owe obedience, not to the Ministers or to the parties who appointed them, but to the law of the land; and while they may have accomplices in their crime and wrongdoing, the fact they have accomplices is no defence whatever for the commission of the offence on their part. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is just as responsible, his conduct is not less offensive and not less contrary to law, because the Secretary of State may have advised him, than if he had acted wholly on his own motion. Now, let me call the attention of the House to this gazetting of members. I take the first general week, leaving out those members who were returned by acclamation, and I find that in the week, up to Saturday, there were returned on the 5th one Tory and two Reformers; one Tory and one Reformer were gazetted in the *Gazette* of next week. On Monday the 7th, sixteen members were returned—eleven Tories and five Reformers. In the *Gazette* of the Saturday following all the Tories were gazetted and but one of the five Reformers. On Tuesday there were fifteen Tories and eleven Reformers returned. In the *Gazette* of the Saturday following the whole of the fifteen Tories were gazetted and but two of the five Reformers. On Wednesday there were sixteen Tories and four Reformers returned, and on the Saturday following fourteen Tories and one Reformer were gazetted. On Monday there were six Tories and five Reformers returned, and in the *Gazette* of the Saturday following six Tories and not one Reformer were gazetted. On Friday, the day preceding the issue of the *Gazette*, eight Tories and ten Reformers were returned, and there were five Tories, and no Reformer, gazetted. For the week there were fifty-seven Tories and thirty-seven Reformers returned, and of the fifty-seven Tories fifty-two were gazetted, while of the thirty-seven Reformers but five were gazetted. So much for that week. Taking the week following, I find that on the Saturday there were nine Tories and sixteen Reformers returned, and there were nine Tories and three Reformers gazetted the next Saturday. There was a whole week, and there was the same deliberate omission of the names of the Reformers whose names had been received from the *Gazette* of the following week. On Monday sixteen Tories and seven Reformers were returned, and sixteen Tories were gazetted on the Saturday following. On Tuesday there were two Tories and two Reformers returned, and two Tories and one Reformer were gazetted. On Wednesday two Tories and one Reformer were returned, and two Tories and no Reformers gazetted the Saturday following. On Thursday and Friday one Tory was returned on each day, and both were gazetted. For that week thirty-two Tories and twenty-nine Reformers were returned, and thirty-two Tories and but ten of the twenty-nine Reformers were gazetted. Then, for the next week—I need not go over each day—five Tories were returned and seven Reformers, while the five Tories were gazetted and not one Reformer. The names of those Reformers were not only omitted from that *Gazette*, but the majority of them were omitted from the *Gazette* of the next week; and it was not until the third and

Mr. MILLS,

sometimes the fourth week that they were gazetted. Now, there is no excuse for such conduct, and there is a certain, easy, obvious explanation. No one can have the slightest doubt as to the motives by which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was actuated, and no one can have any doubt as to the motives which actuated those who advised and impelled him on in this course in opposition to the law and in violation of his oath of office. Now, Sir, I need not go further into detail, by way of justifying the motion I have made. I would now ask the attention of the House to the misconduct of certain returning officers. I find, for instance, that if the return brought down to this House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is correct, the return of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) was delayed thirty-two days by the returning officer. I find that the return of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Mallory) was delayed thirty-six days, the return of the hon. member for East Peterboro' (Mr. Lang) was delayed for thirty-three days. The return of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was delayed for twenty-one days, and the return of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was delayed thirty-seven days. Now, in these cases there is clearly a gross violation of duty on the part of the returning officers. I understood from the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that the returning officers respectively assure them that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has brought down a false return, as far as they are concerned, and therefore, in these cases, it is all the more necessary that an investigation should be had into the conduct of the returning officers in these cases, and the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The law makes the duty of these officers perfectly clear, and it provides that where they have grossly neglected their duty they shall be liable to punishment. And, Sir, if the facts which I have brought under the attention of the House are at all sustained, then I think it is clearly the duty of the Administration to dismiss the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery from the office which he now holds. By his conduct in this matter, by his withholding from the *Gazette* the names of certain members who were elected, contrary to the direction of the law; by his setting at defiance the law, and his disregard of his oath of office and the obligations which the holding of that office has imposed on him, shows himself wholly unworthy of the office which he holds—wholly unworthy of public confidence. There is, perhaps, no officer connected with an election about whose conduct there is less room for excuse. Sir, his duties are light, although they are important. There is nothing in the world to hinder him from being ready to gazette the members who are regularly returned. If there is anything irregular or wrong in the return, then he will, upon enquiry, be able to show that; and I say it is impossible that such a statement can be true, as that there were mistakes and errors made by the returning officers who were employed in constituencies which returned members to this side, but that there were no mistakes made by returning officers who returned members to the other side of the House. I find, Sir, that in upwards of seventy cases there have been delays, contrary to the law, in the gazetting of members who were elected on the Opposition side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This whole subject, was, I think, discussed fully on the previous motion of the hon. gentleman to have the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery brought to the Table to make the returns, so that it is scarcely worth while to go into the matter again. The hon. gentleman has only elaborated his former argument. In his motion, however, he refers to the returning officers as well as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It is quite clear, from the speech of the hon. gentleman, that most of his argument applies to the conduct of the Clerk of the

Crown in Chancery. He said in the first place that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be dismissed. If he should be dismissed, there is not the slightest necessity of having a committee enquire into his conduct; yet the hon. gentleman moves that the matter should be referred to the committee. Well, we have heard the indictment against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. We have not heard his reply, and I think we ought to have his reply before we condemn him or consider him as *quasi*-condemned by the House, by having this referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I therefore move:

That all after the word "That" be struck out, and the following substituted: "That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be ordered to address a letter to the Clerk of this House specifying the course adopted by him in gazettement the election returns of the last general elections, and his reasons for such course."

Mr. BLAKE. It does not seem to me that this is a fitting method of dealing with the question of my hon. friend's motion. In the first place, it proposes entirely to retrench that portion of the motion which deals with the question of the conduct of the returning officers. The hon. gentleman proposes that we shall not address ourselves to an enquiry upon that subject at all; and yet that is a very serious question indeed. My hon. friend stated that in England, where the duty of the returning officer was not at the time specified by statute in the precise manner in which it is in our country, where consequently his duty was reasonable diligence only, Parliament had intervened—not in the mild method which my hon. friend proposes, but in a much more summary method. A recent publication summarises the action of the Imperial Parliament on that subject:—

"The neglect to make a prompt return, and unnecessary delays in scrutinizing votes, have also been summarily punished. Prior to the Acts 10 and 11 William III, c. 7, as to the writs of vacancies, and George III, c. 84, as to writs at a general election, there was no statute regulating the time of the return of the writs by the returning officer. But these Acts are not applicable to elections in Canada, as the Dominion Elections Act fixes a precise time, and requires the returning officer 'immediately after the sixth day after the final addition by himself' (unless a recount is granted) 'to transmit his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that the candidate having the largest number of votes has been duly elected.' And in the case of a recount, he is, on receipt of a judge's certificate, to make his return, *i.e.*, forthwith. In administering its jurisdiction in this branch of parliamentary election, the House"—

That is, the Imperial House—

"has declared that a month's delay of the return was a neglect, and ordered the returning officer to be sent for as a delinquent."

And that was at a time when there was no specific provision but he was simply to use reasonable diligence.

"So also a week's delay, and in another a fortnight's delay have been held to be 'neglect.' And a delay of eighteen days caused the House to order the sheriff to attend and explain."

Here we have a provision that within six days, unless there is an order for a recount, the returning officer shall act; but the delays have been very great. I do not know how they are explicable in many cases, but in some of them they seem to be quite inexplicable. I find, for instance, that in the east riding of Elgin the returning officer delayed to act for twenty-one days after the election, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for eighteen days after he got the return, making a cumulative delay of forty-six days. In the East Northumberland election, if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery correctly states the date of the receipt of the writ, it took thirty-six days for the return to reach him from the returning officer, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery delayed acting for ten more, making a cumulative delay of forty-six days. In the case of the East York election, thirty-seven days elapsed between the date of the election and the receipt of the return by the Clerk, and the Clerk added to that delay—which one would have thought enough for all lawful and most unlawful purposes—nine days, making a

cumulative delay of forty-six days. My hon. friend who represents East York has been kind enough to place in my hands the certificate which, according to law, the returning officer was bound to give him, which is as follows:—

"I hereby certify that the member elected for the Electoral District of East York, in pursuance of the writ of election received by me, as having received the majority of votes lawfully given, is the hon. Alexander Mackenzie, of the city of Toronto, Esquire.

"As witness my hand this third day of March, A. D. 1887.

"JAMES ROBINSON,

Returning Officer, East York."

But according to the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery it was not until the 21st of March that he obtained from this returning officer the documents on that return of which he had given my hon. friend a certificate so early as the 3rd of March. Now, that is the case in which the evidence is not confined to the dates as given to us by the Clerk of the Crown, but we have cumulative evidence in the statement I have just made indicating there must have been gross and wilful neglect—at any rate, neglect which demands enquiry. In the case of the south riding of Brant, the return was delayed for thirty-nine days. I do not know whether it took the returning officer a very long time to count my hon. friend's majority.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have the returning officer's certificate dated the 9th March.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has the returning officer's certificate to himself, dated the 9th March, of his election, but it was not until the 2nd of April that the return reached the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, according to his statement; and it was not until the 9th that my hon. friend's election was gazetted. These officers, appointed by the Administration, are charged with the statutory duty of making these returns within six weeks. Of course, they are entitled to delay in the case of a recount; of course, if there is any irregularity which obliges them to obtain further evidence, they are entitled to delay, and they obtained it; and there may be some delay in the mailing or delivery in the course of a post. But we find in these cases delays altogether inexplicable, because all such suppositions are excluded entirely by the statements from my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), which he has just made in his place, that there was no question of recount or of any difficulty in getting the vote. I find that on the 3rd of March, in the one case, and on the 9th of March in the other case, the returning officer had completed his duty. My hon. friend has handed me this return:—

"I hereby certify that the member elected for the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Brant, in pursuance of the writ of election, dated the 17th day of January, A. D. 1887, and to me directed to return a member to serve in the House of Commons of Canada for the said electoral district, as having received the majority of votes lawfully given is William Paterson, of the city of Brantford, in the county of Brant, manufacturer.

"H. McK. WILSON,

Returning Officer.

"Dated at Brantford this 9th day of March, A. D. 1887."

So you find these two cases, and I dare say we may find some others also. It is, however, right to say that two hon. members I think, certainly one, mentioned the other day—and there may be further statements before the debate is over—that the information they had received from the returning officer was that the despatch of the return varied from the account given of it by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and that the return must have been received by him, in the course of the mail, at a considerably earlier period than he accounted for. There is thus the probability, in some cases, the possibility in some others, of the fault of the returning officer not being as great as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would make it out to be, because we find

the statement made that the fault lies at his door to a greater extent even than the faults applicable to himself in the way of gazetting, namely, the fault of making an erroneous return. I do not charge him with that more than the circumstances would imply, but is it not the fact that these returning officers were competent on the 9th of March to give in their returns, and should their returns not have reached the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery earlier than the 31st of March? Does not that demand enquiry? Yet the hon. gentleman's motion proposes to wave that away as a matter of no consequence, as a matter to which there is to be no remedy or application of the power of this House, with the view of enquiring into the causes which led to this apparent misconduct. The hon. gentleman's suggestion strikes me as one very unsatisfactory. It is proposed that a letter should be directed to be given by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, stating what his course was. But we know what his course was. Here it is. We have got the dates at which he received the various papers; we have the dates at which he gazetted the various returns; we have the only cases in which he had any correspondence with the returning officers, after he had received the returns—I think there were but two—and, therefore, in all the other cases there was nothing for him to do, for nothing he did, except open the papers which were received by him, according to his account, on that day. It was obvious, from the correspondence that appeared in the newspapers, and from an interview with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that the blame was to be put on the returning officers. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery said the returns were, in many cases, very defective, and that it would be a good thing if some of the returning officers were brought to the bar in consequence of neglect of duty, and so forth. It rather looked, from these statements in two papers of opposite politics, in identically the same terms, as if the delays, which had been so apparently flagrant, were caused by the fault of the returning officers. For that reason it was suggested that we should see in what cases there had been any correspondence, and what was the purpose of that correspondence. The Clerk of the Crown had the opportunity, and he availed himself of it to make a statement in two cases of the cause of delay, so that he leaves the whole question entirely untouched as regards the other cases. Assuming the accuracy of the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, assuming that he received the returns in all cases as late as he says—I have taken those four weeks which bore the stress of the election, from Saturday, 5th March, to Friday, 1st of April, in which there were about one hundred and eighty returns, according to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, received by him. Of these returns about ninety-eight were Conservatives, about four occupied more or less doubtful positions, and seventy-eight were Reformers. Now there were gazetted in the first *Gazette* ninety-three out of ninety-eight Conservatives, leaving only five Conservatives in respect of whom the law was violated when it affected hon. gentlemen opposite. I will not say absolutely violated, because, of course, there are some causes; for instance, the returns might be received very late Friday night, and it might be impossible to carry out the law, and that is the reason I began with Saturday, not taking the returns of the preceding Friday, because several, with no apparent favoritism, at that early period had been omitted. There may be some cases of this kind. But you will find it was possible for the Clerk of the Crown to gazette, and he did gazette, ninety-three out of the ninety-eight Conservatives returned in those four weeks. There were seventy-eight Reformers returned practically in the same four weeks, yet only fifteen was the Clerk of the Crown able to gazette according to law. Thus it appears that almost all the Con-

Mr. BLAKE.

servatives were gazetted and hardly any of the Reformers. Of course, we know there is such a thing as the doctrine of chance, but the doctrine of chance applied to 180 cases with these results proves to you there is more than chance in the matter. No man with a grave face can say—

Mr. BOWELL. The chances were against you.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, in this as in other things, because the dice were loaded.

Mr. MILLS. And by the First Minister.

Mr. BLAKE. No man can say that the law was incapable of being observed out of seventy-eight cases on the one side, while it was quite capable of being observed, and was observed, in ninety-three out of ninety-eight cases on the other side. But that is not all. As well as I can make it out, of these sixty-three Reformers about twenty-seven were held over one *Gazette*, and of those twenty-seven no less than twelve were held over for fourteen days; for, assuming the returns were received on Saturday too late to be gazetted in that week's *Gazette*, there was the whole week from that Saturday exhausted by the Clerk of the Crown; still he was unable to put them in the next Saturday, and consequently another week had to elapse, so that fourteen days, in the case of twelve of these men, was exhausted before the law was complied with in their cases. There were twenty-five Reformers held over for two *Gazettes*. Two of them sixteen days, four seventeen days, ten eighteen days, seven nineteen days, two twenty-one days, making really three *Gazettes*, the returns having been received on Saturday and gazetted Saturday three weeks later. That makes the twenty-five. There were nine Reformers held over for three *Gazettes*, seven of them twenty-two days' delay, one twenty-three, and one twenty-six. In all, the gazetting of sixty-three Reformers was postponed, and this large number of Reformers whom I have referred to were left over not for one day, or two days, or three days or four days, but postponed, as I have said, the shortest time of all but fifteen being fourteen days, and a very much longer time for all the remainder. Now, take the Province of Quebec. There, as well as I can make out—and I was not able to go over these papers a second time, and there may possibly be an error or two in them—there were twenty-five cases in which the gazetting was delayed. There were three cases in which the *Gazette* was passed over—one for ten days, one for twelve days, and one for fourteen days. There were seventeen cases in which two *Gazettes* were passed over, one for sixteen days, one for seventeen days, and fifteen for nineteen days, and there were five cases in which three *Gazettes* were passed over, in each case for twenty-two days; and in these cases in which the gazetting was delayed, twenty-three belonged to the Opposition and the other two were the cases of Nicolet and Montcalm, in regard to which the unfortunates who were delayed were not to be credited to our side of the House. So there were twenty-three to two. In New Brunswick there were seven cases of delay, five in which one *Gazette* was passed over, three by ten days, one by eleven days and one by twelve days; there was one in regard to whom two *Gazettes* were passed over by eighteen days—my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell)—and there was one in regard to whom three *Gazettes* were passed over by twenty-two days, my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). Of these seven cases, six belonged to the Opposition, and only one to the Government, and a number of them were very long delays. In Nova Scotia there were five cases of delay of fourteen days each, all being, according to this doctrine of chance, on the Reform side; and in Prince Edward Island there were four cases of delay of fourteen days each, all being also Reform. So, in the Maritime Provinces there were sixteen cases of delay, fifteen

being Reform and one Government; and in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces there were forty-one cases of delay, thirty-eight being Reform and three Conservative. In Ontario, as far as I can make out from the return, there were seventy-four members gazetted in those four weeks, about forty being Conservatives and thirty-four Reformers. Of the forty Conservatives, thirty-nine Tories were gazetted in the first *Gazette* and one in the second *Gazette*. Of the thirty-four Reformers, nine were gazetted in the first *Gazette*, twelve in the second, nine in the third, and four in the fourth *Gazette*. Thus you see that one Conservative was delayed out or forty, and twenty-five Reformers were delayed out of thirty-four. These are the facts as we find them in the statement made by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery himself, in a case where the law required him to take the return sent down to him, and gazette them in the ordinary form in the order in which he received them. I have shown you some seventy cases in which the law was not followed, and I have shown you that almost everyone of these cases affected the Reformers, and that hardly one affected the Conservatives. Therefore, there is an enormous number of instances of apparent breach of duty, and you have to add to that the fact that the breaches of duty affect one side almost exclusively, and affect the other side hardly at all. Surely that is a state of things which demands enquiry. The hon. gentleman says that we ought to get a letter from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Does he suppose that we will be satisfied with that letter or with that plea of the Clerk of the Crown, whatever it may be? Of course, if this is referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the first thing the committee would do would be to ask the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to come there and make his statement, but they would not be satisfied with his statement alone; they would cross-examine him; they would ask him the reason why, and the persons by whose command, connivance, or suggestion this was done; and that is the reason why the hon. gentleman moves his amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I hope that the amendment placed in your hands by the First Minister is not intended to indicate the character of the investigation which is to be had. If it be, and if it is carried out by the consent of this House, I think we may well despair of obtaining at the hands of the Government of the day anything in the shape of fair play. I do not know of any case which has come to my notice during my short parliamentary career which so imperatively demands and richly deserves investigation and action as the case in regard to the conduct of an officer which has been brought under our consideration to-day. I have already in this House, in regard to the returning officer in my riding, relieved him, as far as I knew the facts of the case, from any error in regard to the matter. I have nothing new to state in regard to his conduct in that election. I have been informed, however, and the returns show, that in many other constituencies, the conduct of the returning officers has been just as blameworthy as in my opinion is the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and I think that an investigation should be held. We have this gentleman here at our command to a certain extent, and that is a very different thing from the returning officers. I know that in my constituency our friends are well able to take care of the returning officer; and, if any palpable unfairness were shown by him, I think they would be able to take a shorter means of inflicting condign punishment than by bringing him to the Bar of the House. As far as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is concerned, he is an officer of this House, and is here. I suppose he is in the service of the Government, and that they can dismiss him or retain him in his office. If anything can be done by a public officer which deserves the immediate attention of

the Government in dismissing or retaining him, I think the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has shown clearly that he should be dismissed, and if the motion had been so framed I should have been better pleased with it. It has been said that his excuse was that the returning officers were at fault, and we know that he informed many of those who called on him for information that this was the case. Then he brought down a return to this House showing that in only two cases had he to call on the returning officer. He stated to the press that he had, in several cases, to write to these returning officers in order to get returns. Other cases are given by him in his statement which I believe will fall to the ground when they are investigated. We are asked to request the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to direct a letter to the Clerk of the House, giving explanations in regard to this matter. I have a letter from the Clerk of Crown in Chancery which I do not consider very satisfactory, and I do not believe that any other letters he may write will be very satisfactory. I will give the House the benefit of that which I have, and I think the House can judge from that whether we are likely to have a satisfactory explanation from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. After my election I waited very patiently until the 3rd April, and not having been gazetted at that date, I addressed a few lines to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to ask the reasons for delay. In reply he wrote me as follows:—

“OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY,

“OTTAWA, 5th April, 1887.

“DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of yesterday, I beg to state that the papers in Prince Edward, with those in other constituencies, had to be examined before I could gazette them, which, of course, takes considerable time, as they are voluminous. Prince Edward, with some others, will be gazetted on Saturday next.

“R. POPE,

“Clerk of Crown in Chancery.”

Well, Sir, I do not know that can be held as being very satisfactory, I do not know how these papers are very voluminous. If he had opened that package and taken out the writ, he would have found endorsed on the back of it these words:

“I hereby certify that the member elected for the electoral district of Prince Edward, in pursuance of the within writ, as having received the majority of votes, lawfully given, was John Milton Platt, of the town of Picton, in the county of Prince Edward, physician.

“GEORGE ALCORN,

“Returning Officer.”

This was the voluminous document which he said took several weeks to examine and report upon. I have further to say in regard to the assertion that a delay, such as occurred in my own particular case, was occasioned by dereliction of duty on the part of returning officers. I have here from the returning officer these words:

“I have had no communication with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery since the acknowledgment of receipt of the return, which receipt I showed you,” &c.

This was written on the 26th April. I now come to another part of the charge which I have to make against that gentleman. I said that not only has he, by delaying the gazetting, violated the law and endeavored to deprive certain members of this House of the chance of receiving fair play as compared with those on the opposite side, but, in excusing himself, he says that the returns are irregular, that these registered packages were not received here until several days after they were mailed. I informed the House on a previous occasion that I was in possession of proof of the fact that a registered package from my town was mailed on the 9th. I have since Sir, received from the post office authorities proof that it was mailed on the 9th, that it was despatched on the morning of the 10th, that it was received here on the evening of the 10th, and yet the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery brings down to this House a statement that he received it on the 14th.

Mr. BLAKE. Read your proof.

Mr. PLATT. The proof that I shall be most happy to read if I have the privilege of bringing this officer before a committee, will be found to be this: The inspector of the Post Office Department writes as follows:—

"The postmaster at Ottawa reports that registered parcel for Clerk of the Crown in Chancery from Picton, reached his office on the night of the 10th," &c.

I have a letter from the postmaster at Picton saying:

"Mr. S. Alcorn mailed a package after all mails were despatched on the 9th of March, and it went forward on the morning of the 10th March by Deseronto, billed on the Grand Trunk mail clerk going east," &c.

If anything more be needed I can read to you a letter from the returning officer stating that he showed me the Clerk of the Crown's acknowledgment of the receipt of the return. I have not that acknowledgment in my possession, but it can be had for the committee's information if necessary. When it was read to me I took this memorandum. He only read a short distance, and I said that was satisfactory, it was all I wished to know. And here is the memorandum I made:

"OTTAWA, 11th March, 1887.

"Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 9th instant, enclosing return," &c.

Now, Sir, I do not think that with such evidence before the House, we will be justified in simply asking for a letter from that officer. So far as I am concerned I believe him now to lie under the double charge of having purposely, as I believe, delayed the returns of many members, and in my case he gives the 14th as the date of the receipt, when he received it on the 11th. Why? Because that would pass it over until the next *Gazette*. If he received it on the evening of the 10th, or on the 11th, I should have been gazetted on the 12th. Five that were received on the 11th must have gone to the printing office on the 11th, and were gazetted on the 12th. We know that my return was received at this office on the evening of the 10th and was not gazetted on the 12th, and on the 12th of April when I left for the capital I did not know that I was gazetted. I ask if that is done in a spirit of fair play. If this officer is the only officer at fault, I want him punished. I want some recognition of the fact that we are living in a country where we expect British fair play. There are very many other gross instances of unfairness which can be proved before this House, but, as I said before, my own case appears to be of all the worst. Why, Sir, we find from the 12th of March, the date upon which I should have been gazetted, they had to the 9th of April, twenty-seven days; from the 22nd of February to the date of my being gazetted, was forty-seven days; and from the 22nd February, the date of the election, until the petition was filed against me, there were just seventy-five days. Now, I think, there are very many hon. gentlemen holding seats in this House who, after the excitement of filing petitions had arisen, and as each party was desirous of getting as many in chancery, so to speak, as possible, if their thirty days had not elapsed, would have been, a great many of them, in the same boat as myself, so far as election petitions are concerned. But, Sir, the result of this becoming known, I trust, will be to arouse a spirit and a feeling in the country in favor of fair play. So far as my own individual case is concerned, and this particular officer's conduct, I do not very much regret it, but I think for the credit of the country, and for the credit of this Parliament, it is very much to be regretted.

Mr. BURDETT. I believe I have also been singled out as a victim of this species of political rascality. I desire to enquire as to the conduct of the Clerk of Crown in Chancery. Either he or the mail service have been guilty of neglect in my case, and the result of that neglect is that I have to fight, and go to the trouble and expense of defending an election protest. I desire to say that the returning officer

Mr. PLATT.

in my own district was and is an honest man; he did his duty like an honest man, but I limit that declaration to the returning officer personally. I have his letter in which he stated that my return was sent forward to Ottawa on the 8th of March. Now, in due course of mail, it would reach here on the morning of the 9th, and I am quite satisfied that it did reach here on the morning of the 9th. I desire an investigation, and I challenge proof upon that fact, and I believe I will be able to prove, if the receipts in the post office are not besmeared with ink, so that we cannot see when these men who get the returns, signed the receipts therefor, it will be found that my return reached here on the morning of the 9th. Yet the Clerk of the Crown states in that paper which he brings down here as a return, and which, probably, is about as truthful as any letter that he may sign—that they did not reach here until the 12th, so that my return was not gazetted until the 19th. Now, I say that is a state of affairs that no hon. member, be he Grit or Tory, will tolerate, and if it is tolerated by members of this House, it will not be tolerated by the people of this country. Now, the result of it is this: there was no trouble found in gazetting the member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson)—no trouble found in his case whatever; and it was well known that if his election was protested, he, in all probability, would run the same, if not greater, risk of being unseated than myself. If the evidence could be at all relied upon we were certain to unseat the member for West Hastings, and he and his friends were desirous that no protest should be put in against him. But his time for a protest expired much sooner than mine, much sooner than it would otherwise have expired but for this gazetting business; and therefore he and some of his friends said to me that if no protest was put in against him, they would use their best endeavors to prevent a protest against me. I desire to say that I acquit the member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) and his friends of any dishonorable action; I believe they honestly wished to carry out what they promised, and if that hon. member had had his way, and if the leading men of the Conservative party in Belleville had had their wishes carried out, there would have been no protest entered against me. But the point is here: I firmly believe that if my return had been gazetted when it should have been done, no protest would have been lodged, because a protest was lodged on the afternoon of the last day. Had that extra week not been given, no protest, I say, would have been lodged, because it is evident from what I can learn that the decision to file a protest was not reached until the Saturday previous to the Monday on which it was filed. This is not only unfair but it is unmanly for an officer of this Government and of the Crown to delay returns in order to give one party an advantage over the other. If the Conservative party can beat us on a fair and open field let them do so; but this striking below the belt, this striking a man when he is down, is an unmanly and cowardly way of attacking any man either personally or politically.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I have a little grievance which I desire to present to this House in regard to the matter under consideration. When the subject was up for consideration before I said nothing in regard to my case, because I was not then in a position to speak for lack of possessing the necessary information. I have, however, received a communication from the returning officer in my riding, who is a man of respectability and honor, stating that he mailed the return on 9th March; but I find by the return of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that he did not receive the return until 26th March, seventeen days after the time when the returning officer registered the letter containing it in the post office near where he lives. Feeling that some mistake might have arisen, or

that the return might have had to be sent back for amendment or for completion, I took the opportunity of writing to the returning officer to ascertain that the return was made properly and at the time stated by him in his letter to me. I received this letter from him a few days ago :

" GORRIE, 25th April, 1887.

" To PETER MACDONALD, M. P.,
" OTTAWA.

" SIR,—In reply to your request of the 23rd, in reference to the return of election made by me, I have to say that the writ of election with all the matter pertaining to the election was by me mailed at the Gorrie post office and registered as required by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, addressed to him on 9th day of March, 1887. A copy of your return as M.P. was sent to you at the same time. Hoping this reply will be satisfactory to you,

" Yours Respectfully,

" THOMAS K. BODDY,

" Returning Officer for East Huron."

I find on looking up the return submitted to the House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that the return for my county purports not to have been received by him until the 26th, that is to say seventeen days after it was said to have been registered at the Gorrie post office; and if it was registered on the 9th it would certainly have arrived here on the 10th, and my name should have been gazetted on the 12th. But the *Gazette* of that date was published and my name did not appear. The *Gazette* of the 19th, also of the 26th, appeared without my name, and it was not until the 2nd April that my return was gazetted, no less than twenty-one days after the return was made. The hon. member for Bothwell said that probably a great deal of this want of punctuality arose from the returning officers. It is, however, plainly seen by the letter I have read that the returning officer for my county discharged his duty efficiently and made his return in accordance with law; and therefore the fault, wherever it lies, does not lie with the returning officer. In fact, I judge that the fault is not entirely with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; because from an answer to a question propounded to the First Minister the inference must be drawn that there has been some tampering with that official. It is impossible to see what object the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would have in gazetting the names in such a way as to favor the Conservatives and injure the Reformers, unless he had received some instruction from a high source, the source from which his office comes. When the First Minister said he refused to answer the question as to whether the Government had a conference with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or not, the only natural inference to be drawn was that they had given instructions to him. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. members on this side of the House, whether they consider such conduct as right and just in the interests of the affairs of this country, and whether it is right and proper to adopt an amendment so as to prevent an investigation by which the blame could be placed on the shoulders of the persons who are actually responsible. If the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery were brought before the Committee on Privileges and Elections he could be interrogated, and in order to shield himself from the imputation of acting dishonestly, he would, no doubt, under oath, give testimony as to whether he had received instructions from the Ministers or not, and then the country would see who were the parties to blame in this matter. I, therefore, hope that for the honor and dignity of this House, hon. members will rise above politics and vote for a full and complete investigation of this scandal.

Mr. MALLORY. It is evident from remarks of hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that something wrong has occurred either in the management of the elections, or in the returns which the returning officers have made to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or in the action of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery himself, or possibly in con-

nection with the instructions which Government may have given their servants in connection with the conduct of the elections which recently took place. It is incumbent upon this House that some investigation into the serious charges made should take place. If the Government whose servant, particularly the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is, and to whom the returning officers owe their appointments, have through their officers conducted the elections properly, it is only fair to this House and the country that this fact should be known, and it is unfair to them that any imputation should hang over them in this respect. If the returning officers have performed their duty properly and faithfully in the public interest it is only right that they too should be cleared of any imputation of wrong-doing. If, again the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has discharged his duties properly it is only right that he should have full opportunity to clear himself from any charge made against him. So, the only proper course for this House to take is to refer the whole matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in order that the committee might enter upon a careful examination of the parties, under oath, and ascertain just where the instructions came from, if any instructions were given to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and ascertain exactly what instructions were given to the returning officers, if any instructions except those which the law provides, were given to them. I believe that in some instances the blame cannot be placed upon any one particular set of shoulders. I honestly believe that there has been a preconcerted scheme, in order that the returns should be delayed by the returning officers and by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. So far as my own constituency is concerned the election was held on the 22nd of February; the six days which the law allows to make the return had nearly expired when, on the evening of the sixth day my opponent applied for a recount. The application was granted, and it took from that time until the 17th of March to get the decision of the judge in reference to the recount. I do not wish it to be understood that I blame the county judge in any way for the manner in which he conducted the recount, for I believe he conducted it fairly and honestly, though there was some unavoidable delay. On the 17th his decision was given with regard to the recount, and the declaration was made. On the 18th I received a notice from the returning officer that my return was made on the 18th of March, and, if that was the case, the return should have been mailed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the evening of the 18th. But such was not the case—why, I cannot tell. I should be sorry indeed to cast any imputation on the returning officer, because I believe that, unless he had instructions from some outside source, he would have mailed his return promptly, for on the day of declaration he informed me that he had only six days in which to make his return, and that if a recount was asked for—as they stated that day that it would—immediately the decision of the judge was given he must mail his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. But what do we find? Although he gave me notice of my return on the 18th, that return was not mailed from the post office until the evening of the 29th. Why should this long delay occur, unless there were instructions from some outside source? The returning officer was a lawyer himself; he knew the law, and he told me what the law was when I asked him. As I stated, I have a letter from him, and I have also a letter from the post office authorities at his post office, showing that the return was not mailed until the evening of the 29th. Now, Sir, in this case the mails were not at fault, because I find from the return of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that this particular return was received on the 30th. But I find also that, instead of its being gazetted in the next *Gazette*, which was issued on the 2nd day of April, it was delayed for some mysterious reason. What that

reason was I cannot tell. Possibly it was the great press of work in the office of the Clerk of the Crown, although, as most of the returns were in at that time, I cannot see why he should have been pressed so much in this particular case. I find that on the 2nd of April a *Gazette* was issued, but my name did not appear. I find that on the 5th my name did not appear, but on the 9th day of April my return was gazetted. Now it appears to me, and I think it must appear to every member of this House as well as to the country, that there had been some peculiar instructions of some kind issued to the officers who conducted the election. If not, why is it that that returning officer, who knew his duty and who knew the law and all the circumstances in connection with it, should have withheld the making of the return from the 17th or the 18th—the day on which he gave me notice of my return—until the 29th? And why is it that a return which was received here by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 30th, was withheld from the *Gazette* until the 9th of the next month? I think it is due, not only to the Ministry themselves, but to these returning officers who have delayed their returns, as well as to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that this matter should be fully investigated, so that members of this House and the country at large may know exactly where to attach the blame, if blame there is. The law is plain; evidently some one has violated it, and in my case both the returning officer and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery have violated the law. If they have a reasonable excuse for acting as they did, it is but right that we should hear what that excuse is, and the only way of hearing it is to bring them before the Privileges and Elections Committee, so that we may hear on oath what they have to say in defence of their action in this matter. I believe that this is one instance among many where the authorities in power have used the power they have in their hands, contrary to the law and contrary to honor, to defeat their opponents. I cannot easily forget the very humorous remark that the First Minister made, when this matter was being discussed in the House before. He said it was of no importance whatever, that gentlemen ought to be glad their returns were delayed, because the heat of the contest would have passed away, and of course protests would not be entered so frequently, protests were not so apt to be entered, as if the gazetting had taken place in accordance with the law. But how is it, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has conclusively shown, that every one of these hon. gentlemen opposite was gazetted as rapidly as possible? What mysterious influence has been brought to bear upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and upon the mail service of this country, as well as upon the returning officers appointed to conduct the late election, which made them all contribute their share to secure the early gazetting of these particular gentlemen. The only conclusion that can strike one is that all, like one hon. gentleman who spoke the other evening, rushed as rapidly as possible to the returning officer, and insisted on the returns being made as fast as they could, in order that the time for entering a protest might elapse. I believe that some mysterious influence of this kind has been brought to bear on these officers. In my own instance I do not know whether a protest has been entered, because to-day is the last day upon which a petition can be presented. But a gentleman wrote me on Saturday night that there would likely be a protest. But whatever may be the fact, I have to say this: that although the court concluded its labors on the 17th of March, one week from that day my opponents held their convention, when they concluded there was no evidence against me, and that they should not enter a protest. But they have had ever since that time to investigate matters, and I find that a few days ago my opponent was here. Whether he came of his own accord, or was summoned, I cannot say, but it is rather a strange coin-

Mr. MALLORY.

idence that the great majority of the defeated Tory candidates in the late elections have made flying visits to this city of late, and whether my opponent has been "loaded up the other way" in order to push the protest, I cannot say. I say it is only in accordance with justice, fair play and that loyalty to our country and to our constituencies, which hon. gentlemen opposite are so prone to ask from the people of this country, that a full and free investigation of this matter should take place, so that we may know where the blame lies, if there is blame.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). This case seems to me to be so plain, and the duty of the House so clear, that I thought there would be no opposition to the motion which has been presented by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I was therefore very much surprised when the hon. leader of the House proposed this amendment. Now, Sir, what are the facts? A charge is brought against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that he has failed to perform the duties devolving upon him, and a motion is made to refer the whole matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in order that the charge may be investigated. To my mind that is a course which ought to be adopted without a moment's hesitation. Before that committee witnesses can be examined, and the matter can be investigated more fully and freely than anywhere else. What did we do a few days ago? It was charged against a returning officer in New Brunswick that he had failed to do his duty. The matter was referred to that committee, and what does the committee do? It reports back to this House that whereas it appears that irregularities have been committed, that officer should be sent for and brought all the way from New Brunswick to appear before this House to explain his conduct. In that case the resolution merely says that the irregularities appear to have been committed, whereas in this case there is no question at all that gross irregularities have been committed, and that on the admission of the officer himself. Therefore it is the bounden duty of this House to investigate these charges; it is due to the good reputation and character of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that that should be done. Therefore I hope that the matter will be referred to the committee.

Mr. BOYLE. It may seem presumptuous in me, a young member, to pronounce an opinion on any matter of this sort; but it seems to me that the time of the House is unnecessarily taken up in raking over every petty election scandal in the endeavor to account for the defeat our friends opposite sustained in the late elections. When this matter was first brought before the House by the hon. member for Bothwell, he drew a comparison between the conduct of the partisan returning officers, so-called, appointed by this Government, and the judicially inclined returning officers appointed by the Ontario and other Provincial Governments in their elections. Will it surprise hon. gentlemen opposite to know that whether by accident or otherwise, an almost similar state of affairs has prevailed in connection with the returns to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the Ontario elections. It is true, the law is somewhat different in Ontario. There the time for entering a protest is not determined by the time the gazetting takes place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYLE. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I will come to the point directly. The Ontario law states that the returning officer shall make his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and twenty-one days after that shall be the limit for entering a protest. What are the facts regarding the Ontario returns? The *Ontario Gazette* shows that on the very day the elections came off, the 28th of December, one Conservative and one Reformer were returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as elected; on the 31st of the same month, one Conservative and one Reformer were returned; so that up to that point we had

tolerably fair play; but immediately afterwards the returns begin to change. On the 1st of January one Reformer was returned and no Conservative; on the 3rd of January three Reformers were returned and no Conservative; on the 4th of January, one Conservative and five Reformers; on the 5th of January, five Conservatives and ten Reformers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was it a daily *Gazette*?

Mr. BOYLE. If the hon. gentleman knew what he was talking about he would know that these returns were made to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery from day to day, and they were published in the *Gazette* at the end of the week. We find, therefore, that in the first week eight Conservatives and twenty-one Reformers had been returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as elected. In the second week they received fair play; but that was the average week, and it does not count. In the third week the returns were as follows: On the 17th one Conservative and no Reformer, on the 18th three Conservatives and one Reformer, on the 19th one Conservative and no Reformer, on the 20th no Conservative and one Reformer, and on the 21st one Conservative and one Reformer; or in all for that week six Conservatives and three Reformers; so that the deficiency which occurred in the first week's returns was made up in the last week. In other words the injustice which has been charged against this Government is also chargeable according to the *Ontario Gazette* against the Ontario Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Take the numbers for the second week.

Mr. BOYLE. That is the average week, and, therefore, it does not tell. The point I wish to make is this, that in the first week eight Conservatives were gazetted and twenty-one Reformers; in the second week eighteen Conservatives and twenty-nine Reformers were gazetted—that is the average week; and in the third week six Conservatives and three Reformers, thus showing that an undue proportion of Reformers is included in the earliest returns and an undue proportion of Conservatives in the latest.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think it would have been better if the hon. member for Monck had left the question of the fairness of the Ontario Government alone. We find by his own statement that the gazetting in that case was fair and honest. Can we say as much for the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite? Can we say that their conduct was above suspicion—that they acted fairly in dealing with the members of the Opposition? The hon. member for Monck ought to have known that in the Local Legislature there is a very large majority of Reformers, and had it not been for the iniquitous gerrymandering of this Government we would have had the same proportion of majority here as we have in Ontario. I have no grievance to offer against my returning officer. He is a fair, straightforward man; but what I do complain of is the delay, for which he was in no way responsible, in the gazetting of my election. I was not gazetted until the 9th of April, and in fact I and some others who had started on our way down here, did not know whether we would be permitted to enter the folds of this Parliament or not. But I found after I started that I was gazetted. I was one of those held over eighteen days after the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery stated he had received the certificate from the returning officer of the 12th March declaring me elected. Why this long delay? Why did it occur? There is no doubt that a gentle hint had come from my opponent in the county of Elgin. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought they were going to carry that riding without any difficulty. One of the members of the Government said: Be sure and defeat that Wilson; we do not want him down here, he makes too much noise. No doubt the desire was expressed by an opponent that my gazetting should be delayed as long as possible, because we knew well that I was one of those who

believed in running an election purely, fairly and honestly, and that he would have great difficulty in finding even that any of my supporters had done anything that they ought not to have done, and that he would probably be unable, under any circumstances, to petition against me. It has been said by the First Minister, and by hon. gentlemen opposite: Oh! it is better to be late; while the heat and excitement of the election are great, you will have more protests perhaps than now. Do hon. gentlemen opposite preach and practice alike? Do they act upon what they recommend to be the best course? Not at all. They preach one doctrine and practice another. I have no hesitation in saying that if hon. gentlemen opposite would pursue the course laid out by my hon. friend from Bothwell, they would pursue the right one. The hon. the First Minister has a good deal to say in the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Why does he not take the opportunity here of saying that this committee is the proper tribunal to try this case, and that we should not make a charge against a servant of the House without giving him an opportunity to vindicate his character? Is he going to allow that servant merely to send in the reason why he acted in this matter without giving him the opportunity of going before the Election Committee and explaining everything connected with the matter. Or, is it possible this servant of the Government knows more than the leader of the Government desires should be known? Is the First Minister afraid that a cross-examination would bring out something which he is anxious should not be known? Is there a sinister motive behind his conduct? If there be not, the hon. the First Minister will at once, as it is his duty to do, give that servant an opportunity to show that he, at least, is not responsible for the wrongs afflicted on the members of the Opposition. Why should the First Minister have any fear if the Government has done nothing wrong? If it is purely by chance or by accident, as the First Minister states, that these delays in gazetting occurred, why should the Government hesitate for a moment to allow the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to go before the committee composed of a majority of their own friends. Their hesitation will produce the impression from one end of the Dominion to the other, that it was not all by chance this gazetting took place. If the Government refuse to allow a fair investigation to be had into this matter, they will lead the country to believe that they have been using loaded dice, and were bound to be sustained by means foul or fair. What statement can be expected from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery? Supposing he sends a statement here, I must say that I, for one, judging from the manner in which he gazetted my return, could have no confidence in any statement he would make. It is only in a fair, careful, thorough investigation that I could have confidence. Should the Government persist in refusing an investigation, the country will feel that the acts of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will not bear light. The country will hold them responsible for striking below the belt, and taking undue advantage of their opponents. Such conduct is un-British, I was about to say cowardly, on their part.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member who brought this matter before the House mentioned North Wellington and the action of the returning officer in connection with that constituency, which I represent. Personally, I have no complaint to make with regard to the returning officer. I believe that he endeavored to discharge his duty faithfully. I hold in my hand a certificate he gave me after the close of the election:

"HARRISTON, 7th March, 1887.

"I hereby certify that the member-elect for the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Wellington, in pursuance of the writ in writ, as having the majority of votes lawfully given, is James McMullen, of the town of Mount Forest, in the county of Wellington."

My return is marked as having been received at the city of Ottawa on the 15th March, though this certificate is dated the 7th March. I feel quite certain that the returning officer, after the required number of days had expired during which he was required by law to hold the papers for the purpose of a recount, forwarded them to Ottawa. It only takes a day for a letter to reach Ottawa from Harriston, so I think those papers must have been received here before the 15th. The returning officer told me he should return the papers the moment the time fixed by law expired. I believe he did so. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery says that the papers were received here on the 15th March. I was not gazetted until the 2nd April. The Clerk of the Crown kept them over not only for one Saturday, but for two, and it was not until the third that my constituency was gazetted as having returned me as its representative. From the discussion that has taken place in connection with this matter, and from the evidence which has been already presented to this House and will go to the country, those people who are unbiassed in their political views can come to no other conclusion than that an arrangement has been privately and secretly entered into, to keep back the gazettement of Reform members, so as to give the Conservatives all the opportunity possible of entering protests after they themselves had escaped being protested. The first Minister, in his reply to the hon. gentleman who brought this question before the House, in the first place, said that the probabilities were that, if the returns remained over for some time, until the heat of political passion had worn off, they might not be protested, but if they were gazetted immediately, and while the people retained the feelings of bitterness which had arisen during the contest, possibly a protest might be entered. From that view of the case, he would lead us to suppose that the members of the Government were all anxious to have protests entered against themselves. If that be the position, we must conclude that they all courted protests, because almost all of them were gazetted first, while most of the Reformers were left to the last. I have no such idea. I am satisfied that they had a very different intention from that. I am satisfied that they were a little scared at the close of the contest on the 22nd, and that they feared that things would be a little tighter than they had expected, and so they kept back the gazettement of members on the Opposition side of the House, and possibly it might have resulted in a number of gentlemen not being gazetted at all if the Government had not found that they were going to have a small majority after all. I am satisfied, from the evidence which has been brought before the House, from the exposures which have been made, that no reasonable-minded man would come to any other conclusion than that the Government were disposed, if it were necessary in their own interest, to put off the gazettement of a number of Reformers until after the House had met, until after the Speaker was elected, and possibly until after the House had risen for the first time; so that in some way or other they might defeat the intention of the electors and might prevent members coming here to represent the constituencies for which they had been elected. It is not at all creditable to the hon. gentlemen that these means should have been resorted to. It shows a spirit of unfairness which is very much to be deplored in a Canadian Parliament. While we differ in our views on a great number of questions, while we go to the polls and fight before our constituents, and while we seek the suffrages of the people on the ground of the different views held by us on political matters, it is necessary that when the verdict is given it should be carried out; and, when the people decide that a certain individual, holding

Mr. McMULLEN.

certain political views, should be their representative in this House, it is right that their views should not be interfered with, or the man whom they have chosen prevented from taking his seat, or placed at a disadvantage when he does so. We know, from the number of protests that have been entered, that if in any case a Conservative has been protested, then a Reformer has been also protested, in many cases out of a feeling of bitterness. Taking the counties which lie in the neighborhood of my constituency, what do we find? We find that the return from North Grey was received here on the 15th, the same day as my return was received, the same day that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery admits that he received the return for North Wellington. The member for North Grey was gazetted on the 19th March, while, for some reason best known to himself, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not gazette me until the 2nd April. Then take East Grey, the county by which mine is bounded on the east. The return from that constituency was received on the 14th, and the member was gazetted on the 19th. There was nothing wrong with those papers. There was evidently no necessity to make any enquiry into the papers from East Grey, because that hon. member was gazetted on the 19th, but my papers were received only the day after, and I was not gazetted until the 2nd April. Then again take the case of Centre Wellington. That was formerly represented by Dr. Orton. It is now represented by another gentleman. The papers in connection with Centre Wellington the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery says he received on the 4th, but he did not gazette the member until the 26th; he could not find room for him in the *Gazette* of the 19th. Then take the case of Cardwell, the constituency of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, which is also on the east of me, touching my constituency. His returns were received here on the 9th and he was gazetted on the 12th. Then take the case of Peel, a constituency which is also quite close to me. The returns from Peel were received on the 9th and the member was gazetted on the 12th. We notice that all the Conservative constituencies in my immediate section were, in every single instance, gazetted immediately after the returns were received. There was not a single instance in which a Conservative return was left over, while in many cases the Reform returns were held over for one, for two and even for three weeks. What does this all mean? It means this. Take the case of South Grey: it was received early in March and not gazetted until the 26th. Nearly three weeks elapsed from the time the papers connected with South Grey were received before the return was gazetted. Now, the meaning is this: If there had been a protest in North Grey, there would certainly have been one in South Grey, because there was plenty of time from the 15th to the 26th to work up the necessary evidence and file a protest against the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), if North Grey had been protested. Then take the case of Cornwall. If there had been a protest there it would have had to be filed before the 12th April. There was plenty of time up to the 2nd April to file a protest in North Wellington, and so on in all the constituencies around. It shows that the Government intended to have all the advantage in filing protests, and from the number that has been filed and the way which hon. gentlemen on this side have been treated, it is quite clear that was the intention. Take the case of the member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), which I think is the most glaring of all. We have evidence that the return was made at the proper time. He took the pains to enquire from the postmaster at home as to the date upon which these papers were mailed to Ottawa, and he also enquired at the Post Office Department here as to the date when they were received, and he ascertained that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the return four days

before he claimed to have received it. The remarkable thing is that these papers bear evidence of having arrived here and of having been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or some person on his behalf, four days before the date at which he states them to have been received. Now, I say that all these facts prove that, if necessity arose, the Government intended to take advantage of these delays. We went to the country under the disadvantage of the Franchise Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite expected that it would accomplish a great deal in their interest, and no doubt it did. But when the elections were close and there was some doubt as to the result, then they got ready to make this last move, in order, if possible, to prevent the will of the people from being made manifest. Now, I say that this man who is charged with this unfairness in the matter of gazetting the different returns, should either be allowed to appear before this House or before a committee of this House, in order to show whether he is guilty or not. Why, Sir, take the question of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that was put a few evenings ago, and take the answer that was given by the First Minister, and any fair-minded man will come to the conclusion at once that there has been some collusion between the Government, or some member of the Government, and that particular official. The question was as follows:

"Whether any member of the Ministry had any conversation, correspondence or communication of any kind, mediate or immediate, with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on the subject of gazetting the members elected to this House? If so, which member of the Government, and what was the nature of such correspondence, conversation or suggestion."

This question was put to the First Minister and he declined to answer it. He refused to give a reply. No doubt, if the Government had not really been guilty of collusion with this man, if they had had nothing at all to do with this unseemly and ridiculous business, why did not the First Minister get up and say so? What particular harm would there be in his saying the Government had no conversation or no interview with this officer? That would have cleared the skirts of the Government. But the First Minister could not do that, I presume. I suppose he felt it would be unwise and imprudent on his part to dare to load that official with the responsibility by saying that the Government had not had any conversation with him. Now, every one will come to the conclusion that the Government are responsible as well as the official for what has taken place. The official himself is undoubtedly responsible, because, no matter what influences may have been brought to bear on him, it was wrong for him to allow himself to be made a tool of by the Government for the time being. If he has permitted himself to be made a tool of, he does not deserve to occupy that distinguished position any longer, but he deserves, as implied in the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell, to be dismissed. Any man in an official position that will stoop to be guilty of any act such as undoubtedly that official must be guilty of in the course he has taken in connection with this gazetting, certainly deserves to be dismissed. If this House is to be truly representative of the people, we must have an election law carried out in a manner that will be creditable to ourselves, and give the people a controlling voice in this House. If we are not going to have that, if we are going to have a continued system of political trickery from year to year, then we shall have to bear with it until such time as the people rise in their might and put a stop to it. I hope there are enough people in this country who are fair-minded and honest, to put a stop to this system, that they will condemn it, and those who practice it. Now, Sir, an hon. gentleman referred to the returns made in the Ontario elections, and tried to offset the charge that is being made against the Dominion Government, by the Local Government returns. The two cases are not in point, and for this reason: In Ontario the time for filing petitions

dates from the time they are received, and not from the time they are published in the *Gazette*. When the return is received by the Clerk of the House, the time begins to run within which a petition has got to be filed. In the case of the Dominion, from the date on which the return is gazetted, the time begins to run within which a petition may be filed, consequently all the advantage is in the hands of those that were gazetted early, as against those who were gazetted late. Now, Sir, there is an amusing thing in this connection to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and that is in relation to the North-West returns. Up there the elections took place on the 15th March. The election returns for Alberta were received on the 4th April, and they were gazetted on the 9th. The first Saskatchewan return was received on the 9th April, and it was gazetted promptly on the 9th. The return from West Assiniboia was received on the 8th, and gazetted on the 9th. The return for East Assiniboia was received on 1st and gazetted on 2nd. There was no delay in any of those cases; the business was always put through promptly and there was not a minute's delay in the returns being placed in the hands of the Queen's Printer. The evasive answer given by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that the papers were voluminous and considerable investigation had to be made which caused delay in gazetting, did not apparently apply to returns from the North-West, because no examination was made in those cases. There was not a return held over for a week, nor for any unnecessary time whatever. They appear to have gone straight to the *Gazette* on being received; but in the case of Ontario returns a system of discrimination appears to have been adopted and to have been carried out systematically. At first a few Reformers were gazetted with Conservatives, to give a color of fairness to the course of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, for if he had kept all Reformers off the lists the offence would have been too glaring. A few days ago the House considered the question with respect to the difficulty in the return for Queen's county. Hon. gentlemen opposite were very anxious to send that case to a committee and not have it judged by the House. Now, however, they wish this matter judged by the House and oppose its reference to a Committee. The truth is they adopt any course which seems to suit their purpose at the time. If it suited their purpose to send the question to a committee they would do so, but under the existing circumstances they think it will suit them best to have it dealt with by the House. Very possibly if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was examined on oath by the Committee on Privileges and Elections he might frankly say that he had been duped, that influences had been exerted over him and that he had carried out his instructions.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not indulge in cat-calls.

Mr. MILLS. It is very unfair to act in that manner at this early part of the Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. members to cease the noise. If I could discover an offender I would certainly use my powers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House any longer. I shall, however, always address the House on any subject that I consider in the interests of my constituency, and any action on the part of hon. gentleman opposite will never deter me from expressing my opinion. This question should be thoroughly ventilated, for the country cannot afford to have it repeated at another general election. This dodge is about the last that can be resorted to, I imagine. Our political experience of recent years, has been that something is always unearthed to give hon. gentleman opposite a means for accomplishing their object. This last move is not a creditable one, and no

member of this House would dare to face the public and defend the action of this officer. Gross injustice has been done and steps should be taken to prevent its repetition. I hope such an impression will be made on the people of the country that it will not be repeated.

Mr. BOWMAN. This discussion has revealed a very extraordinary state of affairs in regard to the gazetting of returns, especially those of hon. members on this side of the House. I do not propose to discuss the returns of other hon. gentlemen; I simply desire to state the facts in regard to my own case. When we consider the discrepancy which exists in the gazetting of returns, we must come to the conclusion either that the returning officers or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery failed very seriously in discharging their duties. So far as the return of my own riding is concerned, I have a letter in my possession from the returning officer in which he states that he made the return on 7th March, and that statement is corroborated by the return laid on the Table by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in which he acknowledges it was received on the 8th March; and consequently there has been no failure on the part of the returning officer to discharge his duties properly in that respect. Consequently the fault lies altogether at the door of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The return was received on the 9th March. The next *Gazette* was published on the 12th. So there were three days for the return to be sent from the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the office of the Queen's Printer. But for some reason or other it was not published in that number of the *Gazette*. The next *Gazette* was published on the 19th March, but although a week elapsed it did not appear in that issue. It did not make its appearance until the 26th March. So it took eighteen days for the return to get from the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the office of the *Canada Gazette*. There is another feature in connection with this case. It is stated by that official, I understand, that in some cases it was necessary to have some correspondence, that in some cases the returns were so defective they had to be corrected. But in this case there was no correspondence and the return was accepted as sent in. It is important we should know the cause of the delay. It is too much to ask us to assume that these delays were the result of accident or oversight. If one, two or half-dozen cases had occurred, they might be assumed to be due to chance, but when such a large number failed to be gazetted at the proper time we must look for the cause elsewhere. We can only account for this state of affairs by assuming that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery deliberately kept back the returns of members on this side of the House for reasons which are, no doubt, fully understood by at least some hon. gentlemen opposite. I simply desire to state the question of my own return in its true light and show that the returning officer, at all events, was not to blame.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has followed in the wake of those who preceded him on that side of the House in making many general statements charging revising officers, returning officers, and all the other officials in connection with the elections, with being responsible for their being in the cold shades of opposition, on that side of the House. But there is not one of them so far who has pointed out any particular returning officer or revising officer, who has done an injustice to him personally. There is not an hon. gentleman on that side who has said: The returning officer in my county was a Tory, and he did me a flagrant wrong. Of what are they complaining? Simply that they have not been gazetted in time to suit them. Surely there must be something at the back of this—there must be something to fear. I can point to the election in Kingston, where the right hon.

Mr. McMULLEN.

the leader of the Government was elected. No doubt the returning officer there was a Tory—one of the worst kind of Tories, and no doubt his officials were Tories. But being honest, like all Tories, they counted up the ballots, and gave the opposition candidate, Mr. Gunn, the benefit of every doubt, and they returned the leader of the Government to this House by a majority of twelve. The friends of hon. gentlemen opposite opposed it; they said there was a dire wrong somewhere, and they applied for a recount, knowing that the judge was an appointee of their own, and not favorable to the leader of the Government, so far as politics were concerned. What did he do? He said: These corrupt Tory returning officers have not given the Premier a full count; I will increase it to seventeen, and he gave the Premier a majority of seventeen, where the corrupt Tory officials had given him a majority of only twelve.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about Mr. Dunn?

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is Mr. Dunn? Speak for yourselves; name your own returning officer; name the returning officer for Bothwell, or any other returning officer in Ontario. But they point to Mr. Dunn, whose case we have not investigated. Let them speak for themselves and bring a direct charge. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), said he regretted very much that the motion placed in your hands was not for the dismissal of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Try him without judge or jury; cut off the head of an old servant, who has served this Government faithfully for the last twenty years, served when my hon. friends opposite were in power, and no doubt as faithfully then as he has on this occasion, for there were no complaints from that side of the House. But this appears to have been the policy of hon. gentlemen when they were appealing to the electorate of this country. I know it was so in my own riding. I know there was not a public officer there but was threatened with dismissal when the leader of the Opposition and his friends returned to power, as they expected to do, and were sure they would do, on the 22nd of February. Every Custom house officer, every lighthouse keeper, every fishery overseer that took part in the elections was to be dismissed, and their places were promised for political support to the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Not only that, but the portfolios were distributed to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am credibly informed that an hon. gentleman, occupying a leading position on the other side of the House, has received correspondence addressed to him as Mr. So-and-So, M.P., Minister of Customs. No doubt this hon. gentleman said to some of his friends, after the House meets I will be Minister of Customs, and when you address me, address me as Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman whom I see laughing so pleasantly before me knows that is correct; and it proves conclusively that they fully expected to attain power; and that the portfolios were distributed. But a majority of forty-three on the other side does not give them much show of getting in. Now, I was elected on the 22nd of February with a majority of four hundred and sixteen. That was a majority that ought to have guaranteed that my name would appear in the next week's *Gazette*, or in two weeks at most, and yet my name does not appear until the 19th of March. But I am not complaining; I have nothing to fear. But hon. gentlemen opposite were in purgatory, and they wanted to get out; they wanted the ten days' rule to apply to them, and the thirty days' rule to apply to us. If hon. gentlemen opposite had nothing to fear they would not complain of their names not being gazetted for a week or two after being elected. A notice that the return of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) was gazetted on the 19th March. The Minister of Customs, who was elected in the north riding with a larger majority, was gazetted on the same day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was returned on the 16th.

Mr. TAYLOR. His name appears in the *Gazette* on the 19th.

Mr. EDGAR. Immediately after being returned.

An hon. MEMBER. Gazetted before he was returned perhaps.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Addington (Mr. Bell) was gazetted on the 19th of March. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was gazetted on the 19th. I was gazetted on the 19th of March. The hon. member for North Leeds and Greenvile (Mr. Ferguson) was gazetted on the 26th of March, and the hon. member for West Peterboro' (Mr. Stevenson) was gazetted on the 26th April. Now none of these gentlemen are complaining of the acts of the returning officers. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) insinuates that not only the returning officers, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and other officials are corrupt, but he insinuates that the postmaster would deface the register book in order to assist the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in proving that certain letters had not arrived on a particular day. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman saying that he had made arrangements with the people at Belleville that there would be no protest there if there would be none against him, knowing that if my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) was guilty of corrupt acts, it was his duty as an honorable man not to be a party to a corrupt bargain. If he knew that the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) had violated the law, it was his duty to say: Yes, he will be prosecuted; I will take my chances, for I have done nothing wrong. But he could not say that; he made this bargain, and he said that if he was gazetted on the same day as the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) there would be no protest in that case. But he did not blame the hon. member for West Hastings for being a party to the protest, but he blamed somebody else. I think he has himself and his friends to blame for the protest being filed. I could have told him the next day after the election, and why? A couple of his constituents worked in Gananoque, and one of his leading friends wrote down, telling them: We are going to have a hard fight; Burdett wants you on the 22nd to vote for him; you may be sworn; we cannot promise you anything, but come—it will be all right. Those two gentlemen got these letters, and they were advised not to go on these letters, for "we have money in hand." They wrote up to their friends stating that they could not afford to go and pay their own expenses. They received another letter telling them to go to a certain individual in Gananoque who was working for a lumber firm, and would see that they got paid. Those two gentlemen went there and saw that individual, were furnished with funds, and went up to East Hastings and recorded their votes. The hon. gentleman finds fault because the protest was not served on him until the last day. He had a right, perhaps, to find fault because he was not served on the first day; but I suppose that is the experience of all gentlemen on either side of the House. The law is the same for hon. gentlemen on that side as it is for those on this side of the House. If any hon. gentleman on this side did a corrupt act during the election, it was their duty to see that his election was protested, as hon. gentlemen on this side have seen fit to protest the seats of hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course the Conservative party have always been charged with being the corrupt party of this country; but it has always been proved in the courts that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends are the party who have done the most corrupt acts in the election campaigns.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sir John in Kingston.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about Sir John in Kingston?

Mr. McMULLEN. He was unseated.

Mr. TAYLOR. When?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can tell you; in 1874, for a corrupt act of himself or his friends.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the act?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The most corrupt of acts, and he was only spared by the lenity of the judge. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know, Chief Justice Richards declared that he never had more hesitation in not disqualifying a man in his life.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will move, I will second a motion for a special committee to look up precedents in the courts to show which party has the cleanest record in election trials. I am willing to stake the reputation of hon. gentlemen around me that the white glove will not be handed to my hon. friend who made the statement about Sir John in Kingston. Now, until hon. gentlemen opposite will rise and say: "The returning officer in my riding did me a wrong," I am not prepared to have that returning officer dragged before an election committee of this House to have his conduct investigated. I found out, when I was home, why my return was not made sooner. I got my certificate about the 1st of March that I was the elected candidate for South Leeds, and when I was home I asked the returning officer why I was not gazetted sooner. He said: "The fact was, that after I made out the statement, I got a telegram stating that my son, who was in the United States, was ill; I went to see him, and the return remained until I came back." So he did not send it down to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until the 12th of March, when it was received here, and I am gazetted on the 19th.

Mr. BLAKE. It was received on the 14th.

Mr. TAYLOR. Be that as it may, the returning officer perhaps should have had his return in sooner, because my election was settled without any trouble, and the returns were all in within two or three days after the election. But that was the excuse the returning officer gave me, and it was a valid excuse; and until hon. gentlemen opposite make a specific charge against any of these returning officers of having done them a gross injustice, I am not prepared to bring them before a committee of this House, but am ready to believe that they did what was fair and proper, as Tories always do.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat is a delightful example of that wonderful product of our constitution, the innocent Tory member. He examined the returns of half a dozen constituencies that returned Conservative members, and discovering in every instance that they had been gazetted within a day or two after the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, he asks in innocent surprise, what have the members of this House to complain of? It never struck him, I suppose that there were members on this side of the House who were not dealt with in the same way. The motion of the hon. member for Bothwell is based on that very fact, that members on this side have not been dealt with by the ministerial officers of the Crown as those officers have dealt with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), who spoke this afternoon, appeared to be very much dissatisfied that the time of the House should be wasted, as he said, by those petty squabbles over the elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The sentiment appears to be cheered by hon. gentlemen who share the opinion; but I think a little reflection will show them that the taking of proper steps by this House to assert its own dignity and liberties, and to condemn the wrong-doing of those officers who have been

guilty of it, is one of the highest duties to which it can devote itself. It is absurd to imagine that outrages which no hon. gentleman in this House has undertaken to defend—outrages such as that most wicked and diabolical outrage in connection with the Queen's county election that any officer has ever attempted—I am sorry to see hon. gentlemen smile at that—I say, in the face of such outrages, it is time the House devoted some of its time to such cases. In this particular case it may be that the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is capable of explanation; it may be that the conduct of the returning officers who held the returns back for several weeks is capable of explanation. I do not suppose my hon. friend who made the motion proposes to condemn them unheard. What is his proposition? It is the most reasonable imaginable. It is that to the tribunal which hon. gentlemen opposite have declared to be an impartial tribunal, composed of the highest legal talent of the House—a tribunal where, they have told us, again and again, party passion is silent, and everything is done in the judicial spirit of the courts—shall be referred the facts which on their face show that wrong-doing has been perpetrated on a large number of the members of this House, and that that wrong-doing, by a peculiar combination of circumstances, has been perpetrated exclusively on the members of one particular party. It is proposed to refer the facts which on their face, and until they are answered, constitute a very strong case against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; and until they are answered more than one member will retain the opinion that that gentleman has not shown himself fit to hold any longer the office he has filled for many years. The hon. member for Monk attempted to answer the proposition that this House should assert its privileges by referring to the Ontario election returns. There are some hon. gentlemen in this House who can never get their noses beyond the Province of Ontario. It is nothing to me even if in that wonderful Province a wrong was done. If a wrong was done there, it is no argument that I should assist in doing a wrong here; but when he came to his facts, he got the wrong brief, for it turned out that a right was done there, and he argued that because right was done there, wrong should be done here. Now, there are two propositions before the House. One is that on the state of the facts, which constitute a strong *prima facie* case against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the committee should take evidence and report to this House. The other is that we should humbly ask the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to write a letter saying why he took the course he did. There is only one proposition of which I have heard within the last few days that equals the coolness of this, and that is the proposition made in the Committee on Privileges and Elections that an apology should be sent by this House to the returning officer, Mr. Dunn. What return will the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery make to us? He will simply say that he received the papers and made the best possible use of our and his time, which was taken up, as he informed a member the other day, in reading over the documents connected with the return. We know that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has no business to delay the publication of a return made by a returning officer for one hour in order to read those documents. The law is plain and distinct on this point. If he had any judicial duties to discharge, if he had to revise the return of the returning officer and see that it was correct, then, in the Queen's county election, he should have revised the return made by Mr. Dunn, and amended it, so as to declare Mr. King elected. But, I am happy to say, we have not delegated to officers of that kind any judicial duties. All the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had to do was simply to give notice in the next issue of the *Gazette* of the name of the candidate declared by the returning officer to be elected. We know that he has not done so in

Mr. DAVIES.

many cases for weeks; we know that he has thus put hon. gentlemen on this side in a very unfavorable position as compared with that in which he has put hon. gentlemen opposite, as regards the publication of their election returns. The proposition of the hon. gentleman is objectionable from another standpoint, that it deliberately proposes to do away with one-half of the subject matter of complaint. The proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) embraces the complaints made against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and also against the divers returning officers. He proposes that where the returning officers have done wrong and where the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has done wrong, their conduct shall be investigated into and reported upon; but we are asked by the First Minister to give the go-bye to the entire charges against the returning officers and simply to call on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for a letter as to his share in the matter. I do not think that is at all fair or consistent with our self-respect. In the Province I come from—which, I am happy to say, has returned six good Reformers—I find that in the counties of King's and Queen's where there were no hints of a petition being filed, our returns were not gazetted until the 2nd of April, while in the county of Prince, where the returning officer did not make his return until long after the officers of the other two counties had made theirs, his return, by some inexplicable freak, reached here five days before those of the other two counties, and was gazetted on the 19th of March when a petition was immediately filed. Thus where they wished to file a petition hon. gentlemen opposite managed to get their returns in a long time, fourteen days, before the returns of the other counties. Since this debate has proceeded we have had statements made by many hon. gentlemen in their places as to the facts connected with the returns, as to the time they left the officers' hands and were placed in the post office, and the time they should have reached the hands of the clerk, compared with the time the Clerk of the Crown reports to have received them, showing that he reported having received them long after the time they should have been received by him. There has evidently been wrong-doing on the part of some of the officers in cases which materially affect privileges of members of this House, and I propose to move in amendment to the amendment:

To leave out all the words in the amendment after the word "That" and insert the following instead thereof:—"The following words be inserted after 'That' in the main motion:—'it appearing from the statements of several members in their places that some of the returns should have reached the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery earlier than he reports; and it appearing from the return of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that great delays have occurred in transmitting to him and also in gazetting by him many of the returns, and that the returns of the great bulk of the Conservative members were published in the earliest *Gazette* while the returns of the great bulk of the Reform members were delayed, many of them for several *Gazettes*.'"

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I do not know whether, in the debate upon the resolution proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite and the different amendments, attention has been called to the fact that in the House of Commons in England it has not been the custom for years past to venture on this fishing investigation in reference to whether officers of the House or returning officers in the country have or have not performed their duty. Listening to the hon. gentleman from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), it seemed to me that he admitted that these returning officers may, one and all of them, have performed their duty in the last election, and that these facts that seemed to carry conviction on their face, to his mind, of wrong-doing may be so explained, when these gentlemen appear in answer to the summons, that all cause for complaint will be removed. I understood from the tenor of his remarks that he at present passed no opinion upon the conduct of those officers other than was passed upon *prima facie* evidence or the evidence at present before the House, which may be met

and which certain hon. gentlemen in this House think ought to be met in the way they point out. Then my conclusion is that this is a fishing enquiry, that the House proposes to endeavor to ascertain whether there has not been some wrong-doing, and that, while uncertain and with minds still undecided as to whether there is really cause for directing the attention of Parliament to the manner in which any particular returning officer have performed their duty, still, perhaps, some hon. gentlemen hope that, in the immense number of cases that will of course be brought up and that can be brought up, they might find one or two glaring cases in which the officer has not performed his duty, and then they will be able to censure him, to punish him, and to make political capital out of the transaction and so to use it against the Administration of the day. I take the ground that that is not at all in keeping with the wise course of procedure followed in England for some time back. If hon. gentlemen, in their perusal of the many cases into which investigation has lately been made, have read carefully the precedents in the journals in the Mother Country, they must have been struck with the many complaints similar to those which are being made in this Parliament which were ventilated against the returning officers in England time and time again; and there were many cases in which Parliament went through this form, in which the returning officers were summoned, in which the returning officers appeared, in which the returning officers were found guilty and were punished, and their conduct seemed so bad in many cases that Parliament undertook to rid itself of sitting as a *quasi*-criminal court, or to rid itself of sitting in judgment upon these men. And how did they do it? They passed penal enactments, they passed stringent regulations, imposing heavy penalties upon the returning officers for neglect of duty. These statutes are of comparatively modern date. They were passed to compel these officers to perform their duties properly, and this matter was in that respect left for the ordinary tribunals of the country to deal with. We have copied the statutes from the English Act, and among others is the 101st section of chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and that section says:

"If any returning officer wilfully delays, neglects or refuses duly to return any person who ought to be returned to serve in the House of Commons for any electoral district, such person may, if it has been determined on the hearing of an election petition respecting the election for such electoral district, that such person was entitled to have been returned, sue the returning officer who has so wilfully delayed, neglected or refused duly to make such return of his election, in any court of record in the Province in which such electoral district is situate, and recover from him a sum of five hundred dollars, together with all damages he has sustained by reason thereof, and costs, provided such action is commenced within one year after the commission of the act on which it is grounded, or within six months after the conclusion of the trial of the petition relating to such election."

Now, if the conduct of the returning officer has been such as to lead to grave injustice being done to any hon. member of this House, the laws of the country have met that case and it is now the law of the land that a remedy is at hand for any person so aggrieved. But it is not proper, in my humble judgment, that the House of Commons, sitting here to transact business of great importance, should go on this roving enquiry and endeavor to punish these officers for the mere sake of individual cases or personal spite, or whatever you choose to call it, or in order to make political capital, or for any other reason where it does not affect any hon. gentleman in his rights in this House, or as a representative or as a candidate in the election. I claim that, if such an enquiry as is proposed to this House is a proper one for us to enter upon, surely there are others, there are hosts of cases, there are thousands of cases equally important upon which we should also enter. I take it that the law of the land is more particular in regard to bribery than it is in regard to anything else concerning elections, and not only are members compelled to face the serious consequences of any bribery that they may individually commit in an election, but indivi-

dual electors are to be punished for the commission of such an offence. We know that the statutes regulate the sitting of a court of enquiry or the issuing of a commission of enquiry into corrupt practices in the different constituencies; and, if we proceed upon this investigation, we will have to devote the whole year or several Sessions of Parliament to the issue of a commission to fish, to seek out, and to find if we can the thousands of cases that may have happened, that the hon. gentlemen opposite charge have happened, where gross bribery or gross intimidation has occurred, and the laws of the land have been directly violated in connection with the representation in this House. Do the hon. gentlemen seriously propose to follow this up?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him, I would ask if he means to argue that our only redress is in the courts of law and under this penal statute, that, in regard to our own officer, we cannot enquire into his conduct with a view to his dismissal, that, in fact, we cannot dismiss him on certain grounds, and that our only recourse against him is to sue for damages.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton). I hope, before I sit down, I shall be able to reach the intelligence of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell, so that that enquiry on his part will prove to be unnecessary. Up to this point I will tell the hon. gentleman opposite I have not made that statement, I have not made that argument. I may have been a little ambiguous, but I have endeavored to express as concisely as possible the views I entertain. The argument that I have been endeavoring to state is one that struck me a moment ago, and is not at all affected by the position which the hon. gentleman asks me if I am willing to take. Now, I have not stated that the House of Commons cannot enquire into the conduct of the late elections; I have not argued that, as in the election case which we discussed the other night, the House of Commons has no jurisdiction, or that the House of Commons has divested itself of the jurisdiction which it contained. I have been endeavoring to show that it is inexpedient, and there is no good purpose for us to exercise this power, which I understand it is plain we do possess. I do not understand that any hon. gentleman has challenged the right of the House of Commons to enquire into the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or of any returning officer, but I say that it is inexpedient for us to enter upon an enquiry which the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), says, stands now in a position that so far as we are informed, we do not know what may actually happen. So far as his position is concerned, there is no real necessity for this investigation, and no real outrage has been perpetrated, because, as he says, the evidence is merely *prima facie*, he is not able to name the delinquents, he is not able to say that such and such an officer has come within the provisions of the Act which punish violations of it. He says it appears from the returns laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that irregularities have occurred which have affected hon. gentlemen on that side of the House more than on this side; therefore, he proposes that we turn ourselves into a commission of enquiry, and summon all the returning officers of the Dominion and endeavor to see, after a cross-examination, whether we cannot find some poor unfortunate whom we can punish and then leave him to be punished again in the courts. When my hon. friend interrupted me in—and I do not speak in an impolite sense—an impertinent question, as it had no bearing on the views I was expressing, I was proceeding to say that I considered it highly inexpedient that we should enter upon this kind of investigation unless we were prepared to put all the other business of the country aside in order to enquire, first, into this question, and then as to whether gross bribery has been committed in this or that constituency. I for one am not prepared to go into this investigation. I am

not prepared to say that it is expedient we should sit here as a court or commission on matters that are brought before us. I do not believe that it is a matter interesting to the country at large. I believe that the last elections were conducted just as properly, just as morally, just as fairly as any elections were conducted in the past since 1867. But the trouble with my hon. friends opposite is that the result has been so unfortunate to them that they cannot bear to look at it as calmly and as magnanimously as they have been accustomed to. I do not believe that public opinion would justify us in going into this enquiry when all the rights of the members of the House, and therefore of their constituents, are properly conserved by legislation in existence, and when any aggrieved person can go into the court if he desires, where he can have the conduct of the returning officer investigated. It is no argument to say that it imposes responsibility upon the plaintiff who begins this suit, because that difficulty attends every one who goes to the courts for redress. The returning officer is already responsible enough under the general legislation of the country, and is liable to penalties for any wrong or offence of which he may be guilty. We have the proper machinery that would save a great deal of time to the country if we let the parties aggrieved seek redress from the courts. My hon. friend has alluded to the returns in 1874 which I have brought before the attention of the House; he has alluded to them at least twice, and I think it unfortunate that we are not in a position to say whether his estimate of the political opinions of the gentlemen returned in 1874 is correct, or whether my estimate is correct. I by no means vouch for the figures I gave to the House, because I moved for the papers in order that we might examine them, and I hoped that my hon. friend after he had seen the comparison, would have been satisfied to delay his motion until we had the papers on the Table. I stated that in the first *Gazette* four Grits were returned; on 21st February, ten Grits and two Conservatives were returned; 28th February, four Grits and one Conservative. There was a reason for these returns being delayed so long, according to the ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then I find the prominent men in the different Provinces did not appear in the *Gazette* until the very last. There were seven batches in all. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper), who was a prominent man in politics at that time, was not in the first *Gazette*, and the Minister of Inland Revenue was only in the last batch. But I did not bring that argument forward as a *tu quoque* argument at all; I brought it forward to show that this accident would happen, as the common phrase is, even in the best regulated families, and I think it has additional importance to-night, as it corroborates the views taken by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., in virtually saying that we should hesitate before passing final judgment upon the statements of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said that it was apparent that a *primâ facie* case had been made out against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but that, like other *primâ facie* cases, possibly it might be answered if it was referred to a tribunal where there was an opportunity to take evidence.

Mr. TUPPER. I said no more. I think the hon. gentleman is fair in the statement he made. He practically admits that the result of this roving commission may be to waste the time of the House for weeks and months. Stronger *primâ facie* cases have been made and successfully met time and time again in the hon. gentleman's own practice and in the experience of every hon. gentleman, and the result may be that the time of Parliament would be wasted on this fishing excursion. I am not, therefore, prepared to vote for any proposal of that kind. Judging from the temper

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

of hon. gentlemen opposite who have given their experience, I have no doubt if there is a *bond fide* case, they will be ready to drag the offending officer before a tribunal. If our tribunals are worthy of public confidence, returning officers who have neglected to perform their duty faithfully will be punished, and no one would be more anxious to punish the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery than some hon. gentlemen opposite. Our judges are paid to do this work, and we are sent to this Parliament for an entirely different purpose. The English Parliament does not deal with cases of this kind, but they are covered by the statutes from which I have quoted. Individual members have made statements with respect to their own returns, and, if we are going to proceed with an enquiry, it is very unfair that returning officers who have been accused in the most wholesale manner of neglecting their duties, should be thus attacked and serious charges preferred against them. Those gentlemen, as I have pointed out, are face to face with those penal enactments, and surely it is unfair in the case of officers who may have to appear before a court of law that their conduct should be discussed here. The return for the county of Pictou was one of the longest delayed, and, strange as it may seem to hon. gentlemen opposite, the returning officer is a member of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite and a life-long opponent of my colleague and myself. Though he delayed his return, and I think it was almost the last of all those gazetted, yet I have not the slightest doubt he acted in a *bond fide* manner, and I never complained. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have been returned to this House by their different constituents should have been the last to complain. They are here, and they should not quarrel with their returning officers for sending them here, even if a little tardily. There has not been a *bond fide* complaint made out. Reference has been made to the election in Queen's; but that has nothing to do with the present question and it was not attacked in connection with a long delayed return. There has not been a single case upon which to maintain the general charge that has been made, and I trust the House will hesitate before it imposes on us this most unfortunate duty of sitting as a commission of enquiry and assuming functions which the courts of law possess, and which they can adequately discharge.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand the question before the House, we are not enquiring into what the returning officers did particularly, but the resolution before the House questions the actions of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is the particular subject of investigation here this evening. I always listen with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper). The hon. gentleman discusses the question with that vigor and *ex cathedra* style which leads us to hope that in the course of time he will make a leading debater in the House. But the hon. gentleman seems to fall into the way of a good many of his friends, of constantly referring to the results of the last elections. I desire to inform the hon. gentleman that we do not feel nearly so badly over it as he thinks we do, and when the facts are made clear he will not have so much reason to congratulate himself as he seems to have on the present occasion. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) undertook to defend the action of the Government, and instanced the elections for the Local Legislature. It made no difference, however, when the gazetting took place as regards those elections, because the time for protesting does not run from the time of gazetting. Even if it did, the hon. gentleman put himself out of court, because it was plain that those returns were perfectly fair, and that the Conservatives received a fair proper proportion of the number of members gazetted at a certain time. The hon. gentleman talks about fishing excursions. He seems to have fishing excursions on the brain, to use a

common phrase. There is no fishing excursion about this matter. The document placed on the Table shows that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not made the returns as the law requires, that he delayed the gazettement of the returns after he had received them. If that officer has acted properly and can furnish a valid excuse for delay and for disregarding the statute, who will be injured by the investigation? The time of the House will not be occupied; it is a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and the only witness to be examined will be the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. But that is what hon. gentlemen opposite fear; they are afraid that if he is examined he will tell a story not creditable to them. If rumors are correct, the Secretary of State could tell something about this matter. At all events, it is a duty the House owes to itself and the country to see that an explanation is given as to why an officer of this House should utterly disregard the law. If it has been done for the purpose of giving hon. gentlemen opposite a political advantage, then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is not fit to hold the position which he has held for so many years. If he has any lawful and valid excuse, then every hon. member will be prepared to extend to him that consideration to which he would be entitled. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not refer to this matter at all. If there is no necessity to refer to the matter, if we have no right to bring that officer to task, why does the First Minister propose this amendment? Why should he ask the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to furnish a letter of explanation, if this House has no right to enquire as to his conduct? And yet the First Minister proposes that this clerk be asked to write a letter to the Clerk of the House, explaining the delay. If we have no right to enquire into it, we have no right even to ask him for that letter, but the amendment proposed by the First Minister on the face of it shows that we have a right to ask for some information on the subject. And having that right, the proper place for investigating this charge is before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In other cases hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to refer matters to this committee. They have proclaimed over and over again that its functions are judicial, and that the actions of its members will be governed by the feelings which should actuate men who are acting in that capacity. If such is the case, this officer runs no risk in having his case investigated, unless he has been guilty of misconduct, and then he should receive his punishment. This is but the last joint in the tail. We have had, in this country, partisan returning officers and revising barristers; we have had gerrymanders; we have had everything that the ingenuity of man can devise for the purpose of keeping the Tory party in power. We have had millions of dollars expended, on the authority of the Governor General's warrants, immediately before the elections, the money taken from the Treasury and expended, perhaps it may be properly. Lastly, we have the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is to be used to give an advantage to the Conservative party over the Liberals, by gazettement as he has done. I say that this is not only a gross irregularity on his part, but I say that the documents in the return laid before the House show, as I believe, that this was a deliberate fraud upon the Liberal party of this country. I feel that there ought to be no question about referring this matter to the Privileges and Elections Committee. As I said before, if the conduct of this officer has been right and proper, if it does not deserve censure, he has nothing to fear; but the fact of the Government taking the position they have taken is strong presumptive evidence that they have, themselves, something to fear from this investigation.

Mr. TROW. I will confine myself to the circumstances in my own particular riding. The subject has been pretty

thoroughly discussed generally, and it is evident that a wrong has been perpetrated. The speeches of hon. gentlemen do not seem to me to condemn any of the returning officers, but they all unite in condemning the action of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. In regard to my own particular case, I have nothing to say against the returning officer; I think he acted fairly and rightly. The return was received here on the 10th March, but though the *Gazette* was issued on the 12th, and again on the 19th, my return was not gazetted until the 26th. Under the statute it was unquestionably the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to have included my return amongst those which were gazetted on the 12th or the 19th. I find that my neighbor in the same county and living in the same city, the hon. member for the north riding of Perth (Mr. Hesson) was returned the day after I was returned—he was returned on the 11th and he was gazetted on the 19th, a week before I was gazetted, although my return was received one day before his. I cannot conceive why the Government should hesitate in allowing the matter to be thoroughly investigated. It is due to their credit, it is due to the public at large, as well as the members of this House, that an investigation should immediately take place. The committee is composed of the best legal talent in the House—gentlemen well versed in investigations of this description—and I have no doubt that members will approach the subject without any degree of partisanship. There are no less than twenty-three Conservatives on that committee, as against seventeen members of the Opposition, so that they have sufficient advantage in that respect. The investigation cannot possibly occupy more than a day or a part of a day at furthest in the examination of one single witness. I think it is due to the House and the country that the committee should call this officer to give an account of his stewardship.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have a complaint to make, and I am rather curious to know how the question I am about to ask will be answered. My young friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) went fishing. Now when a young man goes fishing he generally wants to catch something, but evidently he did not want to catch anything. It is remarkable to me how few hon. gentlemen opposite want to speak on this subject. I should think that they would want to get up and say something about it—they could mystify the matter, if nothing else. Taking the returns from New Brunswick, I find that the return from the county of Restigouche, where a Conservative was elected, was received here on the 11th of March and gazetted on the 12th of March. In Charlotte, my own county, the return was received on the 11th. There was no room for my name in the *Gazette* of the 12th; there was no room for it in the *Gazette* of the 19th nor in the *Gazette* of the 26th, and they kept me until the 2nd day of April before they gazetted my return. I do not know that I am very much worse off than if I had been gazetted on the 12th, but I would like to know the reason. I do not know whether there is any hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches who can give me the reason, but I cannot think that my hon. friends there, whom I am looking in the face, would have anything to do with such a small, mean matter as this. If they do know anything about it, I would like them to explain why my name was kept out of four *Gazettes* when it could have gone in. I find that the return in the county of Albert, where a Conservative was elected, was received on the 14th and it was gazetted on the 19th, only five days after. In the county of Carleton, N.B., where a Liberal was returned, the return was twelve days in Ottawa before it was gazetted. The return in my own case was in Ottawa twenty-two days before it was gazetted. In the county of Gloucester, where a Conservative was elected, his return passed by one *Gazette*; it

was the only Conservative return from New Brunswick that did, and it was gazetted in ten days. The return from the county of Kent, where a Conservative was elected, was only four days in Ottawa before it was gazetted. So in King's county, four days; York, two days; Westmoreland, seven days; Victoria, four days; St. John, ten days. The hon. member for Northumberland, who was an independent, was kept out of his place for eighteen days. I do not know how that is; I do not know that any injustice has been done me, but I cannot understand the reason why these returns should be in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery here so long without being gazetted. Was there not room enough in the *Gazette*? Is the *Gazette* confined to a certain number of sheets of paper so that when you fill those you cannot fill any more? I think more sheets could be added. There must have been some ulterior motive in this, and surely the Government could not be a party to a small matter like this. Surely those knights to whom people have to bow and take off their hats, could not be a party to a transaction of that kind. I think it must have been done by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and I think it was due to me that an explanation should be given of the reason my return which was made on the 8th of March and received on the 11th, was not gazetted until the 2nd of April, remaining for twenty-two days after being received. I think this official ought to give an account of his conduct in this matter. Of course the reply by hon. gentlemen opposite is: Oh, you have thirty days after you are gazetted, and your case is not prejudiced at all. But I did not know what was coming. I kept watching week after week, and I could not understand why my name did not appear in the *Gazette*. I really began to think I was not going to be gazetted at all. I think this is a sort of conduct that ought to be explained by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and a good tribunal before which to make that explanation is the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think it is due to that officer also to give him a chance to state his reasons for treating members of the different parties in the way they have been treated.

Mr. BURDETT. I do not rise to add anything to this discussion, but as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has kindly given me his personal attention, I do not desire his remarks to go unchallenged, or to show that I bear him any unfriendly feeling by passing them by without notice. I wish to say that, so far as I have been able to discover, there was only one man east of Kingston who had a vote in my riding. He was written to to come, and I suppose not being able to read his letter he placed it in the hands of the hon. member, or some other honest Tory, who endeavored, perhaps, to lay a trap to catch him. But in that he ignominiously failed, for the elector did not vote at my election at all. The only way they can unseat the member for East Hastings is by perjury, and I know how to doctor men who indulge in that, for I have doctored them before. I am much pleased to hear the hon. gentleman talk about political morality. It is the first glimmer of that kind of light which we have had from that side of the House. I can say for myself, and the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson), that when we were through with an exciting contest, and everybody knew that the health of both of us was very poor, and that we were both physically unable to go through such a contest, except at the call of our friends, it was felt to be a manly and generous thing in both parties to leave both of us in the possession of our seats, and not to harass either by protests of any kind. But I have since learned that gentlemen whom the hon. member for South Leeds endeavors to set up as political moralists, have said that they would hound me until all that I would require would be a hearse to carry me to my grave.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). I believe, Sir, that I had the good fortune to be the first member whose name was transmitted by the returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the first to be gazetted. The hon. member for Bothwell, in alluding to this return the other day, sought to leave the impression upon the House that the expedition with which it was made was due to its being made by a partisan returning officer, and to partisanship on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; and when I rose in my seat and told him that the returning officer in my riding was a Reformer, there was great applause and clapping among the members of the Opposition. It is the old story, that whatever may be considered criminal or objectionable on the part of an official who may be a Conservative, is a commendable, virtuous and laudable act on the part of the official who may be a Reformer. Now, Sir, regarding the alleged arrangements which has been alluded to by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Burdett), I am very glad to see that hon. gentleman rise in his place and acquit me and my friends of any breach of faith or trust in connection with the arrangement which he has referred to as having been made by the political friends of both of us in our respective ridings. On two or three occasions the friends of the hon. member for East Hastings waited upon me and said to me that if I would enter into an agreement or arrangement that there should be no protest in East Hastings, West Hastings would not be protested. I replied that it was absolutely absurd to ask me to enter into an arrangement for the entire electorate of East Hastings; that so far as I was personally concerned, having already gone through the worry of an election, and the anxiety and expense of an election protest, I had no desire to go into another, and that any influence I could use with my friends in East Hastings, it would give me great pleasure to use in the endeavor to bring that arrangement about. Subsequently a meeting of the Reform Association of West Hastings was held, and a member of that association afterwards told me that the hon. member for East Hastings had not only refused to enter a protest in the west riding, but had declined to contribute any funds towards one. Meeting the hon. member subsequently I told him I felt it my duty not only to file no protest myself against him, but to endeavor to persuade my friends in East Hastings not to do so. So far as I was concerned, I carried out that promise. I felt, as the hon. member has said, that both of us were not enjoying very good health; both desired to avoid a protest, and I used all the influence I could to prevent it. I supposed that was the conclusion which had been come to, and it was not until I saw in the papers that a protest had been filed against the hon. gentleman, that I was aware that East Hastings was protested. I may say that the chairman of my committee, who has a great deal of influence in East Hastings, as well as in my own riding, also did all he could to endeavor to prevent that protest, and the gentleman who has entered it has done it on his own responsibility. I think he both signed the petition and filed it himself, and those who have the pleasure of knowing John White, the late member for East Hastings, and who know his pugnacious and pugilistic proclivities, know that you might as well try to turn the Chaudière up stream as to persuade him to abandon any course which he makes up his mind to pursue. I thought it my duty to make this explanation. I do not know to what to attribute all this great expenditure of eloquence, this consumption of gas, this great waste of time and money to the country, and these charges against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of dereliction of duty, malfeasance of office, and all that sort of thing. I have reason to believe all these complaints would not have been heard of in this House had our friends on the other side not been chagrined and disappointed in being still

compelled to remain in the cold shades of Opposition. I shall not detain the House at any length further in this connection. I have nothing to complain of, as far as the returning officer in my constituency is concerned, or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) If we wanted any additional or potential evidence of the necessity of this motion, it has been furnished to us in the narration of the facts given by the hon. member for West Hastings, because it is evident that an arrangement was there made between the parties, and as soon as the hon. member for West Hastings was relieved from all liabilities, some one at once turned round and attacked the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett).

Mr. BOWELL. He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. WELDON. It shows that certainly in that case the hon. member for West Hastings had a great advantage in having the returning officer return him at once, and in having his name gazetted on the 5th March. Listening to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, I have come to the conclusion that it is about time we abolished the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. Of what use is it? It has nothing to do with elections at all, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, since we are told when a motion is made with regard to privileges and elections this House has nothing to do with it, that it has been relegated to the courts. We are told that though this is a matter which affects the electors and the privileges of this House our time should not be taken up by it. Well if the motion of my hon. friend had been acceded to, all this discussion would have been avoided; we would have had the matter discussed in the committee and it would not have interfered with the business of the House. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) says this is not a question for the House to deal with. The hon. gentleman must know that the conduct of a returning officer as to making his return should not be a question to affect the result of the election. It is his conduct during the course of an election which is the subject of judicial decision, and as to the duties of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that is a matter with which the courts have nothing to do.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I did not say what the courts had to do with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. What I said was that the complaints in reference to the different returning officers could be enquired into in a prosecution under the statute imposing penalties.

Mr. WELDON. I understood him to say that the conduct of a returning officer could be complained of before the judges. In this respect he knows it could not. It may be that his conduct during the election and his conduct in making the return are subjects for the judges to decide, but as for the time in which he makes the return that is not a matter which affects the validity of the election. The conduct of a returning officer, so far as it affects the validity of an election, may be brought before a judicial tribunal, but the mode in which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery performs his duty is not within the cognisance of a judicial tribunal. The only judicial tribunal to which the party aggrieved can appeal is this Parliament, and when this Parliament delegates it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections it is their duty to investigate this matter. It is not the duty of this House to investigate at the bar of the House questions of this kind, although I do not admit that this question is of the character which hon. gentlemen opposite would assign to it, namely, that it is a matter of no consequence. I contend that the breach of any law, the infraction of any rule of statute is no trivial matter. When I find on the pages of our statutes that the Clerk of the Crown

"shall, on receiving the return of any member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Gazette* of the name of the candidate elected."

and when I find the cases of Prince Edward and Charlotte counties, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there has been some infraction of the law which we should enquire into. It seems to me the amendment of the First Minister is one that is not consistent with the dignity or honor of this House, proposing as it does simply that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be called on to write a letter to the Clerk of the House, as to the reasons for his conduct. Let us appeal to our own tribunal, the Committee on Privileges and Elections; let the Clerk of the Crown be heard in his defence at that tribunal, and if he gives satisfactory reasons that committee will absolve him. If, on the contrary, he has been guilty of dereliction of duty, wilful and clear, despite the plain language of the statute, it will be the duty of the House to censure and, if necessary, to punish him. My hon. friend from Pictou has undertaken to say that in England they have done away with reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections by the repeal of the statute, and that we have followed in that direction. The hon. gentleman says the 101st section of the statute applies to this case. I take issue with him on that point. I maintain that, while parties who have been specially aggrieved may seek redress in the courts and have a penalty inflicted on the returning officer for his conduct, this House alone, where wrong has been done to the electorate and a blow inflicted on the privileges of Parliament, still retains its right to deal with the matter. My hon. friend endeavored ingenuously to argue from the 101st section of the Act that the penalty alone was the only punishment to be inflicted. The section says:

"If any returning officer wilfully delays, neglects or refuses duly to return any person who ought to be returned to serve in the House of Commons for any electoral district, such person may, if it has been determined on the hearing of an election petition respecting the election for such electoral district that such person was entitled to have been returned, sue the returning officer who has so wilfully delayed, neglected or refused duly to make such return of his election, in any court of record in the Province in which such electoral district is situate."

That means simply that after the election petition has been determined on the party aggrieved shall seek in the ordinary tribunals of the country redress for the injuries he has sustained. That is simply his redress. What is the complaint we have here? It is that, according to the return brought down, gross irregularity has been committed and a *prima facie* case has been made out which has been fortified by personal statements from members of this House. Those are matters which are not trivial, but which are of great importance, affecting the rights of the elections, the purity of our elections, and the manner in which the law should be carried out. We should have a searching investigation, not in the one-sided manner suggested by the hon. the First Minister, which only applies to the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but if returning officers have also wilfully delayed the returns their conduct should also be enquired into even if that should take up some time of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not catch all the hon. member for East Hastings said in reply to my statements, but I will just repeat the statement I made from my place, and which is substantially correct. I understood the hon. gentleman to say I had but one voter at Kingston. I say this, that there were two voters residing in Gananoque—one of them working in the carriage works and one in Gillies' establishment. The names I can give if the hon. gentleman wishes. They were written for by friends of the hon. member for East Hastings, and money was furnished them by friends of his, and they went up there on behalf of the hon. member for East Hastings.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to enter into this discussion further than to set the House right with regard to

the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) in reference to the protest for East Hastings. My hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) did not say that an honorable or any other arrangement had been come to between these parties. On the contrary—

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I did not mean to say that there was any actual agreement between them, but that there was an understanding that if the hon. member for West Hastings were not petitioned against, the hon. member for East Hastings should not be petitioned against.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has now stated what he probably intended to say, but the language he used was that an honorable arrangement had been come to between the member for East Hastings and the member for West Hastings that no petition should be entered, and that, as soon as the time expired for a petition to be entered against the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) his friends took advantage of the situation, betrayed the confidence which had been reposed in them, and entered a protest against the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett). The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) did not say what the hon. gentleman attributed to him, but he said that, as far as he was individually concerned, he had done all he could to prevent a protest being made, but he qualified that statement by the remark that, when the proposition was made to him by the friends of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett), he told them that it would be absurd for him to attempt to speak for the electors of another constituency. There has been no breach of faith on the part of either of these parties. I have no doubt that both these gentlemen did their best to prevent a protest. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Robertson) has stated that he tried to prevent a protest being entered, and my hon. friend in front (Mr. Burdett) says he tried to prevent a protest being entered against himself, which was very natural. But, if nothing was done in that election to implicate him in an improper act, there is no reason for him to call so many hard names.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. Why "hear, hear"? The moment an hon. gentleman speaks on this side, we have an echo of "hear, hear" from several hon. gentlemen on that side.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no one in the House who interrupts more than the hon. gentleman from Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I never interrupted anyone in my life.

Mr. BOWELL. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to hold his tongue for ten minutes, or even for five minutes when anything is said affecting his party. Every gentleman on the other side has been listened to courteously, except one, and there was a little noise while he was speaking, and at once steps were taken to stop that by all those on this side who took an interest in proper debate. But my hon. friend from Bothwell, as was said in reference to my friend, Mr. White, is a little pugnacious, and he is always very anxious to say "hear, hear" in a disapproving manner when anyone is speaking on this side. What I was saying was that, if there is nothing wrong in regard to the contest in East Hastings, my hon. friend who occupies that seat now has nothing to fear, but I must question the veracity of the reports which have been carried to him. I do not accuse him of making these statements, but, when he says that any member of the party in Hastings said that they would not only hound him out of political life, but would place him on his bier and would carry him to his grave, I do not believe that any such statements were made.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BURDETT. I will prove that John White said in the Bank of Montreal, that when I got through all I would require would be a hearse.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no right, from a parliamentary standpoint or in parliamentary courtesy, to contradict the statement of the hon. gentleman, but, if there be no more truth in the statement which has been carried to him as to what Mr. White said, than there was in the statement with regard to myself, the hon. gentleman will find no ground for repeating these statements, for the remark which was attributed to Mr. White in regard to myself was without a scintilla of truth. This has nothing to do with the debate, but I mention it in order to show that my hon. friend should not make such statements unless he heard the expressions himself, or unless he has received them on evidence which is unimpeachable. I have said all that I intended to say, which is to state that the party to which I belong in the county of Hastings, and which I believe to be right, is one that I believe to be incapable of saying what is attributed to them. If any arrangements were made by that party in Hastings, they would have been carried out, but the people of Belleville, in another riding, had no more right to make an arrangement as to what the electors in East Hastings would do than the hon. gentleman opposite would have to make arrangements between my constituency and his own in Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All that the hon. gentleman has stated may be correct enough, but I will venture to say, from a tolerably long experience in these matters, that if the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) had been gazetted on the same day as my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) you would have heard very little of a petition in East Hastings. It appears to me, though I am not offering a legal opinion, that, if one thing be clearer than another, it is that the law has been distinctly violated by returning officers, apparently in some cases, and if the statements of hon. members on the floor of this House are to be believed, by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in many cases. I want to call the attention of the First Minister and the attention of this House to this fact. My hon. friend from the county of Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), standing in his place in this House, has brought forward evidence which goes to show that our Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has deliberately made a false return to this House. This hon. gentleman states, as I understood him, that he himself saw a letter from Mr. Pope, in which Mr. Pope admitted the receipt of his return on a certain date, the 10th or 11th of the month, and that Mr. Pope has returned him on the 14th, three days later. I say that, if Mr. Pope did that, Mr. Pope has sent down a false return, and such a charge, so made by a member in his place, is one that ought to be investigated either by a special committee appointed for the purpose, or, if the House so chooses, by the Committee on Elections and Privileges. Let us understand why the Government object to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. They have been virtually charged by many hon. members in this House with having abused their influence and position in order to influence the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to delay the proper gazetting of members according to the law. Are they afraid to allow the Clerk to be examined on oath before a committee of this House in public, for fear that that charge should be substantiated? If they are afraid to allow their doings to be brought to light, then I understand the pitiful evasion which has been attempted by causing him to report by letter to our Clerk at the Table; but, if their hands are clean, if they have nothing to fear, if no member of that Ministry is known to his colleagues to have abused his position in this matter, then I am at a loss to understand why they refuse to allow this gentleman

to be examined before that committee. If there is one thing clearer than another, it is that in practice, as everybody knows, a gross injustice has been done to members of this House by subjecting them to the threat of an election petition for many days later than the vast majority of members on the other side have been subjected to it. I have never, in all my experience, had an election petition presented against me, but the First Minister has had many, and has not come very well out of them; and he must know that it is not a pleasant thing to have, that it is a disagreeable and a costly thing. Why, Sir, he knows perfectly that if you succeed in unseating a man, you have got to pay a round sum over and above all that the courts will allow. I think a recent hon. member of this House, my esteemed friend, Mr. Allison, can testify to that fact, and probably the hon. gentleman could, too, of his own personal experience. Sir, I repeat, first of all, that if the law is correctly laid down by my hon. friend from Bothwell—I did not hear the First Minister or any gentleman who rose on that side dispute the law—*prima facie*, the Clerk of Chancery has deliberately disobeyed the law; and it must be remembered that, after the answer which was made to my hon. friend by the First Minister himself, we are justified in presuming that that gentleman did so under pressure put upon him by members of the Government. Sir, I say that if this House has any respect for itself, has any regard for fair play, honor or decency, it will insist on having an investigation, either before a special committee, or before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I take it my hon. friend does not care which. But I call again attention to the fact that the member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt)—if my ears did not entirely deceive me—has stated in his place, he has brought forward strong corroborative evidence that show that this officer has, in his case, deliberately made a false return in the paper which is now before us. Surely no man is going to say that when a member of this House makes such a charge against an officer of ours, there is not a case for investigation before a competent tribunal.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to address a few observations to the House before this motion is put. One hon. gentleman has asked us what we have to complain of. Sir, we have this to complain of, that the law has been flagrantly violated by an officer of this House. I called the attention of the House to a great many cases. I have pointed out that upwards of 60 members returned to the House on this side were not gazetted as the law required; I have pointed out that the time of a very considerable number was delayed not merely for a week, but for several weeks, and that members who were returned after they had been returned, were gazetted before them. After I was elected my return was received by this officer on the 10th, and I can name a dozen gentlemen sitting opposite who were returned on the same day, and they were gazetted on the 12th. On the 12th I was not gazetted, on the 19th I was not gazetted, on the 26th I was not gazetted. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), the Minister of Finance, representing the constituency of Cumberland, the Minister of Justice, were all returned on the 11th, they were gazetted on the 12th. Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that was in compliance with the law? What are the words in the statute? It says:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of any member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Gazette*."

Did the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery give this notice in my case, did he in the case of my hon. friends on my right and left, did he in the case of the hon. member for Prince Edward, did he in the case of 60 other members of this House, enter the returns in the *Gazette* as required by law? Why, then, should we not enquire into these facts? Does the First

Minister or his colleagues say that this is not a necessary provision of the law? Does he say that it is not necessary that members of this House should stand upon a footing of equality in a matter of this kind? Sir, we know why these hon. gentlemen do not choose to allow my motion to pass; we know why they will not submit the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to be examined on oath. Why, Sir, I hold in my hands the Public Estimates, and they prove beyond all question why the First Minister and his colleagues are not willing that this officer shall be examined on oath. What is the information disclosed in these estimates? I find on looking at page 322 that he has received a salary of \$2,250, charged to the expenses of legislation. I find on looking at page 11 of these estimates that that officer is to be transferred from this House to the Privy Council, and to receive a salary of \$2,600. Now, will the First Minister tell this House when this resolution was come to? Will he tell us when it was found necessary to add \$350 to the salary of this officer who had so faithfully neglected his duty? Will the hon. gentleman tell us how it is that when an officer has violated his duty and his oath in sixty cases, that he finds it necessary to promote him? Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House can understand as well as those sitting on this side of the House, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the country will understand why he has done this act. The country will understand why the hon. gentleman has seen proper to promote a man who is guilty of perjury, who instead of conforming to the law has set the law at defiance, who, instead of doing as the law has directed him, has done as hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches have directed him, in the face of the law, and who propose to reward him at our expense for this nefarious violation of duty. We have here in the case of this officer a mean unprincipled minion of authority, who is ready to play the janissary for those gentlemen, and to play the assassin on members on this side of the House. That is the position which this officer occupies before this country, and the people will understand the position assigned him by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. They will know why this officer ceased to be an officer connected with this House, and became an officer connected with the Privy Council; they will understand why he is promoted, and why it is proposed to add \$350 to his salary; it is because the law has said that he shall gazette members who are returned in the next *Gazette*, and he has refused to do so. It is because the law has said that thirty days from the time after the gazetting of members in the next *Gazette* shall be allowed for contesting the seats of members, and he has added thirty days to the time fixed by the law as against members on this side of the House. Why, Sir, we see in the case of one hon. member sitting there how he has had his head taken out of the noose, and how it has been kept on the neck of an hon. gentleman on this side of the House. We can understand this, and I tell hon. gentlemen who have been elected to support the leader of the Administration, and are disposed to follow him in this offence, this conspiracy between the Government and the Clerk of the Crown—I say the country will understand what has been done by the Ministry in this matter. Sir, I am ready to vote on this question, and I dare say that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House is ready to vote, and we will see the First Minister proposing his motion preventing this man from being examined on oath before a committee of this House. We shall see the First Minister playing in this matter the same sort of show, giving to the House and to the country the same kind of exhibition, that was given here during the Pacific scandal. Why don't the hon. gentleman stand up and call heaven to witness, "these hands are clean?" Sir, we understand now why the hon. gentleman did not answer the questions I put to him the other day, and why he regarded them as impertinent, and why it would have been

the proper thing for me to ask for correspondence that has never taken place.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I have heard nothing in this debate to change the view I expressed when the subject was under discussion some days ago. I regard the whole affair as a trivial matter and believe that no particular grievance has been made out by any hon. gentleman opposite. It does not appear that a single case of wrongdoing has been proved or that any member has been deprived of his rights or has a serious grievance to complain of. In regard to the case of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down and whose return was delayed for twenty days, I believe that if it had been entered earlier, a petition would have been filed against him.

Mr. MILLS. They could not raise the money.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Not that I would suggest that the hon. member was aware of anything wrong. I have reason to believe that the facts are as I have stated in regard to this case. I do not see why the language of political vituperation should be exhausted about a matter which is really one of secondary importance. The effect is to destroy the moral sense of the public outside, when exaggerated language is bestowed on a question of this kind, for the public do not know, when a question of real importance arises, whether to attach weight to it or not. Some remarks I made the other evening were taken up by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and he implied that I had probably had something to conceal, because it was stated that I went to the returning officer and asked him to send in my return. I had intended to say, though I am not so reported, that it was the place of members to see that their returns were sent in as soon as possible. In my case I was not in my riding when the day of declaration came. The matter was adjourned owing to some irregularities, and it was uncertain for a moment whether those irregularities might not be used to prevent my return. I did not see the returning officer from the beginning to the end of the election and I have not seen him since. But the hon. member for West Durham, in that generous and genial spirit which so enhances his personal magnetism in this House, and endears him to its members, took advantage of a verbal slip to assail me as if I must have some dishonorable motive because I had wished to have my return made early. It is perfectly legitimate that members should, if possible, get their returns early, but I have explained the facts in my own case. Under all the circumstances, I think that hon. gentlemen opposite have ample remedy under the Election Act.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I will give the hon. gentleman the section which I think will fully cover the case:

"Every officer and clerk who is guilty of any wilful misfeasance, or any wilful act or omission in violation of this Act, shall forfeit to any person aggrieved by such misfeasance, act or omission, a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars in addition to the amount of all actual damages thereby occasioned to such person:

"Every returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk who refuses or neglects to perform any of the obligations or formalities required of him by this Act, shall, for each such refusal or neglect, forfeit the sum of two hundred dollars to any person who sues for the same."

I think if any returning officer has done wrong or neglected to perform his duties, any sitting member who has suffered injury has ample recourse under this Act, and I do not see it is a matter of sufficient importance to justify the very strong terms which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) used to the official who is blamed for not being so prompt as he might have been in transmitting to the *Canada Gazette* the names of members. In order to complete our information we should be furnished with the names of members who have been petitioned against, so that the public may be able impartially to judge of the whole matter. I intend to oppose the motion to send this subject to a committee, because there is ample remedy against the officer, and I do

Mr. MILLS.

not see why the time of the House should be taken up with a matter that is after all a trivial one. It really looks as if hon. gentlemen opposite, having been disappointed in obtaining a majority, are now venting their spleen on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. LAURIER. We are just out of an election, and the Government have been sustained by a majority; but we may well question at this moment whether we still have responsible government in this country or whether we have an autocracy pure and simple. Judging from what has taken place since the opening of the Session we can come to no other conclusion than that responsible government is a thing of the past in this country. Of course we have kept all the paraphernalia, the gorgeousness, the ceremony and all the rest; but so far as practical matters are concerned, it is no longer the Government which is responsible to Parliament, but Parliament which is responsible to the Government. On a recent occasion a motion was made in this House to have papers laid on the Table as to the dismissal of an officer by the Government. This motion was refused. In the good old times it was held that the Government of the country was responsible for every act of its own, even for the dismissal of an officer. In the good old times, whenever it was asked as to the cause of the dismissal of an officer by the Government, an explanation of the reasons would be placed at once on the Table in order that the House might judge as to whether the conduct of the Government was warranted or not, because the Government was responsible for the acts of their subordinates. But at the present day a Government can dismiss an officer, and when an enquiry into the cause of dismissal is made, no answer need be given. At this day what have we? We have here an officer of the House, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery (to speak of him alone and not to speak of him with the returning officers) who is accused of having failed in his duty. Why, in the Province to which I belong, we have, according to the report made by this Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, no less than twenty-three different cases of members, all belonging to this side of the House, whose returns of election were kept in the archives of that officer one, two or three weeks before they were published. Is not that a grievance? The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who is generally so fair-minded in his opinions, sees no grievance whatever. I have not seen, he says, a single case of grievance. Let me refer him again, not to the twenty-three cases to which I have just alluded, but to the language which he must have heard this afternoon of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). He stated in his place in the House, and he not only made the statement but he corroborated it by actual proof, that the return of his election had been stated by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as being on a certain day, and a different day had been placed in the return. Is not that a grievance? If an officer of this House is allowed to make a false statement, is it not a grievance of which the House should take cognisance? It appears that an officer of the House, wilfully or not wilfully, makes a false statement, and yet this is not a grievance. If that is not a grievance I am at a loss to know what is the meaning of the word "honor," and also of the words "British fair play," as understood at one time. Of course the majority is here, and the members can sustain the Government; and, indeed, as I have said, we have come to this that the majority is here simply to do the bidding of the Government, and give solemnity to their decrees. It is no longer the majority which controls the Government, but it is altogether the Government which controls the majority. We cannot do much in the matter; we are a minority; but, at least, we can protest, and protest we will, in the name of British fair play and of British independence of character.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat might very well speak for himself, but I think when he assumes the right to talk of the honesty of the intentions of members supporting the Government he is going a little too far. If evidence were wanted it could be found from many quarters to show that members on this side are just as independent in their action, as honest in their intention, as intelligent in what they do as hon. gentlemen opposite, and they are quite as anxious to understand and carry out the principles of responsible government. It seems to me there is a strange unanimity in the condemnation of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by hon. gentlemen composing the Opposition. Every one of them has about the same story to tell, and there is something very strange in the coincidence that this story happens to come from those members who are to-day honored with an invitation to appear before the courts and show whether the transactions in which they were engaged during the elections were legal or illegal. They are very unanimous in their condemnation of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; they say that the trouble is all due to the fact that he did not place their names in the *Gazette* at a certain time, but I think the courts and the judges will decide before very long that the trouble is due to some other cause. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House to-night who has satisfactorily shown that a single protest entered against an hon. member on the Opposition side is due to the fact that that member was gazetted a few days or weeks early or late. If he did no wrong why should he fear? It is not the honest man who is afraid of the law, but it is the man who has done illegal acts. The time is a matter of no consequence to him, if he committed no corrupt or illegal acts during the election, because he knows that such acts cannot be proven against him if he is innocent; but it is the party who has been doing illegal acts who is afraid. With him time is the essence of the agreement; he is anxious to get through the period of suspense as early as possible. During the argument on the Queen's county case the whole gist of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite was that the returning officers were partisan and unfair, that they had not done their duty, while to-night their whole cry is against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It seems to me that, ever since the opening of the Session, the whole drift of the Opposition speeches has been an endeavor to show why they were defeated at the elections, why they have again been left in the cold shades of Opposition in this House. When they were before the people in the elections they said they were bound to succeed. They were confident they would carry the country, and a determined and persistent effort was kept up to strike down the character and reputation of every man supporting the Government. They failed in that policy, and now they come back chagrined and disappointed because they are still unable to convince a majority of the electorate that they are the honest and able men they represent themselves to be. The hon. member for Huron gave his reasons for their defeat. I remember distinctly the reasons which he gave in 1878 for their coming to this House in a minority—that the people had been deluded, and hoodwinked, and deceived, but that the time would come when they would awake to the truth, and when that time came the decision would be reversed. Well, that decision was not reversed in 1882, when they said the same thing—that the people were deluded and deceived into giving the verdict which they had given. The same cries were raised this present year when the elections took place; it was said that the verdict would be reversed. But that verdict was not reversed, and now the whole gist of their speeches is to explain why they happen to be sitting on the Opposition side to-day. They have to find some scape-goat—some Jonah; and the whole gist of their argument is directed against the returning officers,

and the revising officers, and the judges of the country. In the Queen's county election case they blamed the returning officer, but to-night one after another gets up, and yet they fail to give a single instance in which a returning officer did anything illegal and wrong. They are trying hard to find something to lay before the House and the country to show how they were defeated at the elections, and why they are now sitting where they are. They have at last hit upon this gentleman, who is a civil servant, and cannot come forward in his own defence; they have at last found a Jonah—a scape-goat, and the whole argument is directed against him. If I could satisfy myself that all the members of this House supporting the Government, or a majority of them, were gazetted within the prescribed time, and all those on the other side, or a majority of them, had not been gazetted within the same time, then I might presume that it was probable that this man had not done his duty fairly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the case.

Mr. SPROULE. But I find that members on both sides were not gazetted immediately after the return, according to the papers which have been laid before the House, and is it not so very inexplicable that it should be so? The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) says that he is satisfied that if he had been gazetted by a certain time, a petition would not have been entered against him. The return was made on the 12th of March, and he was gazetted on the 19th. He was returned on the very day the *Gazette* came out, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could not prepare all the returns that came in for the *Gazette* of that day. The hon. gentleman was gazetted in the next *Gazette*, and yet he complains that a protest has still been entered against him. He goes on to say that an understanding was entered into between the parties that they would countenance illegal acts, that both of them honorably agreed that they would refrain from entering a protest. But I ask, would that be honorable; would it not be winking at criminal or illegal acts? I say that if the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) knew of illegal acts being committed, he was just as culpable as the men who committed those acts if he refrained from taking steps to punish them. But I think he forgets that shortly after the elections, when John White was interviewed, he stated that he was in possession of sufficient information then to unseat the hon. gentleman; that he intended to do it, and now, because he is carrying out his intention, the hon. gentleman complains, and says that the member for the other riding should save him; that it was an understanding, because both were in delicate health, that there should be no protest, although there was evidence that he had committed illegal acts. Again, take the case of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). Did not the hon. gentleman speak in a way which would have the effect of at least shaking the confidence of hon. gentlemen in his good intentions? He said: Why we are in a position to show not only that the sealed parcel was mailed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on a certain day, but to show that he received it on a certain day. He said: If the registry books of the post-office are not blotted, and if there has been no erasure upon them, we can show that they were received on a particular day. But I would ask the House if that is not an unfair and gratuitous presumption.

Mr. PLATT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him. He is putting words in my mouth which I did not use at all. I did not say anything about the blotting of the erasure of the post office books.

Mr. BLAKE. It was another man—the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett).

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that I withdraw the statement I made with reference to the hon. member for

Prince Edward county. I believed it to be that hon. gentleman, but even if it were not, I say the arguments he advanced were equally fallacious.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) laughs as if there was something ridiculous in that statement, but though it may be so to his great mind, common sense will appeal to common minds with the same force that intricate questions will to great minds, and we are entitled to our opinions just as much as the hon. member for West Durham is to his. There is nothing strange in the fact that a sealed parcel should be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on a particular day, and that he should not register it the very day and hour it was received. When receiving, as he must have received, within a few weeks, hundreds of these parcels, is it to be expected that he should open and examine the whole of them and register them the very day they are received. If there is any discrepancy between the time of the post-office register and the receipt of these returns, it would not be at all unusual, because we often find that letters have lain in various departments for days before they are answered, and when you look at the registers you find that they have been filed and registered in the letter-books of the Departments days before their receipt is acknowledged. These returns might lie with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery days before he could read them and attend to them, as he had a large number of them to go through, and I say that it is no evidence that he did not act in good faith, because a few days intervene between the time the parcel was received at the post-office and the time the member was gazetted. In my own case the election was held on the 22nd of February, and I was not gazetted until the 19th of March, and though I could not see any reason for the delay, I did not find any fault with it; I did not even look at the *Gazette* to see when my return was there, because I believed the election was carried on legally and fairly, and, therefore, I was not afraid of a protest. I think these hon. gentlemen who are so much afraid of a protest must have a strong impression that there was something wrong, or they would not look upon the matter so closely and so interestedly to know when they were gazetted. And there is a strange significance in the fact that these wholesale charges come principally from the men who to-day are haunted with the knowledge that they must shortly appear before the courts to give an account of their acts during the election. I do not see anything wrong at all in the proposition made by the hon. leader of the Government, to order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make any explanation he can make to this House. If that explanation is not proper, there will afterwards be the same opportunity to call him to account that there is now. I do not think there is a valid reason why so much of the time of this House should be used in discussing what hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to call great grievances, but which appear to me to be no grievances at all. In other words, they are trying to explain away the fact of their being in the unfortunate position they are in to-day, and of being obliged to show whether their conduct in the election has been legal or illegal, honest or dishonest.

Mr. BRIEN. In looking over the return furnished to the Government, I find that my return was acknowledged by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 14th of March, and I was not gazetted until the 2nd of April. I would like to know the reason why. But I find that the return of the hon. member for North Essex, who is a general supporter of the Government, was acknowledged on the 9th of March, and he was gazetted on the 12th. There seems to be a strange coincidence in so many of these delays taking place in the returns of Reformers as against the few in the case

Mr. SPROULE.

of Conservatives. As the matter stands at present, the blame rests with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to draw a herring across the trail by saying that we are always trying to find fault with the returning officers. We have found fault with very few of the returning officers. If the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell passes, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will have an opportunity to defend himself. There is a strong suspicion that this gentleman has been coached by the members of the Government, and they also will have an opportunity of acquitting themselves, which I hope they will be able to do for their own credit and the credit of this country. Hon. gentlemen speak about the loss of time, but if this motion had been allowed to pass, there would not have been so much time lost. It is said by an eminent authority that he who attempts at any time to conceal evidence is always presumed to be guilty, and the conduct of the Government on this occasion seems to show that there is something they wish to conceal in this matter. In the hope to justify themselves, hon. gentlemen go back and try to find something against the Mackenzie Government, or the Ontario Government; but the hon. member who endeavored to do that only showed that they acted fairly in such matters. Instead of going behind either the Mackenzie Administration or the Mowat Administration, hon. gentlemen opposite should allow the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to defend himself against these charges. If I may be allowed to use the phrase of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I should say that if they deserve a licking, they should take it like gentlemen. There has been a wrong committed in my case, and I am desirous of knowing why it has been done. The argument has been continually raised that wrong has been done before, and, therefore, this is not wrong. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is fond of quoting precedents. I, for my part, think the time has arrived when this country should cease to lean on the Mother Country, or to be forever going to her for advice. I think this country is quite capable of transacting its business for itself. This Parliament is not a Parliament of imbeciles, incapable of handling a simple case of this kind. I thank the House for the attention with which it has listened to me.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think there is more ground for investigating the doings of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery than some hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to admit. It may suit these hon. gentlemen to resist such an investigation, because the dice have been loaded in their favor, and nobody knows that better than themselves; but it does seem to me preposterous for them to say that there is no ground of complaint against the conduct of this officer. We have been told that sometimes the returning officers fail to make the proper form of return, and delays were necessary to correct their returns. Again, the plea was set up by one hon. gentleman that the papers were voluminous, and that time, and care, and attention were required to examine them; and to night we have listened to elaborate arguments from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to demonstrate that the returning officers and the revising officers have done their duty properly, and that, therefore, nobody has any right to complain. When the conduct of the revising officers and the returning officers is under the consideration of this House, we propose to discuss their conduct; but the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell deals in the first place with the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and if he fails to show that the fault is not with him, then the conduct of the returning officers can be dealt with. So far as my own case is concerned I do not happen to be decorated with a protest, and, therefore, perhaps, I am not open to the charge that it makes any difference whether my return was early or late.

But I want to draw the attention of the House to a peculiarity in the mode in which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery gazetted the returns from the part of the Province of Ontario which I have the honor to come from. It does seem to me that that gentleman must have bestowed a great deal more time in reading the newspapers of the day to keep himself informed of the political complexion of the candidates who were returned, than he did in reading up the statutes which define his duty to publish the returns in the official *Gazette* at the earliest opportunity. In the case of the north riding of Wentworth, which I have the honor to represent, I find, turning to his own official statement, that he received the returns from my returning officer on the 5th of March. In corroboration of that I may say that the returning officer furnished me with a certificate, dated on the 4th of March, intimating that on that day he had forwarded my return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The 5th of March was the day on which the *Canada Gazette* was issued, and I had no reasonable right to expect that it would appear in that day's issue, and so far as I remember there is just one member whose election was gazetted on the day his return was received, and curiously enough he happens to belong to the ministerial side of the House. However, he had a week to wrestle with the returns from North Wentworth, and the 12th came and there was no official announcement of the election in North Wentworth in the *Gazette*. Another week elapsed, and the 19th came, and still he was unable to decide whether anybody had been returned in North Wentworth or not; but by the 26th he made up his mind that the North Wentworth returns were in proper form, and it was his duty to have them gazetted. What was the action with respect to the south riding, where he had the same postal facilities and occupied the same position as the officials here? His statement is that he received the returns from the south riding two days after he received it from the north riding, on the 7th of March, and he was able to determine that the gentleman from South Wentworth was properly elected and gazetted him on the first issue of the *Gazette*. It was in the *Gazette* of the 12th, immediately after his election. In the city of Hamilton, which happens to be close to both our ridings, the returns were made on the 4th of March, and he was able to discover, notwithstanding Hamilton is a large constituency, that next day they should appear in the *Gazette*, and accordingly they appeared. Take, adjoining on the east, the constituency of Lincoln and Niagara, and what do we find there. We find that he received those returns on the 7th—or two days after he received the return of North Wentworth—and on that very day he was able to decide that the election for Niagara should be gazetted. Again in Monck, the representative of which aired his eloquence to-night with respect to the wrongdoing in Ontario, I find the returning officer is announced as having made the return on the 14th, and it appeared in the next *Gazette*. Take the riding of Haldimand. We all remember there were some peculiar circumstances in connection with Haldimand. We have a Judge Upper there, and I dare say it is fresh in the recollection of the members of this House that there were some peculiar occurrences in connection with the official in that riding. The matters in that riding connected with the election were referred to Judge Upper. He took a week to consider, and after he got through his return with respect to Haldimand, his report reached the Clerk of the Crown on the 18th, and he was immediately able to decide that the return was in proper shape to go in the *Gazette* the next day, and we find Haldimand gazetted on the 19th. In Wentworth it took the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery twenty-one days to make his return; in Halton, it took him fifteen days to find out whether my hon. friend was properly elected so as to be gazetted. In North Brant it took him ten days, although North Brant

was one of those cases in which the election was gained by a large majority. In South Wellington it took him twelve days to decide. It is most extraordinary that in all these cases if these things do occur accidentally, that where Conservatives were returned their elections were placed invariably in the first issue of the *Gazette*, and in every single case of adjoining counties represented by members of the Opposition it took him from ten days to three weeks to get his returns from his office here to the *Canada Gazette*. Yet hon. members say that the conduct of this officer should not be enquired into. If their sense of political justice has gone so far astray, the public at large had better be acquainted with the fact, and we had better have the matter discussed and thoroughly ventilated in this House. If the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is to be a political officer, who is to publish returns in the *Gazette* according as it suits his politics, he should be brought before this House. If this gentleman is to do as he pleases in connection with this matter, or, rather, if he is to act, not as the statute, but as the Government of the day prescribes, that should be known. In so far as the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is concerned the arguments of hon. members on the other side have not been directed to meet the issues in question, but have been directed to every other possible issue; and while on other occasions they are very zealous to have every question affecting members of the House referred to a special committee, yet on this occasion no other inference can be drawn from their conduct than that there is something to be concealed which will not stand investigation. It is plain on the face of it that no letter from the gentleman will convey to the committee the information that a direct personal examination would tend to bring out. I shall support the original resolution as moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to have a thorough examination of this officer's conduct before the committee, and I shall vote against the attempt made by the Government to screen him against either his own misconduct or the misconduct of any officer of this House or any officer outside of this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have noticed and have been struck by the fact that not a single member of the Government has been heard upon the question before the House, with the exception of the right hon. the First Minister, who merely moved the resolution to burk this enquiry, and the hon. the Minister of Customs who rose to make a personal explanation in regard to this matter. With these two exceptions, not one of the Ministers has deigned to give any explanation of the views of the Government or to enter into any defence of their conduct in regard to this matter. I deem this a very remarkable fact, and it reminds me of a certain memorable episode in the parliamentary history of Canada two years ago, when that most iniquitous measure, the Franchise Act, was introduced here and was debated week after week and month after month, and the solid majority on that side sat dumb and voiceless, allowing the discussion to be monopolised by this side of the House and confining their own labor to the effective work of casting their votes in order to overrule us. It is true that the course taken by the Government is defended by some of their supporters. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), in the course of his brief remarks, asserted that this was a trivial matter. Is it indeed a trivial matter, a case which involves the conduct of an officer of the Government, a question which involves his truthfulness, a question which involves the propriety of the mode in which he has performed his duty, which charges that he has falsified records, that he has been guilty of perjury, that in the exercise of his judicial functions he has prostituted them for partisan purposes, that he has acted for the purpose of forwarding the interests of one party in

this country and injuring another party. Is this a trivial matter? Is it a trivial matter that many of the returning officers, the creatures and appointees of this Government, are charged with having withheld the returns and acted with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in a common conspiracy to defraud members of this House of their rights? And are we to relegate to the inferior courts of this land—we, the high court of Parliament—questions affecting our own rights and our own honor, questions as to the conduct of our own officers, the officers of the gentlemen who lead this Parliament? No, this is the tribunal where properly these charges should be tried. If these men have, in violation of their duty, insulted Parliament and failed to discharge the duty of their offices, Parliament should deal with them, either itself directly or through one of its committees. It is said that this will take up our time. Not at all. It will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that committee has plenty of time to sift the evidence, to call these men before it, to cross-examine them, and to ascertain from their statements and the other statements which will be submitted to it, what the true state of the case is.

It seems to me that the Government is a little inconsistent in its conduct. The other day we had the Queen's county case before us, and it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The case was a clear one and rested upon one acknowledged fact. It was contended on this side that Parliament should at once proceed to do what was just and proper in righting a great wrong. No, not at all. The Government said that this must be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that they would deal with it in a judicial capacity. Here we have another case of a similar character, and the Government says, when it is proposed to refer it to the same committee, no, in the case of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Mr. Pope, and the returning officers who are charged with not doing their duty, we must not refer that to the committee; oh, no! What are we to do? We are to take the statement of these men without the opportunity of cross-examination, without being face to face with them. They are simply to send their letters to the Clerk of the House. They are to make their statement as it may please them, without the opportunity being given to the members who may deem themselves aggrieved to test the accuracy of their statements. Why, Sir, this would be a mockery of justice, and no party, no men would resort to a dodge of this kind who had not something in their own conduct to conceal, who were not afraid of having the truth exposed. This is not the course taken in any trial. The accuser and the accused should be brought face to face. The accused is not to send in his letter and the accuser to be deprived of the opportunity of examining him. It is not in accordance with the principles of justice, but it is simply a dodge resorted to by the hon. gentlemen opposite in order—we are warranted in the inference—to conceal their own connection with the action of this officer. A good many references have been made to remarkable disclosures which have been made by these returns. Hours might be spent upon the subject. The more you study these returns, the more palpable becomes the fact that there has been collusion and fraudulent conduct in the withholding of these returns. I take the case of the riding in which I am most interested, the north riding of the county of Norfolk. I received the certificate of my election on the 8th March. I find it was received here, according to the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on the 12th March. I have no doubt it was mailed on the 8th and received on the 9th, but it is said to have been received on the 12th and I am gazetted on the 26th. I find the return from the south riding of Norfolk was received, according to the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on

Mr. CHARLTON.

the 15th, three days later than my own, and that the gentleman who represents that riding is gazetted one week earlier than myself. His return was received on the 15th and he was gazetted on the 19th. Mine was received on the 12th and I was gazetted on the 26th of March. In the case of North Simcoe, the return was received on the 10th, and the gentleman representing that riding was gazetted on the 12th. In the case of East Simcoe, the return was received on the 15th, and the gentleman representing it was gazetted on the 26th. The one was a Conservative, the other a Reformer. I find, in the case of the county of Ontario, that the return for the north riding was received on the 9th, and the member was gazetted on the 12th, while the return from the west riding was received also on the 9th and the member was not gazetted until the 26th. The one was a Reformer and the other a Conservative. I might adduce instances of that kind by the score, but it is only necessary to point out a few of them. In the case of Cumberland, in Nova Scotia, the return was received on the 11th, and the member was gazetted on the 12th, while, in the case of Shelburne, the return was received on the 19th and the member was not gazetted until the 2nd April. Then in New Brunswick, the return for Albert was received on the 14th and gazetted on the 19th, while the return for Charlotte was received on the 11th, and the member was gazetted on the 2nd April. In the case of Northumberland, the return was received on the 8th and the member was gazetted on the 26th.

Mr. MITCHELL. And great efforts made to get a protest.

Mr. CHARLTON. In the case of Queen's, N.B., the return was received on the 5th April, and the candidate who had the minority of votes was gazetted on the 9th. This state of things is outrageous. No member of the Ministry had the hardihood to stand up here and assert that these discrepancies are accidental, that there was not a design in this case. The design is palpable. There can be no other way of accounting for this except there was a fraudulent design in this matter. It was not a trivial matter. It was an attempt made and carried out on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to place some fifty or sixty members of this House in a perilous position. We are told here by the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that honest men are not afraid of a protest. Sir, no man in this House desires a protest. There is no man in this House but knows that a protest is a very serious matter; no man in this House but knows that the Government, with the money at its command, can assist defeated candidates who come trooping down here as they have been coming for weeks past, and can place funds in their hands to protest members from motives of spite; and if you leave the returns in such a way as to enable the great majority of Government supporters to escape unscathed, then fifty or sixty Reformers will be liable to protest, and great outrage has been committed upon them. They have not been dealt fairly with. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has prostituted his powers, and has been guilty of a dereliction of duty, and deserves the condemnation of this House. Sir, if we are to permit crimes of this kind to go unpunished, if we are to allow this Government to usurp power after power, to trample upon the rights and liberties of the people of this country and the minority of this House of Commons, there will be no remedy. The day is speedily coming when there will be no remedy but a resort to arms. The First Minister of this Government has already provoked one rebellion, he has driven a few wretched half-breeds in the North-West to take up arms, by his careless and criminal neglect, and he may drive white men to take up arms in this country. I tell you that such outrages as the Gerrymander Act, which gives to two Conservatives the power of three Reformers in

Ontario, such outrages as the Franchise Act, which was introduced here for the purpose of robbing the people of this country of their rights, such acts as that in connection with the Queen's county case, where a man who was elected by a majority of votes is left at home, and will remain at home, in all probability, through this Parliament—such acts as these we are dealing with to-night, where the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has acted as the tool of the hon. gentlemen opposite, has systematically withheld returns in the case of one side, and has rushed them with as great alacrity as possible in the case of the other side—I say these are things which require attention on the part of Parliament, and it does not behove us as representatives of the people to allow these things to go without protest, without an attempt to rectify the wrongs, and if that degree of independence existed on the opposite side of the House which my hon. friend from Grey has declared to exist, this motion would carry by an overwhelming majority in this House. I do not suppose it will carry. I have been in the House of Commons long enough to realise that there is little use in making protests against usurpation, tyranny, outrage and wrong. I realise that we are helpless; I realise that there is no appeal but to the public sentiment of this country. We can appeal to that here, but we spend our voice in vain in appealing to the members of this House for justice, in appealing to the members of this House to carry on the business of this country in accordance with the constitutional precedents derived from our Mother Country. Such things as these are not done in England. They were once. Great parliamentary outrages took place there a few centuries ago, but a crisis came and the head of a king was brought to the block; and, in consequence of this, and succeeding events, popular rights in England are respected. We may possibly have a catastrophe in this country sometime, that will lead to a proper respect on the part of the Ministry of the day of the rights of the people and the rights of the minority in this House. But the Government now, Sir, does trample ruthlessly and with impunity upon the rights of the people, upon the rights of the minority of the members of this House. They have done it in this matter. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been charged with being guilty of certain offences. One member of this House has made specific charges against him. He has charged that he has wilfully, and with knowledge of the fact, falsified the records. Now, that charge is made by a member of this House, and it is proper that it should be investigated by this House; and if the Government of the day were honest in this matter, if their skirts were clear, they would be satisfied with nothing less than a searching investigation in order to clear themselves; and the fact that they propose to deny that investigation, is, to my mind, evidence unanswerable that they are guilty of all that is charged against them, and of more than is charged against them. They propose—not that there shall be an investigation, not that members who feel aggrieved as to the conduct of their own officer, shall have the privilege in a committee of this House to question him as to his conduct. Oh no! He is not to be brought to the Bar in committee of this House. There is to be no investigation, but he is, forsooth, to address a letter to the Clerk of this House, explaining his conduct in such a way as may please him, and leave the members of this House unable to cross-examine him. Sir, this is a mockery of justice. In doing this, as they propose to do it, as they will do it, this Government has simply given us another illustration of the facility with which they trample upon liberty and justice, and outrage every principle of right and every principle of decency in the administration of the affairs of this country. I protest, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House, against the conduct of the Government. I assert, Sir, that we are fast drifting to a condition of things that will be no better than the state of affairs in Mexico, where

rule is exercised by virtue of pronouncements and revolutions. Sir, we are fast approaching a crisis in the affairs of this country, and the abuses that have been perpetrated by the Government in power, not the least of which is that which they propose to perpetrate to-night, give us very solemn reasons for looking with apprehension on the future of this country, unless these men shall be driven out of power by an uprising of the people, and by a repudiation of their acts.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have listened with a great deal of attention thus far to the discussion of this subject, having some little doubt in my own mind at the outset whether there was not some advantage in being gazetted early rather than late. But the language of the last speaker, extravagant and violent out of all proportions to the importance of the subject under discussion, has convinced me that if I had any doubt it should be dispelled. He told us during the course of his remarks that his return should have been gazetted before the return of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), the adjoining constituency, and yet the member for South Norfolk who was returned sooner than he was returned, is protested against to-day, and that hon. gentleman's return, who was returned later, is not protested. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was among the first who were returned, and he is to-day under protest.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I beg your pardon. He is not protested against.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. Postmaster General's return was among the first that were gazetted; he to-day is under protest. The hon. Minister of Finance was among the first to be returned; he to-day is under protest. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to any person who has listened with attention to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, and has penetrated through that apparent zeal and sincerity they have thrown into this discussion, will discover that in many cases, I venture to say in the majority of cases, there has been no advantage whatever gained by those members whose returns were made late instead of early. Now, in the face of all this, is there any possible excuse for the dangerous language we have just heard from an hon. gentleman who has sat in this House for many years, and is among the old parliamentarians of this country? I submit that in this country, when hon. gentlemen attempt to build up a case upon the action of this Government, based upon the idea that there has been an assault on the liberties of the people, they ought to be very careful in their language and very certain of their facts. Have they been certain of their facts, in this case, as they would lead us to believe? I venture to say they have not. I venture to say, as the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) has said, that lapse of time after the bitter partisan spirit which is evoked in an election softens rather than strengthens that spirit which would naturally tend to bring about an election protest. I believe that is the experience of many hon. gentlemen who, if their returns had not been late would, perhaps, to-day have been honored with a protest. As to the case of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett), I do not see of what that hon. gentleman can complain. His return was gazetted very soon after it was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the fact of his return being gazetted or not has nothing to do with the state of facts he has brought up in connection with the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson). He can have no complaint whatever against the Clerk of the Crown. I never knew when the return of my own election was gazetted—I never made an enquiry about it. I knew that the election took place on the 22nd of February, and I think I was gazetted on the 19th of March.

Mr. MILLS. On the 12th.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not see that there could be any advantage from having been gazetted two or three weeks earlier, as perhaps I might have done if I had gone to the returning officer and urged him to hurry up his return. I submit that the time of the House and country has been to a great extent wasted by this discussion. We have here the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the papers presented against him. Is it not but fair that he should put his own case in writing as against the papers submitted against him. It is, I think, eminently fair and just that both sides of the case should be placed in writing and submitted to this House and the country so that the judgment of the people may be passed upon it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman thought the speech which the last hon. gentleman who spoke made a case against himself. I might say with respect to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wood) remarks that he has furnished an additional reason why the Clerk of the Crown should be called to account for the very extraordinary manner in which he caused the return of members to be gazetted. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is a member of the legal profession; no doubt he aspires to a judgeship at some time; he views every question with judicial propriety, and he tells us as he gives us his cool and unbiassed opinion that in delaying the returns of members the officer was taking a very sure way of minimising the possibility of those members being protested against. Here is the case of forty or fifty members of the Opposition, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery appears to have been acting in this partisan manner in delaying the gazetting of those members. If he had gazetted them at the time when party strife was warm, we are told, they would most surely have been protested against. But the Clerk of the Crown delays their gazetting, he does not gazette their returns for weeks after the hot political excitement has passed, and so he has saved them from protest! What an injustice that is to the other side of the House? It is really a question that should be considered and examined. While there is much that is humiliating in what we have witnessed today, even in the amendment offered to burk enquiry, there is one gleam of pleasure, that while there are some members who are anxious to stifle enquiry, hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, with one or two exceptions, have been just those whom we would have expected to defend this action. We have not heard the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) say anything. He is a high judicial authority, and I should like to obtain his opinion. I should be pleased to hear him explain why the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), whose return was received on 11th March, was gazetted on the 12th, but the hon. member for Bothwell, whose return was received on the previous day, was not gazetted on the 12th, 19th, no. 26th, but on 2nd April. I should like him to account for this: that in the case of his own riding the return, which was received on 10th March, was gazetted on the 12th, while the member for Russell, whose return was received three days before, was not gazetted till two weeks afterwards. One of the hon. gentlemen who attempted to defend the amendment to prevent enquiry was gazetted on the 19th, his return being received on the 14th, while the return of the member for Kent was received on the 11th, and not gazetted till 2nd April. Similar results took place in two ridings of a county, such as the two ridings of Essex, the two ridings of Wentworth and of Norfolk and so on. Not only was that the case in Ontario, but it also prevailed in the Province of Quebec; and in Nova Scotia, the return of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) was received on the 19th and not gazetted till 2nd April, while that of the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) was

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

returned on the 11th and gazetted on the 12th; and in New Brunswick the same state of affairs prevailed. In fact looking through this return, all we have to do is to notice the discrepancy between the time the return was received and the time it was gazetted, and in each case when the return was delayed a Liberal was returned. Under such circumstances it is proposed to bring this officer before the Committee of Privileges and Elections to give an explanation. There is an additional reason why this should be done. Statements have been made by hon. members in their places that they had documentary proof that the return as submitted to this House in reply to the Order of the House was not a correct return. If the motion of the First Minister should prevail, what position does this officer occupy? Here are charges made against him and he has no opportunity of defending his character. It may be said that the members of the Government would rise and defend him, that it would be their province to do so, as he is not here to defend himself. But, Sir, they are silent; they say nothing. The First Minister said scarce a word; the Minister of Customs rose, but he rose but to scold on some side issue. We have not heard from the Minister of Public Works, or any of the other members of the Government. And there are some members on this side of this House who think that perhaps the reason why the Ministers have been quiet when this matter was discussed is that they had given instructions to that officer in some way or other. At any rate they want to have an opportunity of cross-questioning that officer, to have him explain how it is that such a state of things exist. One speaker on this side ventured the remark that perhaps the hon. Secretary of State, if rumor spoke truly, could tell us something about it. It may be that he thought that because the Department of the Secretary of State was the one with which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had most to do, possibly that rumor was true; but I think I shall be able to show, after I have pointed out some statements which have been made, that he could not possibly be a party to any transactions of that kind, whatever anyone else might do. A few weeks ago some one was kind enough to place in my box in the post office a book containing a description of the life and character of that gentleman. I perused it with great pleasure, because I thought that in such a crisis as I conceived our country was passing through it was a good thing that the Parliament of Canada had among its members a gentleman possessed of such a character—one who, when the rights and liberties of the people were invaded, was ever found to be the champion of those rights and liberties. We have to go back to the fifth century before Christ to understand the character of that hon. gentleman. The description of his life states:

"In the fifth century, before Christ, there appeared a man to whose ear all the people of Greece seemed attached; his insinuating and persuasive eloquence had crowned him king of speech, and his oratorical contests, which were but one series of victories, gave to his century the name of Pericles. What an admirable analogy between that phase of Greek history and the present time in Canada? In the two countries all depends on speech; the acts of the Government are discussed openly, the people take part in Government contests"—

An hon. MEMBER. Government contracts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, not contracts, contests.

"speech is sovereign; the statesman should be an orator. And if Pericles at Agora in Athens defended the rights of his people, here the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in seductive accents of persuasive eloquence supports with energy the rights of progress and patriotism, everything connected with him recalls to mind that fine eloquence which fascinated and conquered antiquity and enlightened the modern world with the purest rays of oratorical art."

Now, can we for one moment suppose that an hon. gentleman gifted like that—Pericles the Second—would be a party to a thing like this? But my surprise is not there; my surprise is that one who has been noted all his life as the champion of popular rights and constitutional government, one who has stood up for the liberties of the people, should

have remained silent at this supreme crisis of our country's history. He should speak and lend the weight of his mighty eloquence in denouncing the wrong that has been perpetrated, for he will see, with his quick perceptions of what is right and wrong, that there has been a gross outrage committed on the rights and privileges of members of Parliament. I want to hear his strong tones, for I am told that:

"He belongs to the finest class of exalted orators, his speech, at the same time, harmonious and sweet, his incomparable mastery of irony, the broadness of his views and above all his invincible love of his country have raised him to the rank of Demosthenes and Isocrates."

There is where I experience a feeling of surprise—that the hon. gentleman should go through a long discussion like this, when he sees that there is an evident attempt being made by the First Minister to bark enquiry, and should take no steps to protect the rights and liberties of this Parliament from being invaded—I say that I am at a loss to understand why he forbears to speak.

"We are at a loss as to which we should the more admire in him, the seductive manner of his victorious speech or his admirable expression of an ever invincible patriotism."

But, Sir, we have had no opportunity on the present occasion of judging of "the seductive manner of his victorious speech or his admirable expression of an ever invincible patriotism." He liked politics, he says, because his own words are quoted:

"I liked politics before having known the way of interest, ambition or intrigue, I studied politics before having understood the narrow meanness or the calculating impudence which is connected with it."

I should judge from this article that he entered politics pure, and that he has maintained the purity of his political character; and I would like him now, with his fresh and pure political character, to rise and lend the weight of his eloquence in denouncing what a large number of the members of this House conceive to be an outrage on their rights and liberties. There are times we are told:

"When Mr. Chapleau decides to cease tormenting his adversaries by bringing to their mind evidence of their own shame, and when he ascends the rostrum when the great question of governing the world is concerned and when he speaks of the strength and patriotism of the Canadian people, his majestic and grave delivery commands the respect even of his enemies who find themselves obliged to bend before his noble utterances."

Will I be pardoned if I venture to suggest to him that now is an eminently proper time for the hon. gentleman to ascend to those regions? And I would suggest that he should not be too careful about the manner of ascending—whether he climbs up step by step, or whether he soars, so long as he reaches that eminence; and when he has done so, he should give us his candid opinion whether he thinks that in this manner of gazetted members he discovers anything of "narrow meanness or the calculating impudence which is connected with politics" but which he so carefully eschews. It is time for him and every man who is a lover of his country, every man who believes in constitutional and responsible government, to array himself on the side of those who are attempting to defend it. They say that this is time wasted. Time wasted in discussing a matter which strikes at the very roots of the liberties of the people! The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Wood) in a very glib way, told us we were wasting the time of the country. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman what are his conceptions of the duty of a member of Parliament, or of the fundamental principles of a free state, when he can find sufficient boldness to rise in his place, as a Canadian representative, and give expression to such views as those? The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has pointed out to you that while we are denouncing this act we are but denouncing one long series of outrages against the rights and liberties of the people. This thing has been going on for some time. They say we are chagrined because we are not in office. Well, I don't

think they are in a position to judge. I do not feel any great chagrin, but I do feel that when we have such exhibitions in this Parliament as men rising to sanction and uphold these outrages on the body of which they are members, we are in a measure abased; that we are not maintaining the high stand we should maintain as representatives of the people of this country. It matters not to this country what party governs, but it does matter to this country—it matters in the most solemn sense—that it shall be the people who shall make the laws under which the people live; and I tell you, that in all the outrages which I conceive have been perpetrated on the liberties and rights of the people, you have been but carrying out the Tory principles, those principles which have ever been held by the Tory party; principles which do not, perhaps, find expression in as open a manner now as in days gone by, but principles which are sought to be given effect to by these gentlemen, in representing the rights and liberties of the people, in endeavoring, by what I might almost call bribes, to stifle the expression of what ought to be the independent organs of public opinion, in endeavoring to subvert constituencies and members of Parliament who are elected to represent those constituencies. Sir, there has been a long series of that. To-day I believe in my heart that the success of the party opposite has been obtained through means that are not in the interest and well-being of the Dominion, which it ought to be our honor and pride, each one of us, to endeavor to build up. Sir, let the people rule; let there be a free expression of the people's will; untie the people's hands; give them a free ballot, and let them cast their votes; and if they relegate the Liberal party to the Opposition benches, all right. What the people do is right. But what we say is that when the Government use the power that they possess to tie the hands of the people and thus secure in their own favor a verdict at the polls that they could not secure on their merits, then they are recreant to their trust and are doing damage to the country over which they are called to preside. We charge that against the hon. gentlemen opposite, and as a proof that there is something in the charge, hon. gentlemen sit with sealed lips, and do not dare to rise to defend the iniquities that they perpetrate by their votes. That is a scene which has been witnessed in this House more than once. I said it was to their credit that they were able to maintain silence while they gave their votes at any rate; but it seems to me that an hon. gentleman who is prepared to cast his vote in a certain direction ought to rise and defend his course in doing it. In a grave case like this, which is proved on the very face of it, and it is sought that there shall be an investigation of it, the duty of the First Minister does not require him to intercept with an amendment by which he seeks to thwart the ends of justice. Why, Sir, the investigation does not need to be gone into. The people of this country only need to have printed in the public press the statement returned to this House by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Their knowledge of the different constituencies there referred to will enable them to see that no amount of explanation or sophistry can ever wipe out that record, which I venture to say is disgraceful to all who have been connected with it. It would only worry you, Sir, if I were to go again over the cases in which it is glaringly plain to every one that members of this House have been outraged. Sir, it is a thing to be regretted that in this Parliament such a thing is ever to be seen as this—that where an officer has plainly neglected to do his duty, and has had such grave charges made against him, as those specified by members of this House, an attempt should be made to prevent that officer going before a tribunal, where he will have an opportunity of presenting his own case and giving explanation of his conduct. Sir, the people of the country will judge; but it should not be left to the people of the country to decide on this matter some years hence, when this House may be dis-

solved and we are sent back to them. There ought to be in the breasts of the members of this House sufficient of the principles of honor and of regard for the standing of this House and the rights and liberties of its members, that when members rise in their places and say that they believe they can prove that incorrect return has been sent to this House, there should not be a man here who would not say that the officer concerned must appear and explain his conduct, and if incapable of explaining it, must suffer the consequences. Sir, two methods have been proposed of dealing with this matter. I for one feel that there have been such revelations in this case that I would be lacking in my duty, in my own sense of honor and dignity, and in my duty to my constituents, if I hesitated to vote in favor of that gentleman being brought where he shall have an opportunity of explaining his conduct. Of course the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), who laughs at me, may have different ideas of his duty and dignity. If the hon. member feels that the privileges of this House have not been invaded, and that there has been no harm done, he is at liberty to cast his vote in such a way as he pleases. But I warn the House again that liberty, popular rights, responsible and constitutional Government were only attained after a long series of constitutional struggles, and it is well that we should beware of the first attempt that is made to sap the liberties that we are enjoying. In my opinion, this is not the first, it is not the second, it is not the third, it is not the fourth attempt that has been made; but there has been a series of attempts, of which this is, we may say, the culminating point, to subvert the liberties of the people and to again reduce us, as it were to vassalage, and to gain for those on the Treasury benches the absolute power to govern this country, those who are elected to this House to judge questions on their merits, casting aside their judgment and their conscience and yielding judgment, conscience and all to the few men who hold power. Sir, I believe in liberty, I believe in responsible government and constitutional government, I believe in the rights and liberties of this House, and let the majority do what they will, I will not bind my judgment, my conscience, and my liberty, to any Government in this country, be its name Tory or be its name Liberal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My modesty should have prompted me a moment ago to rise and call the hon. gentleman to order. But I must say that I yielded to the charm of once hearing from the lips of a Reformer my eulogy as a humble member of the Conservative party. It was a novelty to me, who have been accustomed during a long period of public life never to have heard uttered from the mouth of a Liberal, Reformer or Grit anything but abuse, the vilest slanders and the greatest outrages—it was a novelty to me to listen to the hon. gentleman repeating the far too flattering and exaggerated compliments that he has been reading. I pay him my compliments—he did it well. One of these days, perhaps, he will believe what he has repeated, and I hope that that day is not very far distant. I hope this evening, after my remarks, the hon. gentleman will say that I deserve at least the credit of always taking in a debate the part that is noble and generous. I do not want to yield to the two or three different appeals that have been made to me as the humble head of the department which comprises the Queen's Printer and the official *Gazette*, to tell of the great conspiracy and the dark deed with which an important officer of this Government is charged. I have no tale to tell except one which is personal to me, and if I have been a party to that conspiracy, as it is called by my hon. friends, I have certainly well covered my tracks, as I am one of those unfortunate members who had to wait a long time for the gazetting of his return to Parliament. There certainly should have been no doubt about my having been elected. It is true the prophecies made

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

by hon. gentlemen opposite on the hustings and in the press, would have led people to suppose that a crushing defeat was awaiting me in the county I have represented for over twenty years. Gallows had been erected in my county once, and it was said that if physically I would not hang to those gallows which were erected in January, 1886, that politically my existence would cease on those gallows built up in commemoration of the Regina scaffold; but on the 22nd of February, though I had paid just two short visits to my electors, I was elected by a majority of from 875 to 900. The returning officer surely had not to wait for a recount in my case. My adversaries did not want a recount; it was painful enough for them to have counted once. Still, I waited until the 14th of March for the return, and until the 19th March for the gazetting my election. Why did I wait patiently and quietly as I did, in spite of my legitimate desire of seeing my name in the *Canada Gazette*? It was because my conscience was not terror-stricken as was the consciences of hon. gentlemen opposite. I was never in any trepidation of hearing people say that it was the money which had been sent from the other side of the border, which had been the cause of my election, nor any other money. My conscience, politically and personally, was quiet, and I did not complain. One would believe, in listening to the declamations of hon. gentlemen, that the constitution and the country were in danger, and I was surprised to find out in the suave preacher of morality and Sabbath observance, in that quiet lecturer of this House, a Roman soldier, a man who was ready to take up arms, against us. I thought for a moment the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would cross over to another seat and snatch from the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) his old Saskatchewan musket. But no, I am sure that display of warlike sentiment was only—I will not say for the show; because that would not be parliamentary—the consequence of over-zeal in politics. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Quebec East say that responsible government was no longer in existence here, and that Baldwin and Lafontaine had been fighting for nothing. Why, what was his ground for that statement? Because ten or twenty days had elapsed before the official *Gazette* announced the results of the elections to the electors. I have heard also that popular rights had been trampled under foot, and the hon. gentleman who has just sat down appealed to me to use my eloquence in denouncing those wicked men who had allowed popular rights to be trampled under foot. What popular rights have been trampled on? Our popular rights have been exercised during the elections. Has there been a petition of the electorate complaining of what the Clerk of the Crown and Queen's Printer have been doing? Has the liberty of the people been attacked, or the right of a single elector invaded? No; true, the comfort of some hon. members may have been disturbed, but that is all, and their comfort has been disturbed only in the cases of those who had reason to fear between a wrong election and a true return. I am surprised at these denunciations. It is a tradition in the bar, the profession to which I belong, that a client has forty-eight hours to curse his judge. Had the hon. gentleman been denouncing those who rendered a verdict against them, I would understand it; but I am at a loss to understand that when a pleader has lost his case he should say, not that the judge was incompetent, or the jury stupid, but that the prothonotary who registers the judgment is a scoundrel. It is the first time I have heard of a suitor venting his wrath in that way. The judgment is not denied, the judge is not accused, the jury is not denounced, but the clerk is called a dishonest man. I have been surprised at this debate, and I must say I have regretted it. I did not intend to take part in it at all. The hon. gentleman has said that during my life I have defended popular rights and the liberties of the people,

It is true, and I glory in it, but there is also one thing I have always respected; I have always respected what is noble and generous, and I have always tried to be generous towards the weak. To be ungenerous towards officials serving under us, towards those who have no right to defend themselves, I cannot accuse myself of. I would not condemn a man who is not before the House to defend himself, as do hon. gentlemen opposite, who have denied him the right of giving him an answer. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but they are doing this by their vote. What is the proposition of the leader of the Government? He moves that the Clerk of the Crown be called on to give an answer and an explanation of the report which he has laid before the House. Is it not right that he should be allowed to give this answer? Hon. gentlemen opposite say, let him give his answer before the Committee on Privileges and Elections; but his answers there would not have the same significance after the denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman may say "hear, hear," but he must admit that I am right. I always felt that great consideration was due to the position of the servants of Parliament and of the Crown. Seven years ago, when I was the Premier of Quebec—

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. To the shame of the Province.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has used a word which is not parliamentary, and I will call on him to withdraw it.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will not retort out of respect for the dignity of the House and for my own dignity; but I must say that if that gentleman who has just risen to insult me thinks he is the glory of his county and his Province he may keep that opinion to himself.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I suppose it is parliamentary—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. Well, I appeal to the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) The hon. member may interrupt me as much as they like, but even if they should see fit to do their utmost to intimidate me, that would not hinder me from speaking. I have sat in parliamentary assemblies before this, although this is my first session here. I wish to know this, Mr. Speaker: I have been called to order by you and I have submitted to your decision. I had, perhaps, nothing to withdraw from what I had said, but, at all events, I have done it, and I do not wish to go back on what I have done. But it seems to me that the hon. Secretary of State has made use towards me of expressions which were unparliamentary when he said that I was not a credit to my constituency. Well, if it is parliamentary for him to use these expressions towards me I wish to know it from you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are some expressions that are glaringly and evidently unparliamentary, when the same thing said in another way and in other words may not be unparliamentary. The rule is that members of the House must speak of each other like gentlemen do, and I maintain that any word conveying in itself that a man is not a gentleman or anything meaning the same thing, is not parliamentary.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I never said—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I want to get a decision.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman chooses to appeal to the House against my decision he can do so, but it must be without debate.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. What is the decision?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was just going to say that, under strong provocation, though I am accustomed to it, I might be, and I think I would be quite excusable in making use of expressions which otherwise and elsewhere I would not use. In this instance I know that the expressions which I used were not unparliamentary, but I may say that, except under provocation, I would not have made use of those expressions. This is, I suppose, sufficient to satisfy the House that I had not the intention of hurting the feelings of the hon. gentleman. I generally try to keep within the rules of debate when I address the House, which I am sorry to say is not often, because I am not sufficiently *au fait* of the language of those who generally speak in the House to do it with advantage. I was saying, what probably my hon. friend from Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine) knows quite well, that seven years ago I was the Premier of the Province of Quebec, and I have had praise in that regard from the present Premier of the Province, whose testimony will not be suspected by the hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has said he is accustomed to parliamentary assemblies, but I am afraid that he is going to prove that, if he has been there for a long time, he has not much profited by his experience. When I was Premier in Quebec there was a man who was an officer of the Government, who, before being an officer in that Province, was directly opposed to me in politics. He had been sitting in this House for some time, and was known to be thoroughly in the ranks of the Liberal party. On one or two occasions, over zealous partisans attempted to bring the name of that officer before the House, in connection with alleged partisan action. I am glad to say that I then and there stepped forward and said that I would not, unless a gross injustice, a gross damage, a flagrant injustice had been done, ever allow, as long as I could command the House, an officer of the House or an officer of the Government to be dragged out and to be denounced in the House when he had no opportunity to defend himself. I was surprised at the denunciation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, and afterwards at their refusal to do what the right hon. gentleman is asking, to give the officer in question an opportunity of giving an explanation, which will not prevent the hon. gentlemen afterwards, if they choose, from making any motion they desire after his answer has been received. Upon that answer will depend the whole fate of this discussion, which I would not like to call frivolous, but which did not deserve to occupy the time which it has occupied. Suppose the answer of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is before the House, and is found by the House to be satisfactory and to be sufficient to convince everyone of us; and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot say that they will not be convinced, they do not know what the answer will be. Suppose they see that there is nothing in the conduct of that officer to be reprimanded, nothing to be blamed, what then would have been the good of this discussion to-night and the denunciations which we have heard, denunciations which should not have fallen from the lips of those hon. gentlemen; insinuations, for instance, such as that from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who, with the ingenuity which he always displays and which belongs to him—and I say this in all sincerity—who is seldom misinformed in his statements, who is painstaking in looking up the facts which he is presenting to the House, made a discovery and thought he had found in the estimates

the secret of the nefarious conduct of this officer, because he said the officer had been transferred from this House into the Department of the Privy Council, that is to say, the Department of the right hon. the leader of the Government. My hon. friend might have known, and, if he had looked at the Civil Service List for 1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886, he would have seen that that officer was in the Department of the Secretary of State. I can inform him that he was transferred from my Department several months before the Government thought of having a general election. The officer was in my Department. Some questions arose, questions of precedence between officials in the Departments, and, looking over the list of officials, I thought that that officer, who belonged partly to the House and partly to all the Departments in general, should be transferred to that Department which has no special work except the general work affecting all the Departments, the Department of the President of the Privy Council. That was done not at the demand of the right hon. gentleman, but at my own demand, and long before the Government had even thought of having a general election. So far with regard to that insinuation of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have known the Clerk of the Crown for years. He was in the Department over which I have the honor to preside, and a more painstaking, a more honest, a more impartial officer, and more ready to do his duty, I have not seen. I am glad to have an opportunity to render him this testimony after the obloquy to which he has been subjected on the part of hon. members opposite. I do not intend to go any further into the discussion of this question. To me it seems very clear, and I cannot see that it has any party bearings at all. At least, speaking for myself, I can say that I regard it wholly independent of political feeling. I take that case exactly as it should be taken, and I say that officer has obeyed our command. He has put before us a report, and that report has been commented upon far too strongly by hon. gentlemen opposite, accompanied with expressions and denunciations which I regret to have heard used. He is now asked to give his explanation; if it is satisfactory well and good. No damage has been done to anybody, and if the explanation is one which is satisfactory, this will end the matter. But, I do not wish to be obliged, for one, to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and enquire into the conduct of every returning officer during the whole of the last elections. It is said that members have got time to make that investigation; and I perceived immediately that some hon. gentlemen who spoke upon this question only intended that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be examined, whereas in the Committee on Privileges and Elections every hon. member will be at liberty to bring up the whole question of the returning officer in his county. Everyone who has a little political grievance in his county would be induced to call that up, and there would be no end to it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this investigation would not be regular, and as regards the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery I am perfectly sure that as far as political partisanship is concerned, all impartial men in this House will say that this gentleman should have the protection that every one of our officers should have, and should be allowed to give his explanation as he has been asked to give it.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) At this late hour of the night I do not intend to delay the House very long, but the insinuations which have just been made by the hon. Secretary of State, in his speech, compel me to speak, if not for my own sake, at least for the fair fame of my county, which the hon. member for Terrebonne saw fit to insult on account of the choice it made by electing me as its representative. It will be sufficient for me to appeal to the hon. Secretary of State—

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. It is all very well for hon. members who do not understand French to sneer at me; it is their business. I suppose they are paid for it, but that will not deter me from taking as much time as will be necessary for my remarks.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The language the hon. gentleman has just used is not parliamentary. He said that hon. members were paid for interrupting him.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to say that hon. members are paid to interrupt him.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I never applied the word "paid" to any of the members of this House. I said that if there is anybody in this House who wishes to interrupt me he must be paid for it, because I hold that nobody in this House has a right to interrupt me without cause.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have given my decision and it seems to me that the hon. member should submit to it.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. Had I understood that the word could apply to any of the hon. gentlemen opposite—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It could not apply to the galleries.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I did not understand that it could apply to the galleries, because in this House we are supposed to follow parliamentary practice, and the public is not supposed to be present at our proceedings. When a member is addressing the House on a question in which his Province and the country at large are interested, he should not be interrupted. I say I have a perfect right, if not in my own name, at least in the name of my constituency, and in the name of the Province of Quebec to address the House in answer of the hon. Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman, after you had called me to order, Mr. Speaker, because in the course of his remarks he boasted that he had been Premier of the Province of Quebec—I know he is very skilful in that respect, that he causes himself to be banquetted and sticks feathers in his own cap for things that do not amount to much—and I ventured to say that it was for the shame of the Province of Quebec. You called me to order, and I understood from your decision that the language I used was not parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member ought not to come back on that point and repeat those expressions in an indirect way.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I was about to state, Mr. Speaker, that I had bowed down to your decision. It seems to me that there is nothing unparliamentary in that. At all events if there is anything unparliamentary in it I withdraw all that I have said with respect to that. To resume my subject, I say that from the standpoint of the Province of Quebec, and from the standpoint of the county which I have the honor to represent in the House of Commons of Canada, I believe that in the opinion of the majority of the electors of my county I represent them as honorably as any member represents his constituency in this House, and even as honorably as the hon. Secretary of State, notwithstanding his large majority. I can very well understand that the hon. Secretary of State should boast of his large majority, and I am not at a loss for an explanation of that fact. But, on the other hand, if, in the month of July, 1886, I did not have the advantage of having as large a majority as that of the hon. Secretary of State, that was probably due to his efforts and exertions in the county of Chambly. But strange to say, at the election of the 22nd of February last, the hon. Secretary of State did not show himself in the county of Chambly. The success with which he had met on the 30th July, 1886, had inspired him with the discreet courage of not putting in an appearance, and the result was—it was not to my advantage but rather to the advan-

tage of the hon. Secretary of State—that my majority, which amounted to eighty-eight on the 30th of July, 1886, was reduced to forty-six. I suppose it was because the hon. Secretary of State had not shown himself in the county of Chambly. That was the secret of the change which took place in the county. At all events I am not complaining of that, Mr. Speaker; we are discussing a question which is far more important. I do not wish to relate the history of my election, it would be too long. In the month of July, 1886, it was intended to make a test case in the Province of Quebec. The hon. Secretary of State had, so to speak, flung his portfolio at the head of the Premier and hurled defiance at the Province of Quebec. He did not resign at that time. No; he made the people believe he was resigning, but it is well known that he was not slow in withdrawing his resignation. It was not serious. But he felt perfectly sure, that, by hurrying through the elections with the old lists, he would have a majority and carry the county of Chambly. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will please notice, that the cards had been spotted beforehand, so to speak; it was not a fair deal. The hon. gentlemen said to themselves: If we could only carry the county of Chambly under the circumstances, what a great success it would be. So and so is going to be a candidate, and we must begin to destroy him two months beforehand. Then, the organ of the Secretary of State—for he had an organ, and an important organ, at Montreal; he has two now—the organ of the Secretary of State commenced to demolish the future member for Chambly. The result did not annihilate him; on the contrary, the result was to bring his candidature out in full bloom; for he had no intention of re-entering politics, nor of running as a candidate in a county which, in 1881, had told him to go back home and devote himself to his professional pursuits; he had no intention, I say, to continue to take part in politics. But, owing to the repeated attacks of the organ of the hon. Secretary of State against me, I said to myself: There is only one thing for me to do, and it is to vindicate my honor, which is so wantonly attacked. It was rumored at that time that the member for the county of Chambly was about to obtain a situation—I will not say for what motive or for what reason. The member for Chambly who preceded me in this House is one of my personal friends, although he is not one of my political friends, but he is an excellent officer, who fulfils his duties well. He is not a returning officer.

Mr. BERGIN. I would like to ask whether the hon. gentleman is in order in discussing the political contest in the Province of Quebec, or whether he ought not to confine himself to the discussion of the question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The moment the hon. member is called to order, I am obliged to tell him, that the point he is discussing with regard to the county of Chambly has nothing to do with the question before the House, and that if he will return to the question before the House he will be in order.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I respectfully submit to your decision, Mr. Speaker, but I thought that owing to the wide area over which this debate had already been dragged, that I also, had a right to answer the arguments of the hon. Secretary of State. But I am willing to confine myself to the question now before us. What is our position, Mr. Speaker, on the question now before us? We hold, or rather it is held in the main motion that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not discharged his duty; that he did not act according to law. I regret that I have been interrupted, because I should have successfully answered, I think, many of the arguments of the hon. Secretary of State, but I do not wish to revert to that. We complain that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not performed his duties according to law. I have admired the artlessness of the hon. Secretary of State. It is not the first time. Those

who do not know him, may believe in it, but I have not much faith in it, still one must always admire the expression of a feeling carried to its utmost limit, whenever it is to be found. I have admired him when he said in my county I had a returning officer who belonged to my party. I did not complain against him. He made the return of my election on the 12th of March, and I did not complain of the fact, that the gazetting took place some time after that. But let us examine when the return of the election of the hon. Secretary of State was made. We read in the report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, as it appears in the Orders of the House, that the return of the election in the county of Terrebonne, an election which was carried by 800 majority, as he said, was sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 12th of March, and he does not complain of the delay within which he has been gazetted. Well, Mr. Speaker, to hear him you would think that he was not gazetted until at least the 12th or 15th of April. Not at all. He was gazetted on the 19th of March in the number of the *Official Gazette* which immediately followed the election. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery followed the election law, which reads as follows, section 66:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of any member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette* of the name of the candidate so elected."

Now, the hon. Secretary of State would have us pity his lot, when, according to this return, and according to what we have before us, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has acted entirely according to law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I never said anything else. My hon. friend was mistaken. I did not complain of the returning officer. I said that I was quite surprised to see that he had not made the return of my election before the 14th of March, when I was elected on the 22nd of February.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I understand that it was a question of discussing the duties of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and that in complaining of the conduct of that officer we are not complaining of the conduct of the returning officer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is the motion.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. And that when the return of an election was made on the 12th, no complaint could be made against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery who published that return in the next number of the *Official Gazette* according to law. Now, I might tell the hon. Secretary of State, that this long debate which takes up quite a length of time, which perhaps would not have been better employed otherwise, at least by the hon. Secretary of State, and those who spoke on his side, for he gave us a very instructive course of constitutional law, which may learn to future generations what is a constitutional government put within the reach of everybody when the whole Tory party may have a hand in it. But with regard to the question before us, I say the members of this House have a perfect right to discuss the course followed by an officer of this House. Now, what is said to us from the other side of the House? Hon. gentleman opposite say: Oh, but this Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is a kind of a madonna, he must not be touched; he must not be approached, he is an employee of the Government and he is such a good employee, that, first of all an increase of \$300 on his salary must be voted to him for having done his duty so well with regard to the publishing of the returns of the elections of members on this side of the House. So unapproachable is this man—although he is an officer of this House—that we must send him a letter and ask him very meekly if he will be pleased to give some explanations, just exactly as in the election for Queen's, N.B. Here is a returning officer who has failed in his duty in a flagrant manner—it is admitted by everybody—but he

is a sacred person, a holy ark; we must not lay our hand on him; he is not a man like other men; he must not be attacked, even if he fails in his duty; we must let him go on because he returned as elected a member on the other side of the House, who supports the Government, instead of a Grit, a Liberal, a Reformist, or a Nationalist, for a Nationalist is considered as still worse than all. At all events, as long as he has made this return, he must not be touched; we must let him go on; take the matter very coolly, and not ask him to come and explain before the House; for it seems that this is the decision arrived at by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Be that as it may, that is not the question now before us; but I, for one, do not intend to defend the returning officer of Queen's county nor the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I am convinced that they have not followed the law. I even feel that they have violated it in a most obnoxious manner. In the present case I believe that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not act in good faith. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that he acted in good faith. Well, for God's sake, let us have the proof that he was in good faith; it is just what we ask. We asked that he be summoned to appear before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to answer to certain questions which would be put to him. Really, judging from this debate one would be apt to think that the members of the Opposition would put inconsiderate questions to him, and that hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish such questions to be put to him. He will simply be asked to write a letter; in this letter he will say what he will please and there the thing will end. But the Government say: You members of the Opposition, you are making a factious Opposition, you are taking our time uselessly; you are unnecessarily asking for a thing which you will not have. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that we will not get it; therefore, we are not discussing the question for the hon. gentlemen opposite. I am satisfied that we will not get it because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery can not reasonably explain his conduct. He cannot do it without involving the members of the Government. No man in his senses, whether in this House or in any part of the country will ever believe that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not been dictated by anybody. And as has been said before, there is certainly something peculiar in the course followed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the Province of Quebec after the 14th of October, when the result was doubtful, it was attempted, by foul means, to snatch from the popular majority, from the majority of the representatives which the popular vote had elected to govern the Province of Quebec, the management of public affairs. The attempt failed. Every possible means were employed to displace this majority, but all in vain. But here, for the Government of the Dominion of Canada if it had only been a question of displacing four or five votes, the means which were employed would have succeeded. One member would have been intimidated by having his return published one or two months after the delay determined by law, another would have been intimidated through other means, and hon. gentleman would have managed to keep the power in their own hands. The Government did not get the real majority in the Dominion of Canada; it is well known on the other side of the House and it is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite—it will not be admitted here on the floor of the House—but it is well known everywhere and public opinion is aware of it. Now public opinion may be manifested in various manners. I can very well understand that during the last elections it has not expressed itself exactly as there was reason to hope that it should express itself; that is to say, the result has not been what we expected it would be. But if we look at the reasons, if we enquire into the causes through which the result was obtained, there is no man on this side of the House, I am sure, who is not proud

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

of the result, because, at least on this side of the House, the result which was obtained, was a frank and honest expression of the various counties of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentlemen opposite cannot say as much in this respect after having employed all the means they have employed to carry the elections. We are sneered at and we are told that we are raging because we did not obtain power. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say for my part, that rather than to obtain power and retain it by such means as the Government are now employing to retain it, I prefer to remain in the Opposition. I am proud of numbering as a private in the ranks of the Opposition and to oppose the Government when they fail to do their duty. I have not been elected here as an out-and-out Oppositionist. Whenever the Government will do anything which will deserve my approbation—I have said as much in my county—I will give them my support. I will not mind the fact that I had to contend with the hon. Secretary of State and his friends, I will not mind the petition against my election, nor the fact that he furnished \$500 of the deposit required for the contestation. I have a duty to perform towards my electors; I shall perform it whatever may be the consequences, and no man will deter me from doing my duty. But I consider that in taking that position, I take an honorable position towards my electors, I take an honorable position towards the Province of Quebec, just as I took up the gauntlet which was thrown at the face of my Province on the 23rd of July 1836, in the county of Chambly, when I was elected on the 30th July, 1836. I can very well understand why the hon. Secretary of State does not like to be interrupted by me. He does not like me in any way. I do not know why. I never did him any wrong. On the contrary, I did him some good, and I might remind him of an instance in particular, in the county of Chambly, on nomination day, in the month of July, 1836, if he was allowed to address a meeting in the county, it was due to my intervention and to nothing else.

Mr. BERGIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is still going away from the subject under discussion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume that I may be allowed to speak to the point of order. I am astonished that a member who addresses this House for the first time is interrupted by old parliamentarians in the way he is —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose I need not call the hon. member back to the question. He knows very well that he is returning to questions outside of the debate.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. Mr. Speaker, I will return to the election of the county of Chambly and to the report which was made of that election. Here is what I find in the report which is now before the House: the report of the returning officer has been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 7th of March, and not on the 12th of March. I pray the hon. Secretary of State to mark the date. The report was received on the 7th of March. Well, when was I gazetted? I do not complain about it; I knew that my election was going to be contested. The report was published in the *Official Gazette* on the 26th of March, and I find in this report two irregularities. In the first place, there was no recount of the votes in my county; people did not dare to ask for a recount; they were satisfied that I had the legal majority, and the deputy returning officers were so well trained that it was not thought that they had counted in my favor ballot papers which did not belong to me. The recount should have taken place within six days, if it had been demanded. Here is what the law says; I always base my opinion on the law:

"The returning officer shall immediately after the sixth day after the final addition by him, unless before that time he receives notice that he is required to attend before a judge for the purpose of a final addition or recount by such judge of the votes given at the election, transmit his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, that the candidate having

the largest number of votes has been duly elected, and shall forward to each of the respective candidates a duplicate or copy thereof, and such return shall be in the form CC., in the first schedule of this Act."

I hope the hon. member will pardon me. It was my desire to read this in French, but we have not yet received the French version of the Revised Statutes. I suppose the hon. Secretary of State will explain to me how it happens that Statutes which have been in force since the 1st of March, 1837, have not yet been published in the French language. I suppose people have been too busy stewing the electoral returns. As I told the hon. Secretary of State, I was only gazetted on the 26th of March. As for him, his return was received on the 12th and he was gazetted on the 19th. This means that I did not hold the handle of the frying pan in that Department, and that he took very good care to have his return published before mine. That was probably intended to make me angry, but it has not hindered me from being so. Now, here is what has been proved with regard to other counties where elections took place at the same date and where they had a recount before the judge. Take as an instance the Joliette election. I do not blame the hon. gentleman opposite for having been elected in that county. It is true he has only been elected by the majority of the returning officer, but it is as respectable a majority as any other. The report of his election was received on the 8th of March, and people hastened to have him gazetted on the 12th of March. In the county of Yamaska, it was about the same thing with this difference, that the recount took a little more time; there were ballots which were tied with strings and the judge was unable to untie the knot, which explains the little delay. There was a little too much rope and the judge did not want to touch it. The return was received on the 14th and they hastened to have him gazetted on the 19th, that is to say, one week before me—poor martyr! belonging to the Opposition, and who had been elected twice for the same seat. Well, I am told by hon. gentlemen opposite that I have no right to complain. They say there is not a member of the Opposition who can point out to us a single wrong which has been committed against anybody. It is not a wrong, because my election might have been contested before, and I might not have been elected at all. But one thing is certain, and it is that by gazetting me on the 26th and by gazetting the member for Yamaska on the 19th, he was given the advantage of a week over me; then they might say: If the hon. member for Yamaska is contested, we will be able to contest the member for Chambly, and, right or wrong, after contesting him, we will endeavor to pair off the contestation of the election of the member for Yamaska with his own or with any other. Well, it seems that is the way it has been done in my county. But, unfortunately for me, I am unable to pair; the deposit of the petitioner is already seized. I have not enough to secure my costs. I am obliged to push it to the end, and I cannot request an additional security. On the strength of that, this is what I have done: I was in a very painful position. It is said that this was not an injustice. Well, I find that it is not just for me, since I have been obliged to file my appearance within the five days, to plead to the merits within the five days, and to immediately request the time of the trial to be fixed, and it was fixed on the 1st of June. So that on the 1st of June next we will know whether I am a member of this House and whether I have a right to occupy a seat here or not. There is one thing certain, and that is: if I have no right to hold my seat here I will not hold it by force. I will not do as some hon. members opposite are doing; I will not do as the Ross Government has done in Quebec when they clung to power after the elections of the 14th of October. But I understand that this is a little foreign to the question before us, and I say so incidentally to point out to the House and to you, Mr. Speaker,

that I have not been treated with justice. Again I say, I am aware that these contestations are only meant as a dodge, because if we were to believe that they are serious there would be a very serious conclusion to infer from that, and that conclusion was drawn last fall, after the elections of the month of October, by the Chief Justice of the Superior Court for the District of Montreal, the Honorable Judge Johnson, who from the Bench made the following declaration: having learned from the newspapers that out of 65 elections held in the Province of Quebec, 43 were contested. He said: If we are to believe that these contestations are serious, if we are to believe that in 43 counties the electorate has been corrupted, the Province of Quebec is not worthy of being governed and is not worthy of a constitutional government. And if we must apply these words to the present case we will come to the same conclusion, because in the Province of Quebec alone, there are 26 elections which are contested. I am not aware of the number in the other Provinces, but I am sure of one thing, and that is, the Province of Quebec is not more corrupt than any other Province and that a great number of these contestations are only made for the fun of it. They are only made to intimidate certain members who are rather weak-kneed; as for my part I do not fear anything, and I will leave it to other members to get out of scrape the best way they can. Still the conclusion to be drawn is certainly that which was drawn by the Chief Justice of the Superior Court for the district of Montreal, and it is the only one at which a man with a sound judgment can arrive. Because, if in a country like this, out of 215 elections, over one half are contested, this country is not fit to be governed by a constitutional Government. For, in this country for a certain number of years back, a regular system has been organised of political corruption and political favors on one side to secure the votes of hon. members on that side. I repeat it, such a country is not worthy of a constitutional government. Well, I represent a county wherein political favors may have some influence; I know that the county of Chambly, with regard to patronage, may have great wants. I know that the Government cannot help giving justice to my county, but at all events, if they see fit to not give justice to it, they may, to a certain extent grapple me by the throat and say: Mr. Member for Chambly, you are opposing the Government, your county is in want of such and such works on the canal, of such and such subsidies for railways, you shall not have them unless you vote for the Government, or abstain from opposing the Government. Well, this policy is an immoral policy, it is a policy which can only lead us to political disasters and to nothing else. People may laugh at us, they may pretend in this House that we are not serious. Public opinion outside of this House will easily understand the true position, and recognise where is the sound majority in the Dominion of Canada and in the various Provinces. What is the result which we have before us at the present time? How are we to convince anybody whatever—I do not say here in the Dominion of Canada, I know there are people ready to do anything—but will we convince anybody in another country that the present Administration has the real majority of the electorate of Canada? It is well known that this is only for show. The hon. members of the Government know it right well. They know it better than anybody. They know that they have not the real majority of the electorate, and that if the electorate had been free on the 22nd of February last, the result would have been different—it would have been such as it was at the elections for the Local Legislatures. A glance around us will convince any man that the Local Governments in every Province are opposed in politics to the Government of the Dominion. So much is this the case that the hon. Secretary of State, at his great banquet, where he was to be crowned as leader

of the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec, has found nothing better to do than to recriminate against the hon. Premier of the Province of Quebec, instead of delivering a speech worthy of a statesman. It was perhaps on that account that while he was speaking two of the hon. Ministers opposite were pretending to sleep. Mr. Speaker, I have said enough, too much, perhaps, but I do not regret what I have said, except whatever was out of order, since I submitted to your ruling. I regret that part only. I said a while ago, in answer to certain remarks, that I had parliamentary experience. I took part in the debates when the hon. Secretary of State was First Minister of the Province of Quebec, as long as he wishes me to consider that it was an honor for the Province to have him as First Minister; and also when he was leader of the Opposition, as long as he wishes me to consider that it was an honor for the Opposition to be led by him. But I did not understand the question as I understand it now. The experience I gained to-day will learn me that in the future I must not tread on such slippery ground, and especially not speak about things which are foreign to the question. I suppose that all these questions will be discussed anew, and that we will have occasion to speak at length about it and to talk about it between ourselves, as a member of this House and as a representative of the county which I have the honor to represent here; because I am not only the representative of the county of Chambly; it appears I am the representative of a Province. I did not understand that I had that honor. I understand that I had it on the 30th of July last, but I did not have it at the general elections. I thank the hon. members of this House for having listened to my somewhat lengthy remarks, notwithstanding the fact that on this occasion I thought it better to use, for the explanations I had to give, the French language with which I am more familiar. On other occasions when the questions will perhaps be questions of fact, I shall use the English language.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (p. 336):

YEAS:
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ell's,	Mallory,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Béchar, d,	Gauthier,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gigault,	Perry,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Préfontaine,
Brien,	Guay,	Purcell,
Burdett,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Kent),	Holton,	Robertson (King's, P. E. I.)
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Jones,	St. Marie,
Casey,	Kirk,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Charlton,	Lang,	Somerville,
Cimon,	Langelier (Montmor'ncy),	Sutherland,
Clayes,	Laurier,	Trow,
Davies,	Lister,	Tarcot,
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Dessaint,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin),
Edwards,	McMillan (Huron),	Yeo.—74.
Eisenhauer,	McMullen,	

NAYS:
Messieurs

Audet,	Guillet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bain (Soulanges),	Haggart,	Pope,
Baker,	Hall,	Porter,
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Putnam,
Bergin,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Rowell,	Hudspeth,	Robertson (Hastings),
Boyle,	Ives,	Robillard,
Brown,	Joncas,	Roome,
Burns,	Kenny,	Ross,

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Cameron,	Kirkpatrick,	Royal,
Campbell (Digby),	Labelle,	Scarth,
Cargill,	Landry,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Shanly,
Carpenter,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	MacDowall,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Chapleau,	McCarthy,	Smith (Ontario),
Chisholm,	McGilla,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	McDonald (Victoria),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	McDougald (Pictou),	Temple,
Coulombe,	McDougald (OapeBreton),	Thérien,
Couture,	McGreevy,	Thompson,
Curran,	McKay,	Tisdale,
Daly,	McKeen,	Tupper (Pictou),
Davin,	McLelan,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace,
Denison,	McNeil,	Ward,
Desjardins,	Madill,	Weldon (Albert),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mara,	White (Cardwell),
Ferguson (Welland),	Marshall,	Wilmot,
Foster,	Masson,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Freeman,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Lennox),
Gaudet,	Moncreiff,	Wood, (Brockville),
Gordon,	Montplaisir,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Grandbois,	O'Brien,	Wright—104.
Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),	

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. It was understood that my colleague (Mr. Welsh) had paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald), and I notice the hon. member for Pictou voted.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Welsh), told me when I was with him this afternoon, with respect to obtaining a pair with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald), that he would vote with the Government on this question. I asked him: "Will you on any other question consider yourself paired with Mr. McDougald?" and he said he would. If any other arrangement was made with any one else I do not know anything about it; but I made the arrangement for Mr. McDougald on this question, and they were not paired.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Welsh told me that he had paired, at Mr. Tupper's request, with Mr. McDougald for this vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) had better give his own version.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). I know nothing about the arrangement. I wanted a pair, and I did not know whether a pair had been made. If it has been made, I am quite willing to abide by it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Assinibria (Mr. Perley) told me to-night that he and Mr. Welsh had made a pair for to-night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald) will please state if he wishes to vote or not, so that the point may be settled. If he wishes to withdraw the vote, he has a right to do so, if he is paired.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is one of the whips, and when the arrangement was made it was understood that Mr. McDougald had a right to vote on this question.

Mr. DAVIES. If the arrangement was so understood on the other side, I must say it was stated to me distinctly the opposite way by Mr. Welsh himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is not a whip.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely the hon. gentleman's own word is quite as binding as that of a whip.

Mr. HICKEY. If the hon. gentleman's word was worth much he would not have paired with two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. TROW. The rule is that a pair by one whip is not valid unless it is ratified by the whip of the other party. I heard nothing of this affair. The hon. member for North

Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) informed me this afternoon that he had paired with the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling) and he left the House in order to accommodate that gentleman.

Mr. CARLING. I met the hon. gentleman in the passage at 11 o'clock and told him I had to go to the station to meet a friend who was coming by the 11:30 train from Montreal, and I asked him to be kind enough to pair with me till I returned from the railway station, and he said he would do so. That is exactly what took place. I asked him to pair until I returned from the station, and I told him I would be back in one hour, and he said he would do so.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) was anxious to remain, but he understood that it was a pair for to night.

Mr. CARLING. I did not so understand it.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I desire to say that last Friday afternoon I paired with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). If I had voted I would have voted in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. TROW. I desire to say that the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) stayed away purposely.

Mr. SPEAKER. After what has been stated by the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling) I cannot interfere. I am not to be a judge as to all these private arrangements made between hon. members.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with what you have said, Mr. Speaker, but I may be permitted to say that these rather unpleasant incidents show the very great importance it is to hon. members that when any proposition with respect to pairing is made, they should see that it is made through the whips, and then all this trouble would be avoided. It is no doubt unpleasant to hon. members that there should be any misunderstanding, and it is only by following the regular practice which I have indicated that it can be prevented.

Mr. CARLING. I should be very sorry if any misunderstanding occurred with the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) and I think I mentioned to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) that I had paired with the hon. member until the time I returned from the railway station.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt that was the understanding of the hon. member for London, but it appears that a different understanding obtains on this side of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I remember the practice in the old days used to be, and it has not been broken since, that when one party to a pair understood the pair was for a certain time and abstained on that account, it was usual for the other party to withdraw his vote. I have often known the whip of one party to withdraw his vote because the party to the pair could not withdraw his vote. It would be more courteous in this case if the Minister would withdraw his vote.

House divided on amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald (p. 325):

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Audet,	Guillet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bain (Soulanges),	Haggart,	Pope,
Baker,	Hall,	Porter,
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Putnam,
Bergin,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hudspeth,	Robertson (Hastings),
Boyle,	Ives,	Robillard,
Brown,	Joncas,	Roome,
Burns,	Kenny,	Ross,
Cameron,	Kirkpatrick,	Roy-1,
Campbell (Digby),	Labelle,	Scarth,
Cargill,	Landry,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Shanly,

Carpenter,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDowall,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Chapleau,	McCarthy,	Smith (Ontario),
Chisholm,	McGulla,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	McDonald (Victoria),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	McDougald (Pictou),	Temple,
Coulobre,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Thérien,
Couture,	McGreevy,	Thompson,
Curran,	McKay,	Tisdale,
Daly,	McKeen,	Tupper (Pictou),
Davin,	McLellan,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace,
Denison,	McNeill,	Ward,
Desjardins,	Madill,	Weldon (Albert),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mara,	White (Cardwell),
Ferguson (Welland),	Marshall,	Wilmot,
Foster,	Masson,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Freeman,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Leunox),
Gaudet,	Moncreiff,	Wood (Brockville),
Gordon,	Montplaisir,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Grandbois,	O'Brien,	Wright.—104.
Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ellis,	Mallory,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Béchar,	Gauthier,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gigault,	Perry,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Préfontaine,
Brien,	Guay,	Purcell,
Burdett,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Kent),	Holton,	Robertson (King's, PEI),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Jones,	St. Marie,
Casey,	Kirk,	Scriven,
Casgrain,	Lacderkin,	Semple,
Charlton,	Lang,	Semerville,
Cimon,	Langelier (Montm'ncy),	Sutherland,
Clayes,	Laurier,	Trow,
Davies,	Lister,	Turcot,
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Waldie,
Dessaint,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin),
Edwards,	McMillan (Huron),	Yeo.—74.
Eisenhauer,	McMullen,	

Amendment agreed to.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on same division.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1:40 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 71) to enable the Freehold Loan and Savings Company to extend their business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Halifax and West India Steamship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Midland Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hudspeth.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. WELSH. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to make a personal explanation. It appears that there was a misunderstanding about my pairing yesterday with the hon. senior member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper). I believe he stated that I intended to vote with the Government on the question before the House last evening. I think he was under a misapprehension. The hon. gentleman met me in the hall yesterday evening, and he said: "My colleague is busy writing; have you any objection to pairing with him this evening?" I said, "No, I do not think I have." I said, "What is the question?" He said he did not know. I did not promise that I would vote with the Government, for I would not have done so on the question before the House; but on another question I said I would support the Government. During the evening session I did not vote, but I supposed the hon. gentleman had finished his writing by eight o'clock, and I paired with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) for the night. What I did promise to vote with the Government on, was that an Assistant Speaker should be appointed to help you, Mr. Speaker, in your duty. I do that from a fellow feeling. I am very fond of changing my seat myself. I know that if I were confined in my present seat as long as you have been confined to that, I should want a change. I hope this explanation will be satisfactory, and that no harm will result from the misunderstanding between the hon. member for Pictou and myself, for I believe it came out all right.

Mr. TUPPER. I think it is only right that I should say one word. I am very sorry that this misunderstanding occurred, but I am glad that no harm is done. But in justice to myself I should like to state my version of the conversation. If my hon. friend will think over the matter, I think he will remember that in the first place the conversation took place in the House and not outside, very near to where the hon. gentleman is now sitting; and in the next place I am able to make the statement most positively to the House, and I think the House will believe me, that I was fully aware of the subject before the House, for I had taken particular interest in the subject from the very first. Of course I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that he misunderstood the matter; but that I attempted to explain the subject to him I most positively deny. I asked him if he would pair on this question. I mentioned no question, because I thought he knew the question which had been discussed for some time, and my hon. friend, as I remember, said most distinctly to me, "I intend to vote with the Government on that question." The question of the appointment of Deputy Speaker was not mentioned. Then I said: "Well, you will not consider this a pair, because, of course, I do not want to pair with you on that question if you intend to vote with the Government." I regret this misunderstanding, and am glad it has done no one any injury.

Mr. BOWMAN. I desire to make a personal explanation in reference to a misunderstanding between the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and myself about a pair between us last night. Some time during the evening session, about eleven o'clock, he met me in the wardrobe lobby and asked me whether I would do him the favor of pairing with him, as I understood, for the evening. After thinking it over for a moment, I said I would, and just as he was going away he said: "It is understood, then, that you do not vote on this question that is up this evening." I answered him in the affirmative, and I was fully under the impression, from the way he asked me, that I had paired with him on that ques-

Mr. WELSH.

tion, regardless altogether of the time the vote was to be taken. Had I the faintest idea he was coming back again to take his seat, I certainly would not have gone away. I desire to exonerate the hon. gentleman altogether from any intention of wilfully misleading me. I do not entertain that idea for a moment, but it seems to me the difficulty has arisen altogether from a misunderstanding. I was certainly under the impression he had paired on that question for the night. I rather feel that if I were in the hon. gentleman's position and he in mine, I would not have voted or would withdraw the vote now.

Mr. CARLING. I understood that the pair between the hon. member for Waterloo and myself was exactly as I stated in the House last night, namely, that we paired during the time I would be absent from the House, until I returned the same evening. I understood it was only during my absence that the hon. gentleman could not vote. However, we have had an explanation from the hon. gentleman this afternoon and he has stated he understood the pair was for the evening and that he went home under that impression. I would therefore, with the permission of the House, ask that my name be struck off the list of last night.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it would be judicious to comply with the request of the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling). The pairing business, as it has been very correctly suggested last night by the leader of the Government, and by the leader of the Opposition as well, cannot be recognised, and will not be recognised in future, except when arranged by the regular whips of the party. Any pairing that may take place outside of the cognizance of the whips will not be recognised here, and I propose, in future, not to allow hon. gentlemen to enter into any personal explanations on that ground. Of course, the moment I allow an hon. gentleman to explain his side of the question, I am bound, in fairness, to allow the hon. gentleman on the other side to give his own version; but in order to prevent any recurrence of that kind, and any further loss of time to this honorable House, I now intimate my intention in the future not to recognise any pairing business, except when arranged by the recognised whips of the two parties. As to the request of the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling), the House will see how inconvenient it would be to comply with it. The journals of the House would have to be altered, which would set a very bad precedent.

Mr. CURRAN. I rise to a question of privilege. In the *Free Press* of last night I notice the following paragraph:—

"Mr. Curran, M.P. for Montreal Centre, has shown himself to be a thorough Coercionist by ordering the dismissal of a number of poor canal laborers because they refused to vote for him. What an excellent Irish landlord Mr. Curran would make!"

I desire to state there is not one word of truth in the whole allegations. In the first place, I am not a Coercionist; in the second place, I never ordered the dismissal of a canal laborer or any other. There is not a shadow of ground for the accusation in this and other papers. I have never interfered with the Civil Government, or with anybody in the employ of the Government, except to do them a good turn. I will take an early opportunity of putting myself right in the courts with those who originated the report.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act respecting Sick and Distressed Mariners. He said: The Bill is a very short one, consisting only of one clause, intended to correct an error which has crept in the revised edition of the Statutes, by which foreign fishing vessels are allowed to have the benefit of the Sick Mariners' Act. It is proposed to restore the law to what it was originally, and not give these vessels the benefit of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. WELDON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I draw the attention of the First Minister to the matter I mentioned in regard to the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The chairman will be here shortly and will give the information.

WRIT FOR RESTIGOUCHE.

Mr. WELDON. I would also ask whether the writ for the county of Restigouche has been issued?

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been issued, and the House was informed of the fact the other day.

Mr. WELDON. That was the warrant. I would like to know whether the writ has been issued and the day of polling fixed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The nomination for Restigouche will be on the 21st of this month.

MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Mr. POPE moved :

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting the salary of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. BLAKE. That was to stand until we had disposed of the other Bill, as any alterations made in it would apply to this.

Motion allowed to stand.

OXFORD TO NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Mr. POPE moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow be received.

Motion agreed to, and resolution read the second time.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) respecting the Oxford Junction and New Glasgow Branch of the Intercolonial Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like the hon. gentleman, before the second reading of that Bill, to lay on the Table such reports from his officers as he has in reference to the estimate of the cost of this line.

Mr. POPE. Yes ; I stated what the estimate was, but I will do what the hon. gentleman asks.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 47) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be important that the hon. gentleman should now give us a little fuller information as to the railways which have adopted, and the circumstances under which there has been adopted, the system which under this Bill he proposes to take the power to apply generally to the railways of Canada. Of course, we are aware that the system of crossing on the level exists to a very large, and, in my opinion, to a very dangerous, and an increasingly dangerous, extent on this continent. We built our railways, on the other side of the boundary line as well as on this, in the cheapest possible way. The advantage was considered, and the danger to life was perhaps not sufficiently regarded. It is possible that the condition of things in England may have been the reverse of this, and that there may have been too rigid an attention

paid to precautions for safety. However, it is said that there are a great number of crossings on the level, many of which are very dangerous, and, as settlement increases around railway stations and railway crossings, what might have been perhaps of little consequence at first becomes of very serious consequence. The other day, I was talking to a gentleman from the neighboring Republic, I think from Jersey City, and he spoke of the crossings there as almost an arrangement for systematic murder. He said that hardly a week passed without somebody being killed there. Therefore, we have a reason, in view of the precautions which have been taken under the law up to this time to secure the avoidance of danger at these crossings, to consider the subject as one of considerable and growing public importance, and to enquire in regard to it when it is proposed to relax those precautions. The object of stopping at a crossing is, of course, not primarily to avoid the danger to persons crossing the street, but primarily to avoid the danger of collisions with trains on the intersecting roads. That is a continual danger, apart from the one to which I have specially referred. I think the hon. gentleman will see the reasonableness of the request I make, and that he will make a somewhat extended statement as to the circumstances which have caused him to propose this measure and as to the mode by which the safety of human life will be subserved by the proposed change.

Mr. POPE. I agree with my hon. friend as to the danger in many cases of level crossings. In this country, however, where capital is so scarce, and the people can hardly find money to build a railway, the level crossing has been adopted because it is much cheaper than the over-crossing or the under-crossing. For my own part, I would be glad if we could see our way, especially in cities or in the vicinity of cities, in such places as we find in and near Toronto, to have all under-crossings or over-crossings. We are not in that position, but we have done what we could to prevent collisions of this kind at road crossings. Where we were unable to have over and under-crossings, it has been provided that there shall be gates, and watchmen at these gates. There is another difficulty, however, in relation to this matter. Perhaps there is no difficulty where roads have been long established, but where municipalities have been deriving revenue in the shape of taxes from these roads, they should show some consideration. A year or two ago a clause was introduced into the General Railway Act to enable the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to distribute this as they might think best, after examining the whole question, and hearing the evidence which might be brought before them. I should go as far as any one, I should go as far as my hon. friend in this matter, but neither he nor I can go as far as we would like to go, under the state of things which exist in this country now, with a view of obtaining security against collisions at these crossings. The object of trains coming to a dead stop for one minute at these crossings is, as the hon. gentleman has truly said, to prevent these collisions, but the time spent in coming to this dead stop, in stopping for this minute, and then starting again, is considerable. The object of the legislation which I propose now—to adopt a system which has been adopted on the Michigan Central, and the Illinois Central, and which the Southern Railway of Canada is asking to be allowed to adopt—is, in the opinion of our chief engineer, and those who have represented this matter to him, just as safe as if the trains were compelled to come to a dead stand. It is quite possible that one road might ask to adopt this interlocking system, and the road crossing it might not care for it. We provide in this Bill that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall decide what proportion each of these roads shall bear to the other. If I for one moment thought that any danger could arise, I would not propose this legislation, but I know

the necessity there is to give as much speed as possible to trains running between towns and carrying mails and passengers. If we can make it safe, as I believe we can, from information we have, so that trains can run at a good speed, I think it will be a great improvement, and that is the sole object of this Bill. I have not seen these switches in operation, but my engineer has seen them, and other engineers have spoken to me about it, and the engineer of the Canada Southern has seen it in operation. The Canada Southern Company ask permission to put it upon their road, and I think we can safely allow it to be done under the supervision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, who, I am sure, will never allow any change to be made that will prove dangerous to the public.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the hon. gentleman himself not to be aware of the character of the device.

Mr. POPE. I have the device before me.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman seen any reports from officials of roads on which it has been in operation—the Illinois Central and the Michigan Central?

Mr. POPE. No; I have only seen representatives of the roads, who have explained it.

Mr. BLAKE. How long has it been in operation on the Michigan Central or on the Illinois road?

Mr. POPE. I should imagine that it has been on a year or two.

Mr. BLAKE. Those who are at all familiar with the railway system of Ontario can readily understand why there should be a special desire, one laudable enough on the part of the Canada Southern Railway, to avoid any stops that they can avoid. Their line is the most favorable for making speed through a long distance, as there is no curve and no grade to speak of for a very long mileage. It is not for the local convenience so much as for through business that this is wanted. With a high rate of speed, of course, losses of four or five minutes, which, I presume would be caused by this arrangement, is a very serious thing, more serious than under other circumstances it would be. But, although that may be so, it seems to me it would be reasonable that with the experience of other roads, under circumstances somewhat similar, and by reports which have been acquired by the hon. gentleman and mastered by him, he should be able to show us that that result has been achieved. What he speaks of in his Bill is, of course, hypothetical. He does not aver that there exists at this moment any such system, but he proposes to take authority when, in the opinion of the Privy Council, such system has been proved to him to exist, and he has been advised to adopt it. We are, therefore, acting according to the theory of the Bill, which is hypothetical. It seems to me that the application of a system under these circumstances should be adopted with great caution. As the hon. gentleman has the advantage, as he has told us, of knowing it to be in operation on two roads with very extensive travel, I think his first duty would be to ascertain, by an exhaustive report, what the practical working is. Of course, we know there are a great many things which can be verified in theory, but when they come to practical application, difficulties arise. The hon. gentleman has here an opportunity of knowing how the theory has worked, and of which, I think, he should have availed himself before adopting this system at all.

Mr. POPE. Here is a new system that is declared to be an improvement, and here is a road that asks to be allowed to try it in Canada. The Bill does not provide that a railway company shall have power to extend it; it provides that we may extend it so far as we find it safe, and I think that in giving that road an opportunity of putting this switch into operation, we can see the working of it, and

Mr. POPE.

that will be some advantage. I can see no good reason why we should not let the Southern people try it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has told us that there are two roads, with very extensive travel, on which it is in practical operation to-day, and I proposed to him that before adopting it he should obtain such thorough information as to its practical working there as will ensure reasonable certainty of its being of the character which he says it ought to be in the Bill. It will be quite another thing if we proposed to try the experiment. There might be reasons for trying the experiment, but there is no reason for trying the experiment merely because it has been tried elsewhere, though the hon. gentleman has not got the test before him.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Railways stated that he had received the opinion of his chief engineer and other experts. I do not know whether he proposes to submit these opinions to the committee. If he does not, I see very little use in submitting such measures to this body, that is, if it is proposed to treat us as a deliberative body. If we are to take the responsibility of assenting to this matter, then we should be treated as reasonable beings, and be permitted to read these opinions ourselves. It seems to me to be only respectful to this House that the matter should stand over until these opinions, which the Minister says he has, should be submitted for the information of the House. The matter is one, of course, of no party importance in the slightest. We simply have the common good of the country to consider. I should be extremely pleased to see any improvement adopted that will facilitate the working of railways, but the one in question is one that might lead to disastrous results. It would be unfortunate, I think, if the members of this House were held responsible for accidents that might be the outcome of this legislation when they were not in a position, in advance, of being able to give good reasons either for or against the proposed measure. Of course, if a Minister deems it his duty not to submit these opinions to the House, he then takes upon himself the sole responsibility of forcing this measure through the House; and although I hope it will never happen that any evil will be the outcome of it, yet if such should happen, he will have to remember that he took the sole responsibility himself.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Railway Department has taken pains to inform himself through his officers as to the practicability and safety of this plan. I think that he, as the presiding officer of that Department, ought to be in the position to give this House, when it is called upon to sanction this plan, some definite information as to its character and how it has worked elsewhere. I hardly think it is satisfactory to inform the House that this plan has been introduced on two railways on this continent out of the hundreds of railways that exist. If the plan is feasible, if it is safe, if it is advantageous to the railway companies who wish to adopt it, of course no gentleman in this House would think of an objection; but in legislation of this kind we have not only to guard the interests of the railway companies, but the interests of the country, and if it is not a feasible plan, if it has not worked properly elsewhere, the introduction of it here might lead to disastrous consequences, and the result in connection with this plan of interlocking switches might cause the members of this House who had sanctioned this measure to regret that they had taken that step. I should like to obtain some information with respect to its practical operation and to what extent the Minister has examined into its working, whether he is thoroughly satisfied that it will be safe to introduce it, whether he has obtained the written opinion of his chief engineer and of the officers of the railway companies which

have adopted it. It is an easy matter to elicit this information, and the hon. gentleman should have obtained it from the Illinois Central and Michigan Central, on which roads this plan has been adopted. If the hon. gentleman has taken the pains he should have taken, and has procured all the facts obtainable, he is in a position to ask the House to sanction this plan; otherwise the hon. gentleman is acting somewhat hastily in seeking its introduction.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has insinuated that I was trying to force something on the House and on the railway companies. I am not seeking to force anything on the railways. We will not adopt this device unless it is a good one, and no railway can adopt it without the assent of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Consequently, I do not see the danger which the hon. gentleman has suggested. The hon. member has said that I should have obtained information from those railway companies. I have information from those railways; plans and drawings have been laid before me and the Chief Engineer. The best proof is that one of those very roads, and that a connecting road, is asking to adopt this device. Scarcely a day passes but I am asked to try some new device in connection with railways. I have a trial made if the expense is not too great. If the device is not a good one, no further action is taken. The same course will be adopted with regard to this device. If I were to show hon. gentlemen opposite all the drawings and plans, they would not know more about the matter than they do now. Hon. gentlemen cannot suppose that I know all about these railway inventions, but I must take the opinion of the engineers of the Department. If I were to hand the drawings to hon. gentlemen they would tell me to keep them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Send them across.

Mr. POPE. There is no compulsion about this matter. We are not obliged to adopt it unless it works well. Let the people who ask permission to try it be allowed to do so, and if it is a good device let it be adopted.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that before the Minister of Railways asks Parliament to entirely repeal a clause in the Act which has existed ever since we have had railways here, a clause which was, no doubt, adopted for the very best of reasons—the safety of the public—he should at least have on record, for his protection and the protection of the House, the opinion of experts. I have the utmost confidence in his practical judgment in this matter; nevertheless, I think he should have on record the written opinion of his chief engineer. The hon. gentleman asks Parliament to-day to approve a device which he cannot explain to the House. I do not expect the hon. gentleman to explain the working of intricate machinery or devices, such as are said to be adopted here, but it is his duty as a Minister to have on record the opinions of his own officers, and if possible, the opinions of other authorities as well. Those opinions he has not obtained, and yet he asks Parliament to go through the farce of saying that it is a good thing to repeal an old provision of the law in favor of something else which he cannot explain.

Mr. POPE. I do not agree with that.

Mr. MULOCK. I am fully aware that the Act will leave the power in the hands of the Governor General in Council. But we may as well abolish Parliament if the Governor in Council is going to do everything. It appears to be supposed that the Governor in Council embodies all the wisdom of the country, and that Parliament should simply record Ministers' views and hand over them to the power which at one time the people thought they possessed. This is wholly inconsistent with the theory under which Parliament is instituted, and under which Parliament was expected to understand what was proposed before giving its assent thereto.

Mr. SCRIVER. For my part I shall be exceedingly gratified if any device can be invented by which the present system of things can be improved. According to my own personal knowledge—for I travel very frequently upon the railway—the law with respect to the stopping of trains at crossings is constantly and systematically violated. In three cases out of four, so far as the railways I travel over are concerned, the law is not observed. If any invention can be devised and adopted by which the necessity for the existence of the present law can be removed, and a system can be obtained under which that safety which does not exist now can be reached, for my part I should be very glad to see it adopted.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest again to the Minister whether it would not be wise to put in a speed limit instead of giving companies permission to run past the point of junction at the highest possible rate of speed. Would it not be advisable to state that restriction in the Bill, instead of giving the power to the Governor General in Council, because if the Governor in Council have that power they will be compelled to grant it.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite aware that the Governor in Council can refuse, but perhaps the Governor in Council may not have sufficient resolution to do so, and therefore why should not the House adopt in the commencement of this scheme some such safeguard as exist in the railway law to-day, viz.: That in the case of railways running through a thickly-settled country the train shall not run at a greater rate of speed than six miles an hour.

Mr. POPE. It is regulated by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MULOCK. It is regulated by statute. There is a clause in the Railway Act to that effect. The Minister may shake his head, but it will not shake the clause out of the Act.

Mr. POPE. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council regulates the speed at which trains shall be run at dangerous places. This Act contains a similar provision, that the speed may be regulated.

Mr. MULOCK. I make this suggestion, although I suppose it is utterly useless to do so, as the Minister supposes there is nothing in it, for the hon. gentleman assumes that he monopolises all the wisdom. At all events, I would suggest that at the end of line 19 there should be inserted the words: But not at a greater rate of speed than so much an hour. In that way the Minister will have some protection against the opportunities of the railways.

Mr. POPE. Read the next paragraph.

Mr. MULOCK. I have read it. The Minister can regulate the speed, but I want to regulate the Minister.

Bill ordered to be reported.

Mr. MULOCK. I would remind the Minister of Railways, in case he has never read the Railway Act under which he is supposed to regulate railways, that by clause 78 he should not allow the cars to run at these places at a higher rate of speed than six miles an hour.

Mr. POPE. But I may regulate them at a less rate of speed.

Mr. MULOCK. But you said there was no such clause. It provides that you cannot authorise them to run at a higher rate than six miles an hour.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. POPE moved third reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Government Railways Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be convenient that legislation with reference to Government railways should be of the same character as legislation with reference to other railways. The hon. gentleman has adopted provisions with reference to other railways, in which he gives discretion to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as to the order, and this one provides that the opinion of the Minister of Railways is to be the ruling power. I do not see why the lives and property of Her Majesty's liege subjects ought not to receive the same measure of protection, with reference to the adoption of this device on Government railways, that they are to receive with reference to the other railways of the country. Inasmuch as the Minister, notwithstanding my hon. friend from North York's (Mr. Mulock) opinion of his own opinion of his infallibility, did not choose to take to himself the sole responsibility to adjudge as to the other railways, I do not see why he should ask to be given power to be the sole judge as to Government railways.

Mr. POPE. The difference is that Government Railway Bills are in no case under the control of the General Railways Act, and this is a Bill in conformity with the Government Railways Act. Then the hon. gentleman must remember that I am Minister of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. I know that, and that is the reason why I am so anxious to make this amendment.

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

POSTAL SERVICE BETWEEN UPHILL AND VICTORIA ROAD.

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

Mr. McLELAN. The petition was received on the 19th of October, 1886. It was acknowledged and referred for enquiry. The matter is still under consideration.

DISMISSAL OF NAPOLEON GIASSON.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether the Government are aware of the fact that Mr. Napoleon Giasson, measurer of stone, at Caughnawaga, has been dismissed from his employment? If the Government have knowledge of this,—why was he dismissed; what is the name of his successor; when was he appointed; and what is his salary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Napoleon Giasson was dismissed on the 7th of April, 1887. The charges against him were neglect of duty, absenting himself from his post, endeavoring to induce the Indians to drink intoxicants, being himself intoxicated on the day of nomination in the Laprairie election, insulting one of the candidates, and acting generally in such a disorderly manner that the constable had to eject him from the room. Napoleon Giasson was appointed on July 4th, 1878. He receives no compensation now. His remuneration while in office was 2½ cents per cubic yard. His successor has not been appointed.

THE FRANCHISE ACT—MOTION TO REPEAL.

On the Order being called for Resolution:

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to repeal the Franchise Act and to revert to the plan which has been followed from Con-

Mr. MULOCK.

ederation up to the enacting of the said Act, of utilising, for the elections of this House, the Provincial franchises and voters' lists.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to allow this motion to stand for another day, as we had a very late sitting last night.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman fix a day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let it be set for Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. Being first on the notice paper, it will come in due order after the Private Bills, and we ought not to interfere with the progress of Private Bills.

Order allowed to stand.

PROPERTY OF THE LATE W. B. O'DONOGHUE.

Mr. BARRON moved for:

Copies of any and all letters addressed to the Government or any member of the Cabinet by M. F. O'Donoghue, or any other person in his behalf, asking for compensation for the alleged loss or confiscation of the property of the late W. B. O'Donoghue, who was concerned in the North-West troubles of 1869-70. Also for copies of all letters, Orders in Council and other documents in the possession of the Government relating to any claims made by the said M. F. O'Donoghue. Also for a statement showing the amounts paid to M. F. O'Donoghue, or any other person on his behalf, by the Government for services rendered or on any other account.

He said: I hope this motion will pass. We have it from one of the Ministers of the Crown that this Mr. M. F. O'Donoghue has been in the employ of the Government. It appears that he was in the employ of the Government in the month of January last, when the general elections were in progress, and it appears that during those elections and in the late bye-elections he did missionary service on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite. I suppose we have no right to question that gentleman's right to take part in the public affairs of the country, and on that side which he thinks in the interest of the country. But we have it from that gentleman's public utterances that for some time past, while he has been in the employ of the Government, and while working actively in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, he has been a standing applicant for the property of his brother which had been confiscated, and it appeared to me that it was not proper for him to be working so actively on behalf of the Government while in that position. I think it would be interesting to know whether he has made any application on account of the property I have alluded to, and what are the chances of the property being given to him. It would also be interesting to know whether any other person, on behalf of the late W. B. O'Donoghue, who took part in the unfortunate rebellion of 1869-70 in the North-West, has made application for the property. After the papers are brought down it may not be necessary to pursue the matter any further; but from information I have received, I think it would be interesting to the public, especially in the vicinity where this Mr. O'Donoghue took part in the elections, to know what proceedings are going on relative to returning the confiscated property to the representatives of the late Mr. O'Donoghue.

Motion agreed to.

BANFF SPRINGS.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copy of report of W. Pearce, D.L.S., on the Banff Springs, and of claims made to the possession of said springs, or to indemnity for not obtaining possession of them, and all correspondence and papers in connection with such claims; also a detailed statement of all expenditure in connection with the Banff reservation, or any claims to said springs.

He said: I make this motion simply to obtain certain information of which I think the House ought to be in possession, and which the hon. Minister did not seem to be able to give

us when we discussed the Bill relating to the Banff reservation. I would ask the leader of the Government, as the Minister who is technically concerned is not present, if he will allow me to amend this resolution by adding:

Also a detailed statement of all licenses issued or allotments granted to parties to settle on the reservation.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

APPLICATION OF JOSEPH SWISHER.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved for:

Petitions and applications of one Joseph Swisher, a volunteer of the Rebellion of 1837, asking that some substantial consideration be granted him, on account of his health having been greatly impaired while serving as a volunteer during said rebellion.

He said: I desire to bring before the House the grievances under which this noble volunteer of 1837 has been suffering for a number of years. I am perfectly well aware that it is the general feeling of members of this House that we should deal fairly, liberally and uprightly with our volunteers. We all feel proud of our volunteer system, and an interest in their welfare and prosperity; and if we have those feelings to-day, we ought not for a moment hesitate to do ample justice to those who have been volunteers in the past. Of course there may be a difference of opinion as to whether these volunteers were right or whether those who took up arms on that occasion were right. That is a disputed point, and it is not for me to say whether those who took up arms against the Government were right or wrong, but the volunteers of that day were called out to sustain law and order, to put down what the Government of the day desire to put down, rebellion. They performed their duties faithfully and loyally, as good citizens and as servants of the Crown. I have no doubt you will sympathise with me, Sir, and agree that the volunteers of that day perhaps endured hardships different from what they have to endure to-day, and therefore, laying aside all considerations as to whether they were trying to subdue a rebellion that ought not to have been subdued or not, they are entitled at the hands of the Government to just and proper consideration. It may be said that the rebellion in 1837 is an act which this Government cannot take into consideration; it may be said that there was no provision made at the time of Confederation for the just claims of these brave men who endured the hardships and sufferings of 1837. All I have to say is that if such be the interpretation of our Confederation Act, the Act has done wrong upon a very large and worthy class. I have my doubts whether the Confederation Act can be so construed. I know the Minister of Militia said two days ago it was not the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates any consideration for these volunteers of 1837. I regret he made that statement. I think these volunteers are entitled to just as much consideration as those of 1812, as those who took part against the Fenian Raid, and as those who took part in subduing the North-West rebellion. It is unreasonable, unfair and unjust that the services of these men should be ignored, and that the Government of the day should say at this time that they have no right to grant any substantial aid to those who have served their country. These men defended the country, they defended law and order, they did what the Government of the day called on them to do, and no doubt the First Minister may remember the time and may have a feeling towards these men that they performed their duty efficiently, and that they ought to be considered and compensated for it. I think it has been the custom, not only in this country, but in every country under the sun, that those who, while serving their country as volunteers or soldiers, sustained any injury whereby they were incapacitated from following their ordinary avocation for the remainder of their lives, should receive a pension from the Government. This man to

whom I am referring, during the time he was engaged as a volunteer in the 73rd Regiment in the rebellion, contracted a disease, and from that time up to the present, a period of fifty years, he has been unable to perform the ordinary duties he would have been able to perform had he not contracted this disease. That being the case, it is the bounden duty of the Government to make some provision to compensate him. He is now a very old man; he was engaged in suppressing a rebellion; he was in active service, and took the typhoid fever; he went into the hospital, and unfortunately, he says, the physicians of that hospital were not what they ought to have been and gave him too strong medicine. When he received a furlough and was permitted to go out, he was put on duty again and contracted a cold, from which he took other diseases, and has since been unable to perform his ordinary avocations. These fifty years having elapsed, and this man being unable to earn a livelihood for himself and his family, has a strong claim on the consideration of the Government. To substantiate that I am right in my contention that I do not think this is altogether a Provincial matter, I will read the opinion of one whose authority, when I mention his name to the House, it will, no doubt, think ought to be taken into consideration in reference to constitutional law. I am not going to offer here any mean authority upon this point. I am going to offer an authority that I think even the First Minister will respect, after the various opportunities he has had, after the various contests in which he has been engaged with that individual. I think he will, at all events, appreciate the opinion this hon. gentleman offers in reference to this matter. Mr. Mowat, speaking in reference to this matter, says:

"It is quite true that the Dominion Government has chosen to throw off themselves the burden on the Province, but surely the whole spirit of the British North America Act is that all matters of national concern are to be dealt with by the Dominion and not by the Provinces, and, if there is any matter that is of national and not of Provincial concern, it is surely a subject such as this that the resolution deals with."

Therefore, we find that one of the leading authorities on constitutional law in the Dominion of Canada has contended that the Dominion Government ought to take into consideration the treatment of those volunteers, instead of the Provincial Government. It would be only a just and fair thing at this time of the old man's life that some consideration should be granted to him. I might say, if it would be any benefit to the hon. gentlemen opposite, that he is a Conservative, that he has been a Conservative all his life although he has been enduring hardships at the hands of the Conservative party, and that all he asks is simple justice in the matter. He is not desirous of receiving a reward similar to what some of the soldiers have received in the last rebellion. He is not desirous of being knighted or of receiving for the services he rendered a gift of \$20,000. All he asks is that he may be put in such a position that his declining years may be made somewhat comfortable. The Government ought to grant him that, so that during the latter portion of his life he may have means to sustain himself and his family. If it was necessary, I would be able to show that certificates were granted to this man by those who were engaged in the rebellion proving that he was injured by exposure in the interests of the Government and that in consequence he contracted these diseases. I hope the First Minister will not try to take the ground that this is a Provincial and not a Dominion matter. This Parliament has recognised claims somewhat similar before, and, if it granted a compensation to the veterans of 1812, it is within the power of the Dominion to grant to the brave volunteers of 1837 some consideration for the services they rendered. Are we, by the action of the Government, to be led to understand that they have no sympathy with these brave men on account of put-

ting down the rebellion at that time? Are they coming to recognise the fact that that was a justifiable rebellion. Are we to understand, by their neglect in treating these volunteers as they ought to be treated, that they are virtually saying that those volunteers ought not to have been so foolish as to defend the country against what was virtually the conduct of the Government of the day? We know full well the hardships the country had to endure during the time of the Family Compact. It is said that that caused the rebellion, but these men were not responsible for it; they rightly came to the front and assisted the Government of the day in maintaining law and order and expelling those who had taken up arms against the Administration. I say it is a strong and just case, and I appeal to the Government to grant this man what he asks. I, therefore, hope the papers will come down, and I hope that a feeling of humanity will pervade the breast of the Government and induce them to grant this man what he is asking.

Mr. PURCELL. In any recognition the Government should make of the services of the surviving veterans of 1812, I would strongly urge them to include those who served in 1837-38. Men who did not turn out at that time were looked upon as disloyal; many of the survivors reside in my county, and I found in my canvass that some of them are almost destitute. The number, altogether, cannot be large, and I can see no reason why the Government should not take their case into consideration, and the expense it would entail would be very little. The brave Scotchmen of Glangarry of whom I have seen so much, turned out at that time in large numbers. Pensions were paid in 1874 to the veterans of 1812, and scrip has been granted to those who assisted in suppressing the North West Rebellion, and I cannot see any reason why the veterans of 1837-38 should not be treated in a similar manner. It was the Federal Government who dealt with the veterans of 1812, a long time after Confederation, in 1874; why, therefore, should they not deal with those of 1837-38 as well? It seems to me that as long as the Dominion Government have recognised the services of the survivors in the cases I have mentioned, they have an equal right, and it is equally their duty, to recognise the services of the survivors of 1837-38. The Local Government have not dealt with this question, and they are not likely to do so.

Mr. HICKEY. I heartily sympathise with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Wilson) who has brought this matter again before the House. In the Session of 1884 I brought the matter up, and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) had previously brought it before the House. We got no sympathy then from the Opposition, and the leader of the Opposition sat upon my remarks in a most unmerciful manner, and in his elegant way made fun of the volunteers of 1837-38, of whom his friends now would seek to have some recognition made. I think there is no better class of men in any country than those who bore arms in those troubles. Their duty was towards their country, and they manfully did it, although they did not receive such recognition as they deserved. I think it would be an honorable thing for the country to recognise in some way the volunteers, not only in 1837, but also those who bore arms in 1868 during the Fenian raid. In the excitement of the late rebellion the volunteers got medals, which they richly deserved, but the same recognition ought to be made in the case of those who served their country in 1837. The House will remember that the decision arrived at, when I brought this matter before Parliament, was that of the leader of the Government, who said that it was not in the power of this Parliament to deal with it, but that it belonged to the Local Legislature. That opinion was fully endorsed by the leader of the Opposition, the present member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who thought it was a matter wholly belonging Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

to the Local Government, and that the answer given to me by the leader of the Government was perfectly justifiable. I hope, however, that his friends had a mollifying effect upon his patriotism in this respect, and that he will lend his influence in the matter, if not now, at some future time.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not exactly catch the statement of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), but I believe my course upon the occasion to which he refers was one which ought not to have merited so much of his disfavor, for I believe it was my misfortune on that occasion to be obliged to agree with the leader of the Government.

Mr. HICKEY. I said so.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but the hon. gentleman spoke of my action with contumely, while he spoke of the action of the hon. gentleman with applause and admiration. The hon. gentleman mentioned that I sat down upon him. I can assure the hon. gentleman there must have been a necessity for it, for if I had to choose a seat it would be quite a different one.

Mr. HICKEY. I said that the hon. member had made some fun of the volunteers of 1837.

Mr. CURRAN. Of course I fully appreciate the eloquent remarks made on all sides of the House, and I, for one, would be glad that some reward should be paid to the volunteers, and to the patriots of 1837-38 as well. They should both get compensation. But what I wish to say on the present occasion is in connection with a similar subject that I have already had the honor of bringing before this House and the consideration of the Government. I am satisfied that Mr. Joseph Swisher, who has been a volunteer and a military man, ought to receive some consideration, and that the Widow Martin should also have some attention paid to her. I trust that the claim that was put forward some few years ago will not be entirely overlooked, and as we are now dealing with military matters, I hope this poor old lady, whose son died from the effects of exposure while he was on service in 1866, will receive that consideration at the hands of the Minister of Militia to which she is entitled.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the House and the few who are left of those old survivors of 1837-38, owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) for once more bringing this subject before the attention of the House. Hardly a Session has passed since I have had the honor of being a member of this House, that the attention of the Government and the House has not been drawn to the services rendered by these old veterans, and their title to recognition on the part of the Government of the country for those services. I must say that I cannot quite understand the attitude of the Premier, and the attitude of his predecessor in the Administration preceding the present one, with regard to this question. If it is a fact that this Government have no power to deal with this question, it is certainly a very unfortunate state of things. I never could understand why the action taken by the Government with reference to the survivors of 1812 might not fairly have been taken as a precedent for similar action with reference to the volunteers of 1837-38. It is true, as the hon. member for Elgin stated, that a difference of opinion exists as to the provocation which the insurgents of that day had for doing as they did, but I do not consider that matter of any importance with reference to the question of indemnity to those who sustained the Government of the day on that occasion. Those men certainly did their duty faithfully and well; all of them risked their lives, and some lost their lives on the battle field. The loss of life in the section of country I live in was greater, in proportion to the number engaged, than that which took place in the North West Rebellion; and it does seem to me that the services rendered by those men are equally deserving of recognition with

those which were rendered (great as they were) by the volunteers who went to the North-West. The leader of the Government has, on several occasions, stated that he himself shouldered his musket at that time, and, if that was a fact, he must have a strong fellow feeling with those whose services are brought to his attention to-day. It does appear to me that it would be quite proper, and that the action of the Government, if they chose to take action in this regard, would be sustained by a large majority of the House, if something were done even at this late day to recognise the services of those men. It was only quite recently I saw a report in the newspaper of an interview which took place between the Minister of Militia and the leader of the Government and some gentlemen who came here as a deputation to represent those men who took part in defending the country against the Fenian invasions of 1866 and 1870. The hon. gentleman certainly displayed the proper spirit in his remarks to those gentlemen. But if those who volunteered their services on that occasion deserve well of their country, certainly those earlier men in this gallant service also deserved similar recognition at the hands of this House and the Government.

Mr. DENISON. I am strongly of the opinion that something should be done to reward those men. Those events happened a long while ago, and still they have not lost interest to the Canadian people. The men did good service at the time, and even at this late date some recognition should be made of their services. It is quite possible that the rolls have been kept of those who served, and they would show those who were entitled to recognition; and I cannot let this opportunity pass without putting in a word in favor of those who served at that time.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution referred to the action of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie with reference to the veterans of 1812. He referred to it, I think, as the act of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the vote for the veterans of that date was introduced by the Government of the hon. member for East York. With all due deference I think that would hardly form a precedent for such action as the hon. gentleman asks this House to take to-day. The veterans of 1812 were engaged in a national war, defending the country against a foreign invasion, in which, of course, they hazarded their lives and property; but the veterans, so called, of 1837, in my judgment, while they deserve every credit from the people of the older Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, I fail to see have any claim on this Parliament of the Dominion, which now is composed of various Provinces, some of which did not form part of this Confederation. I presume it is on some such ground that the previous Government and the present Government have not dealt with the veterans of 1837 in the same manner as they have dealt with those of 1812, because they would naturally come to the conclusion that if any reward was to be given to the veterans of 1837 it would have to be borne by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and not by the Dominion, in which other Provinces are now embraced.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I think the reasons which entitle the veterans of 1812 to their reward are quite different from those which apply to the men of 1837. It has been truly said by the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that in 1812 it was a national war, and the troops were defending the national honor. In 1837, on the contrary, the volunteers were engaged in civil war. We remember in 1837 the conduct of the troops towards our citizens; we remember the outrages committed in the rural districts and elsewhere. Those acts were carried to such an extent that a Bill was passed by the Parliament of Old Canada to indemnify the people who suffered by the depredation of those men. The adoption of a measure to recognise the services of those men would be a very unpopular measure, at least with the people of the

Province of Quebec. It was suggested the other day by the Minister of Militia that this question was one that ought to be settled by the different Provinces in Confederation, more particularly by Ontario and Quebec. I hope the whole matter will be referred to those Provinces, and not be further discussed by this Parliament.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see how this question can properly be brought under the consideration of this House. It cannot be said that the residents of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or British Columbia can have any interest in this matter. They took no part in the rebellion, and I, for one, am of the opinion that if any reward is to be given to those who fought in the rebellion of 1837 it ought to be given to the rebels and not to the men who fought for the Crown. We all know that the men who fought then on behalf of the people fought for their rights and responsible government, and it was through the action taken by William Lyon Mackenzie, and men who sympathised with him, that we were put in possession of the liberal institutions of which we to-day boast as British subjects. I, therefore, say that if we recognise at all the services of the men who were engaged at that time in fighting for the liberties of British subjects in this country, we ought to recognise the claims of the rebels. What have we on the Parliamentary grounds at Ottawa? We have evidence that this Parliament has recognised one of the most prominent rebels of the Province of Quebec on that occasion, for a reward of \$2,000 was placed on the head of Sir George E. Cartier; and we have to-day a monument here to show that he was a true patriot, and a vote was passed by unanimous consent for that purpose and to keep his memory dear in the hearts of the people. I contend that this Parliament has nothing to do with the question now before the House. If the friends of those who fought to sustain the old Family Compact and to uphold their tyranny over the people of Ontario, desire recognition to be given, let them be rewarded by the men who sympathise with the opinions they were sustaining at that time, and not by a Parliament which owes its existence to the very fact that those men rebelled against the tyranny prevailing, and secured for the people of this country responsible government and free institutions; because we all know that Lord Durham, who was sent out to report on the rebellion, reported that it was really justifiable, and that William Lyon Mackenzie and those who maintained the rights and liberties of the people were doing just what British subjects ought to do on all occasions and in all portions of the British Empire.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the turn the debate has taken shows that it would be better in the future that these motions should be avoided—any motion referring to the unhappy events of 1837. It arouses, as we all see, very warm feeling, both in members from the Province of Quebec and some members from Ontario, and it cannot result in anything like getting relief for the volunteers of 1837. The true line of distinction has been drawn by several hon. gentlemen opposite. The war of 1812 was a war between the United States and the British Empire. Every portion of the British Empire was interested in that war, and British North America as a whole was interested. If Canada had fallen in 1812, if it had been conquered, the consequences of conquest would have followed with respect to the Maritime Provinces, for all British North America was interested in the conflict. In 1837 there was a civil conflict; it was a war of fellow-subject against fellow-subject, under most regrettable circumstances, which should, as much as possible, be forgotten. Besides, the distinction seemed to be agreed upon in 1884 and 1885 that the volunteers of Upper Canada of 1837, for instance, should be rewarded by the Province of Ontario, where there was an outbreak against legitimate authority, where the battle was, in fact, fought out. There was no foreign foe to resist; it

was not a foreign war; it was subject against subject—people of the same country warring against each other. The Province of Ontario has got plenty of lands and means, I suppose, and if the Legislature of Ontario think it right to reward those inhabitants of their Province who served loyally in 1837, it is for them to do so. So in the Province of Quebec, if the Legislature of that Province think it well to look into the cases of those who bore arms on either side, it is for them to do so; it is certainly not for the Dominion. I hold in my hands extracts from the *Hansard* reports of the discussions on this subject in 1884 and 1885, and if I may be permitted to quote myself, I will read them:

"It occurs to me and to the Government, that the recognition, if it comes at all, should come from the several Provinces; that is to say the Province of Ontario, formerly Upper Canada, should recognise the services of its volunteers, and the Province of Quebec, formerly Lower Canada, should recognise the services of its volunteers. I do not think the Dominion Parliament can be called upon to recognise the services of men who served, not only before Confederation, but before there was a united Canada, when there was an Upper and a Lower Canada, and no prospect or idea of their ever being one Province. This is a disappointment to myself."

And then I went on to speak of my being one of the volunteers. Mr. Blake said:

"I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that this is entirely a provincial matter, a matter for Old Canada, or the Provinces of which it was composed. In the Legislature of Ontario, in former days, during the régime of the first Government, a question connected with this matter came up, and the only person whose services was recognised was one named Montgomery."

Then, again in 1885, my hon. friend the member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) moved in the same sense as the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has moved to-day. I used the same line of argument then. I said:

"It appears to me that this cannot be the place where these services can be recognised. They should be recognised by the different Provinces where the disturbances took place and where the volunteers performed their duty."

On that occasion Mr. Blake said:

"I quite agree in the hon. gentleman's view on this subject, as I did before, and I am glad to seize an opportunity of agreeing with him. When the matter came up in a former Parliament, and I may say to the hon. gentleman who was not a member of that Parliament, and may not be aware of the fact, that that view has already been taken by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario in the first Legislature of that Province, under the lead of the late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, when they felt that it was for them to deal with questions which might arise out of the disturbances, and acted accordingly, and compensated Mr. Montgomery for the burning of his barn by the volunteers."

In both cases the motion was withdrawn; and as the hon. gentleman has shown his sympathy with the volunteer named in the motion, as he has placed his views on record, I think he might profitably follow the course followed on previous occasions, and withdraw the motion. He has expressed his sentiments; they will appear in *Hansard*, and, no doubt, they will be very grateful reading to the gentleman whose case he has advocated.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I cannot understand what injury would result from bringing down this return, and I can see no good object in merely moving the motion and then withdrawing it. I have not a great deal of sympathy with some of the remarks which have been made in the course of this discussion, in reference to the treatment of those who were either drafted or went out as volunteers to serve their country during the rebellion of 1837-38. These men have been charged as if they were guilty of all the crimes that could possibly be imputed to them. I have no sympathy with the expressions used by the hon. member for South Brant, that they are deserving of censure instead of commendation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I rise to a point of order. I made no such statement. I did not censure those who were called out to serve their country, but I praised those who fought for civil and religious liberty and responsible government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I say without hesitation that it would be a most unfair thing that we should not consider the cases of those who were in the strict sense of the word faithfully doing their duty to their country, at that time, just because of the conduct of some of those who were parties to that conflict. These men were ordered out by the Government of the day, by the united Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and I say it would be unkind and unjust that their rights and claims should be ignored, when those Provinces are a part of the Dominion of Canada as it is now constituted. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that he does not desire that any complications may arise on this question. Those people loyally served the Dominion of Canada of that time, just as they would serve the greater Dominion of Canada at the present time; and the position taken by the leader of the Government, or the leader of the Opposition, is no justification for allowing these men, who submitted to all kinds of hardships and endangered their lives, to have their claims ignored by this Parliament. These men placed themselves in danger, they fought valiantly for their country, they contracted disease, and yet we are told that this matter should not be brought up in this House for fear it should create ill feeling. Are these men to suffer wrong lest feelings should be engendered in this House? Is that the sort of justice we are to have measured out to true and loyal men, as they were, whether they were led on by the Government of the day, or whether that Government was doing wrong or not? I say it is not, and I feel it my duty to raise my voice for those men who served their country faithfully and well and showed their patriotism by responding to the call of their countrymen when their services were required. No harm can be done by the reports of the petitions being brought down, which will enable us to see just what claims they have set up. I am not asking for a grant for these men; I am only asking for information that will enable me to see what efforts they have been making to get their claims recognised. Of course, if the First Minister insists I will withdraw the motion. If he does not insist I should like to have it passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the remarks of the hon. gentleman I will not ask him to withdraw the motion, and he shall have the papers. I opposed it simply because he made it merely as a groundwork for a speech in favor of relief for the gentleman mentioned in it. That was the object for which he made the speech. The reason I wished him to withdraw the motion is that it will come to no purpose. It will not gain anything for anybody, and it will cost a little to get the returns prepared and printed. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take the responsibility of that expense.

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask that the returns should be printed. I merely asked that they should be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

ELGIN JUNIOR COUNTY JUDGE.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved for:

All memorials, petitions and correspondence, asking for the appointment of a junior judge for the county of Elgin; also the names of all applicants for the said position since 1st January, 1886.

He said: I understood that a great number of applications and a great number of promises were made in regard to this appointment, and there was a good deal of activity among the barristers in my locality about it a short time before the election. I would like to know who are the applicants.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion for the papers, but, in reply to the re-

mark he has just made, I wish to inform him that there are no applicants.

Motion agreed to.

LEASE OF MAIN DUCKS AND WALPOLE ISLANDS.

Mr. PLATT moved for:

Return of correspondence from January 1st, 1873, to the present time, between the Department of Indian Affairs and John Walters, and others, relative to purchase or lease of Main Ducks and Walpole Islands in Lake Ontario; also all applications for purchase or lease of said islands, all offers made to or by the Government as to purchase or sale, reports of all persons at any time appointed to appraise or value said islands, the annual rental paid by present lessee and date of expiration of such lease; also all charges preferred since January 1st, 1878, against John Walters for violation of terms of lease or regulations of Department, together with names of parties making such charges, and the report of parties commissioned to investigate them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he does not mean the Yorkshire Island and not the Walpole Island. Yorkshire is an island near the Main Ducks.

Mr. PLATT. I mean the island generally leased with Duck Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is Yorkshire Island. Walpole Island is on Lake Erie.

Mr. PLATT. I move that the motion be amended so as to replace Walpole Island by Yorkshire Island.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE.

Mr. PLATT moved for:

Return of correspondence, petitions, reports of engineers and others, relative to construction of harbor of refuge at Wellington, Ontario.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to put in instead of engineer, chief engineer, for the same reason that I gave the other day on a similar motion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company.—(Mr. Scriver.)

Bill (No. 60) further to amend the Act incorporating the Western Assurance Company, and other Acts affecting the same.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. Hall moved second reading of Bill (No. 58) to terminate the Trust respecting the South-Eastern Railway to authorise its sale, and to incorporate the South-Eastern Junction Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill is not printed in French. Under ordinary circumstances, I would not make any objection, but the Bill is very objectionable.

Motion allowed to stand.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing the various amounts paid to William McKay, or any other person on his behalf, for painting or other work in or about the Parliamentary and Departmental Buildings at Ottawa, from the 1st of January, 1875, to the 31st December, 1878.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Vankoughnet, or any other officer of the Department of Indian Affairs, and the Rev. James Robertson, superintendent of Presbyterian missions, in relation to the administration of Indian Affairs and the conduct of the officers of the Government in the North-West, and all other correspondence relating to such matter.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return showing up to date the several sums paid in respect of preparation and revision of voters' lists in county of Prince Edward for 1886, viz.:—Amount paid revising officer, amount paid clerk, amount paid bailiff, amount paid for printing; also amounts claimed for said revision yet unpaid.—(Mr. Platt.)

QUEEN'S COUNTY, N. B., ELECTION.

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

Mr. WELDON. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is in his place, I would ask him the question I made some time ago about the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GIROUARD. The report as sent to the House was prepared by the clerk of the committee according to what he understood to be the usual practice. I called his attention to the fact that the amendments were not in the report, and he said it was not the practice to put in the amendments, but only the resolutions adopted by the majority. That is the reason the return was so made. If it is the wish of the committee that the two motions in amendment should be inserted in the report, I would ask permission of the House to withdraw the report and introduce another one containing the amendments as well as the main motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not able to be at the committee at the time of adjournment, but it was understood that such a motion had been made. The proceedings were rather hurried at the end as it was late. It is the usual, customary motion in all these proceedings, and I am not aware of a case in which such a motion has not been made, namely, that the votes and proceedings of the committee should be reported.

Mr. GIROUARD. That motion was made in a general manner.

Mr. BLAKE. The report had better be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. The report even as brought down is not precisely as it was intended it should be. Not only is the resolution come to by the committee reported, but all the authorities that were hunted up by the sub-committee, and the report they make to the committee. If the clerk simply intended to report simply the decision of the committee, he has done too much, but if he intended to report the proceedings of the committee he should have done more.

Mr. GIROUARD. The wish was expressed in the committee that the precedents and authorities should be a portion of the report.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very good that they should.

Mr. WELDON. I certainly understood the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe was that all the proceedings should be reported.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no objection.

Mr. GIROUARD. I move for permission to withdraw the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY CHARTERS.

Mr. WATSON. I would like it to be distinctly understood that my resolution will be the first order after the Budget Speech is delivered by the Minister of Finance. That is the understanding on which I agreed to allow him to take Thursday and to postpone my motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Thursday and Friday perhaps will be taken up by discussion on Supply. On Monday I think we have agreed that the motion of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) in reference to the Franchise Act shall come up. Hon. gentlemen opposite may arrange among themselves whether the Franchise discussion will come up on Monday or the resolution of the hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it would answer at all to interrupt the Budget debate by allowing the motion of my hon. friend to come after the statement of the Finance Minister. That has to be replied to. However, this can easily be arranged to-morrow, when these matters will be considered. What my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) desires, as I understand, is that he shall have an early opportunity of making his motion. There can be no difficulty in giving him that, because it is for the convenience of the House he has altered his arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By all means.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LETTER FROM THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that, in obedience to the order of the House of Monday last, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has addressed a letter to the Clerk of the House, specifying the course adopted by him in gazetting the election returns of the last general election, and his reasons for such course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved that the said letter be laid on the Table, and be now read.

Motion agreed to, and the Clerk accordingly read the letter, as follows:—

“OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY, CANADA,

“OTTAWA, 10th May, 1887.

“To J. G. BOURINOT, Esquire,

“The Clerk of the House of Commons.

“SIR,—In obedience to the Order of the House of Commons of yesterday, respecting the gazetting by me of the Returns of the last Dominion General Election, I beg to say that when the returns first began to reach me, they came in slowly, and I endeavored, as far as possible, and did, gazette them in the order in which I received them; but afterwards they came in so fast, by every mail, some mails over thirty letters, and as many large bundles of papers, some of them being in size about two feet square, in addition to others, which, instead of being sent by mail, as the law requires, were sent by express in large boxes, all of which, before I could gazette the Member elected, required to be arranged and assorted, and the letters, returns and reports of proceedings contained in them examined and read, many of the latter being lengthy and in different handwriting.

“It frequently occurred, also, that after opening and examining large piles of papers, oaths, statements and certificates of the various officers employed at the election, nomination papers and numerous other documents, that the return, or Form S, required by the Dominion Elections Act, to enable me to gazette the member elected, was wanting, and which, in some instances, would arrive several days later, and in others would not reach me till I had written to the returning officers to send it, after waiting a considerable time, in the hope that they would do as others had done—send it later, without being written to for it.

“Again, many of the returning officers, instead of sending the writ, return and report of proceedings in a separate envelope, put them in the large bundle of papers, together with the oaths, statements and certificates of all the various election officers—reports of proceedings, nomination papers, accounts, ballot papers, voters' and revisors' lists, all mixed together in one confused heap, all of which had to be carefully

Mr. WATSON.

assorted, examined and read before I could gazette the member returned.

“Owing to the quantity of letters and large bundles of election papers which reached me by every mail, and which I was consequently unable to assort and examine before the arrival of an additional batch by the following mail, it necessarily happened, from both want of time and space, that those which came last were put on the top of the others, and were in consequence, in many instances, gazetted before those which were underneath, and which had previously arrived.

“In the midst of all the above work it must not be forgotten that I had, in addition thereto, the ordinary duties of my office to perform.

“I lost no time in gazetting the members, as fast as the necessary returns and papers from the returning officers reached me and enabled me to do so. In this connection allusion may be made to the difference, in point of numbers, of the party complexion of the members elected.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

R. POPE,

“Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.”

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Canada Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Mulock.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I promised yesterday, at the instance of hon. gentlemen opposite, to move for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker or Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House. I did not do so, owing to circumstances I will now mention. I had asked my hon. friend the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to accept that appointment, and my hon. friend was inclined to accept it; but on going home to St. Catharines and consulting his family and medical man, he thought better to decline, and he recommended, from his long parliamentary experience, a gentleman whose name I am going to mention, to get the appointment. I had not seen that gentleman in time to make the motion yesterday, or to get his assent to the act. My hon. friend from Lincoln recommended, as I already said, from his acquaintance with the leading members of Parliament, that Mr. Colby, the member for Stanstead, should be Chairman of Committees. I therefore move:

That Mr. Charles C. Colby, the member for Stanstead, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Mr. BLAKE. It is with great satisfaction I rise to perform a duty very much more agreeable than that which I had anticipated would have fallen to my lot on this occasion. I do not know that the mode in which the hon. gentleman has introduced his proposal for the nomination of the hon. member for Stanstead, is altogether calculated to recommend it to the House. It seems he is the nominee of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), but that does not interfere with the merits of the hon. member for Stanstead. I ventured to state, when we first met this Session, some of the qualifications which I considered were necessary for the occupation of the honorable position proposed to be filled. It is only second, Sir, to your own. The duties, under the appointment which the House has decided to continue, are of very great consequence, and those characteristics, which I endeavored to describe as essential to the proper discharge of the duties of Speaker, may not unfitly be called for in the person who is called upon to fulfil the office of Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. I am glad to be able to say that those characteristics are, to my mind, eminently possessed by the hon. member for Stanstead. He has shown himself, during a long parliamentary career, versed in the forms of the House; he has applied himself to the discharge of his parliamentary duties in a manner which, while indicating tenacity and firmness and decision of opinion in accord with his party, has always been entirely unobjectionable to any hon. member of those who were opposed to him. He

has, I fancy, quite as many friends on this side of the House as on the other, and I think he has as great judgment to fit him for the position as any hon. member who can be named. I have very great pleasure in extending him my congratulations on the proposal which has been made.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is only due to the hon. gentleman who has been put forward as Deputy Speaker that I should say something in relation to him. I have had a long intercourse with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), and I have ever found him displaying fairness and honesty in regard to public questions before the House. His position as a party man is very well known, but no one could be named from one side of the House or from the other, and I doubt very much if anyone in my own party could be named, who would be more acceptable than my hon. friend from Stanstead. I rose to bear testimony, from an independent standpoint, to the general satisfaction given by the announcement that the hon. member for Stanstead will be appointed Deputy Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend and repair the breakwater at Miminegash, Prince County, P.E.I., as asked for by petition?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have given instructions to have this matter looked into. I am not in a position to say more to-day in regard to it.

BOUNTY ON THE MANUFACTURE OF IRON.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What amount has been paid during the fiscal year 1886, by way of bounty, on the manufacture of iron? How is the said sum entered in the Public Accounts? How much, during the current year, to 1st May, 1887?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount of bounty paid during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1886, on pig iron manufactured in Canada was \$39,269.56. The amount paid for bounty between the 1st July, 1886, and the 1st May, 1887, was \$32,667.65. The amount paid for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1886, is included in the amount of \$132,815.87 shown for duties refunded in the Public Accounts, pages 10 and 11, part I. I may state that I think that entry is made improperly; it should not be put under that head, and I have given instructions that it shall be put under the head of "bounties" in future.

FISHING BOUNTIES IN VICTORIA, N.S.

Mr. BARRON asked, The names of all persons who applied for fishing bounties, for the year 1886, for the district of Grand Narrows and Washabuck, in the county of Victoria, Nova Scotia. The names of those applicants who, for that year, were refused. Was the claim for fishing bounty of Michael McDougall refused, and why? Was the said McDougall afterwards appointed Fishery Warden for the said district? Who was his immediate predecessor in office? Did the latter resign, or was he dismissed? If dismissed, why?

Mr. FOSTER. The answer to that question would take me a good deal of time to read, and would take a corresponding time of the House. I think my hon. friend had better put it in the form of a notice of motion for an order of the House, and then the information will be brought down to the House in the form of a return,

SALARY OF REVISING BARRISTERS' CLERKS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the salary of revising barristers' clerks been fixed, and if so, what is the amount allowed to each? Have the salaries of revising barristers' clerks, for services in preparing the voters' lists of 1886, been paid, and what is the total amount paid on account of such service? If such salaries have not been paid in full, how many revising barristers' clerks are claimants for arrears, and how many have received no payment up to the present time for services?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think I need only answer the first part of the question by saying that the salary of the revising barristers' clerks has been fixed by Order in Council at \$2 a day. The clerks have been paid by the different revising officers. A number of them have been paid, but it is hard to state to how many balances may be due. I have put before the House a detailed account of the expenses of the revising barristers in the preparation of lists, and in perusing that account hon. members will see what amounts have been paid to each. Some complaints have been made about revising barristers not having completely paid their clerks. The answers have been sent to the Auditor, who is charged with that account, and before settling the balance of salary due to the revising barristers, the amount due to the clerks would have been attended to. Of course the Department could not deal with each of the revising officers' clerks, and it dealt only with those officers when receipts were sent by the different sub-officers who were employed.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand that the amounts submitted to the House include the payments to the clerks of the different revising barristers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They include all the accounts, mentioning those which have been allowed, and those which have been disallowed.

Mr. MILLS. Does the account show the amount they claimed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has that information?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MILLS. It would be very desirable that we should have it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have the information regarding the demands of the clerks who claim amounts due them; there is no need of information regarding the amount of the revising officers' salary.

Mr. MILLS. I was asking as to the amount they demanded for their salary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not concern this question.

Mr. MILLS. It concerns this House.

KIT MONEY FOR VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, When were the field allowance or kit money paid over to the Queen's Own and Royal Grenadiers of Toronto, and what sum was allowed to each man? Have the pay sheets for their kit money been signed by the members of the York and Simcoe provisional battalion, and if so, when were they received by the Militia Department? If the amounts signed for have not been already paid to the men, why has not the Government done so?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Royal Grenadiers were paid compensation, in lieu of boots and underclothing, at the rate of \$8.15 per man, on the 26th December, 1885, by District Paymaster Alger. The Queen's Own were paid an allowance, in lieu of kit and necessaries, the same as was granted to the Royal Grenadiers, at the rate of \$8.15 per man, on the 2nd May, 1886, by departmental cheque No.

14422. No pay sheets for kit money of the York and Simcoe provisional battalion have been received, and no allowance has been made.

LIGHT-KEEPER AT MIMINEGASH.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a keeper of the Ranger Light at Miminegash, Prince county, P.E.I., has been appointed? If so, who is he? And at what salary?

Mr. FOSTER. No keeper has yet been appointed.

THE HALDIMAND ELECTION, 1887.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copies of return, if any, made by returning officer for Haldimand, at election of 1887, after making his final addition, or of his declaration, if no such return was made, and of his return made after the recount by the county judge. 2. Notice of a recount or other proceedings served upon such returning officer. 3. Certificate made by the county judge of Haldimand, as to result of said recount. 4. Any judgment delivered by said county judge during, or after such recount, and of all minutes or memoranda made by said judge or his clerk containing entries or memoranda in regard to any of the ballots in dispute during such recount, showing what decision was come to in the case of each ballot, which ballots were reserved, and what judgment was delivered in regard to such reserved ballots, whether such minutes and other papers were publicly read by such judge or clerk or not during said recount.

He said: As I see that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has returned to the House, I will proceed with my motion. I do not intend to go into any lengthy discussion of the allegations made in regard to the conduct of the Haldimand election; I intend to go no further than will be sufficient to justify me in asking for the papers mentioned in this motion, which refer to the proceedings at the recount of votes held after the election. I will say briefly, and in general terms, that the allegation is that the county judge who conducted the recount publicly gave decisions in regard to nearly all of the ballots in dispute on the 12th day of March last; that on that day he reserved three ballots for further consideration for the purpose of conferring with Judge Cameron, who was then at Cayuga, on the subject of these ballots; that finally, after his public judgment, in addition to disposing of these ballots which he had specially reserved, he disposed of other ballots and changed his decision in regard to other ballots on which he had already pronounced judgment, and disposed of them in an opposite way to that in which they had been publicly disposed of. Now, my information in regard to this matter is not personal; it is derived from persons in Cayuga, and their allegations are that the conduct of the judge led to the doing of an actual injustice to the gentleman who had in the first instance the majority of votes, Mr. Colter. I will try to put their statements in regard to it at a little greater length and in more systematic form. Mr. Colter, the Reform candidate for Haldimand, and the late member, was returned by the returning officer as being elected on this occasion by a majority of 13 votes. On the same day, I think, notice was given of a recount before the county judge. That recount began on the 9th March and continued for three days, and on the 12th judgment was given by Judge Upper in regard to all the votes but those I speak of. Two of the ballots on which judgment was given were numbered 53 and 55, and in regard to these Judge Upper said he disallowed them for Mr. Colter. Now, it turned out, on looking at the ballots themselves, they had not been marked for Mr. Colter. They had been marked—I suppose I may be allowed to mention the hon. member's name—for Mr. Montague, and not for Mr. Colter, and therefore this decision meant a loss of two votes for Mr. Montague, instead of a loss of two votes for Mr. Colter. I am informed that this judgment in regard to these two ballots resulted in leaving Mr. Colter in a majority of four, not counting the three ballots I have already spoken of as having been reserved, numbered 57, 58 and 59. These three

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

were marked for Mr. Colter, and the question was whether they should be allowed for Mr. Colter or not. If they were allowed for Mr. Colter he would have a majority of four; if they were disallowed for Mr. Colter, he would have a majority of one. That was the condition of things at the end of the public judgment, delivered by Judge Upper, in his chambers at Cayuga, as I am informed. Well, Sir, it was publicly stated by Mr. Colter, in a speech in the town of Cayuga, and in which he challenges contradiction of his statements, that this was the case, and he goes into it pretty fully. I will read his own words to the House:

"All other ballots, except those two classes, were decidedly allowed or disallowed that day in presence of those previously mentioned, as well as Doctor Baxter, who came in after the judgment had been partially delivered. I suggested that before we summed up, Mr. W. Langrill, who was acting as the judge's clerk, should read over the judgment again, in order that it might be compared with my record and Mr. Snider's."

Mr. Snider being the agent of Mr. Montague.—

"He did so, and the judgment corresponded exactly with my notes and Mr. Snider's as to the numbers of the ballots allowed and disallowed. I have these notes in their original form—full, complete and unchanged still. Now, this arrangement, if the ballots belonged to each candidate as the judge's clerk had them down, would have cut out my entire majority, the returning officer would have given the casting vote against me, he said so repeatedly, and the reserved votes need not have been called upon at all to do duty. At this point, however, I pointed out that the ballots numbered 53 and 55 were not marked for me at all, but were marked for Mr. Montague. The judge's clerk protested that I must be wrong, but I maintained my position. Mr. Snider admitted that I was correct. The ballots were produced and proved me correct. This was like a thunder-clap out of a clear sky. This changed the tie into a majority of four for me, without counting the reserved ballots or taking them into the calculation. Suppose my ballots, not counting those two, to number 1,750 and Montague's 1,748; if they were deducted from my vote, each candidate would have 1,748, a tie. If the two were deducted from Montague's vote, I would have 1,750 and he 1,746, a majority of four for me. I then pointed out that if the three ballots reserved for having counterfoil, were disallowed, I had a majority of one; if allowed, I had a majority of four, and inasmuch as the judge had expressed so strong an opinion on number 3 Oneida ballots, those endorsed with the name of the deputy returning officer in full, I was entitled to judgment there and then and demanded it. The judge intimated that he would give judgment in my favor, that my majority was four, but wished to consult Chief Justice Cameron as to the ballots endorsed with the name of the deputy returning officer in full, and to consider the counterfoil ballots, and reserved judgment on these two points, and on these alone."

Now, it is clear that if this statement of ballots, of which I have here the original notes as taken down by Mr. Colter at the time, which, he says, were compared with the notes of the judge's clerk and found correct—it is clear that if the judge had only taken action upon the ballots which he reserved, Mr. Colter would have had a majority of one, and the judge would have so returned him with a majority of one. Two points now arise. The first point is whether Judge Upper, having publicly delivered judgment, which not only practically, but implicitly, gave a majority of one vote for Mr. Colter—whether his functions as a judge holding a recount were not then at an end—whether he was not *functus officio*, as I believe the lawyers say, and incapable of giving any further judgment except on the ballots he reserved. That is the view maintained by Mr. Colter and his friends, and I confess, as a layman, that there seems to me to be a great deal of force in the argument. But even supposing he was not *functus officio* as regards the ballots on which he had already pronounced judgment, suppose it was open to him to consider other ballots and reconsider his judgment on those ballots, the course he pursued appears to have been unfair and unjust to Mr. Colter, because, without reopening the court, without hearing further argument, without giving Mr. Colter a chance to object further to the changes he intended to make, he quietly, in the secrecy of his own room, reversed the judgment that he had delivered on certain of these ballots, and so produced a majority of one vote for Mr. Montague. In order to ascertain whether those statements were correct, whether the judge did reconsider the judgment previously

delivered on any of the ballots, it is necessary to have a copy of the judgment that was delivered by him on Saturday, 12th March, in his chambers. It was a written paper read by his clerk, of which he still should have a copy. I have ascertained from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that no copy has been sent in, and therefore the judge will have to be asked to furnish one. It is necessary to have that paper, and compare it with the final judgment which the judge did send to the returning officer, and which has been sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in order to see whether he did act as alleged in regard to those different ballots. I, therefore, make this motion for copies of the document. Whether it is in possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the returning officer or the judge, we are, at all events, entitled to demand it, no matter in whose possession it may be. All those gentlemen were officers of this House for the purpose of that election, and the House has a right to demand papers from them. I am instructed also that undue influence was brought to bear on Judge Upper during the course of his recount; that a gentleman to whom it is said he owes his appointment as judge, Mr. McCallum, the late member for Monck, now a member of the other House, was present with the judge before and during the recount and brought his influence to bear on him; that other Conservatives, wire-pullers and party managers in that neighborhood, were also present during the recount, and were continually in his presence, and were supposed to have exerted influence on him. I am instructed also that they had special means of exercising undue influence on him, as his habits are such as to make him specially liable—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I am quite in order in speaking of the conduct of any officer of this House. I am speaking of the conduct of Judge Upper in the recount.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already ruled that no hon. member has the right to reflect in a disrespectful manner on the judges of the land, and I shall hold to that decision until it is reversed by the House. The hon. gentleman will himself see how unfair it is, especially when he began his speech by saying that the information he possessed was only second-hand information, to reflect in such a way on the judges of the land.

Mr. CASEY. I am quite at one with your decision, Mr. Speaker, that no attack should be made on the judges of the land. It is one of the old principles laid down that an hon. member should not attack a judge, unless prepared to take the usual parliamentary course with a view to remove him. It is, however, quite impossible to discuss this matter, in which the judge's conduct is involved, without stating what is alleged against him, and it is necessary for my case to state what I have been told about the habits of the judge, about the reasons why those gentlemen were supposed to have special influence over him. It is on account of the judge's habits, such as they are—I will not characterise them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to charge anything of the kind against a judge. Here is the authority, and I will mention it to the hon. gentleman if he wishes to discuss my ruling.

Mr. CASEY. I am not discussing your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find in "Brand's Decisions" the following:—

"Charges against the judges are unbecoming to be made, as there is a proper course open if their conduct is to be challenged."

I rule in the same sense.

Mr. CASEY. Do you rule, Mr. Speaker, that that applies in a case where a judge is acting as the servant of this House in conducting business in connection with elections? I will not, however, characterise the judge's habits. His habits, whatever they may be, certainly gave an opportunity to bring undue pressure to bear upon him, and it is said that he was threatened by this gentleman who secured him this appointment, that he would have him removed unless he gave a satisfactory decision in regard to this case. That is what is alleged. He was told that there were other Conservatives, quite as good and quite as active, who would get the place and he would be turned out, and by such reasons he was threatened into taking the action he did take. That was the case as I have been told it in connection with this matter. I have no reason to believe that any part of it is incorrect; I have reason to believe otherwise, because Mr. Colter, at Cayuga, on March 24th, made similar statements against the judge and challenged the disproof of the truth of his allegations. Neither the judge nor any other person attacked took any action against Mr. Colter, or did anything to disprove the accusation. I am, therefore, justified, in the meantime, in believing that those allegations are true. For these reasons I move for the papers named in my motion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know the House will pardon me this afternoon for saying a few words upon this matter, more particularly as I have not troubled them during the previous days of the Session by speaking on any matter that has come before the attention of the House. I am sure, Sir, that no one can question the right of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) to move for any papers in connection with the Haldimand election, or any other election which may have been held in this Dominion. But I am sure this House will agree with me when I say that I am perfectly in order in questioning the propriety and good taste of introducing before this House, in rather a partisan sense, a matter that has now properly and regularly come before the courts of this country. And I think the hon. gentleman displayed much worse taste when he came here to make, in the form of inuendo or insinuation, a charge in this House against any judge or any court of this country. I am sure, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not at all pleased with the result, so far as the county of Haldimand is concerned; and I can very well understand that they are anxious to discredit both me and my friends before the people of this country, in connection with that election. But I am convinced still further that the hon. members of this House, as well as the intelligent electors of this country, will require stronger evidence than the ravings of a disappointed candidate, the ambition and the aspiration of whose life has suddenly taken a drop, before they will decide upon any question as to my right to sit here, or the character of the county judge who made that recount. Of course, I recognise at once, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is doing good service for his party. Indeed, I may be allowed to suggest that he is endeavoring to win a name and fame that might entitle him to the Cabinet position, in the Government of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), which I believe he announced to his electors, some time ago, he was about to take when that Government was formed. However, I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the manner in which he has served his party, and I only hope that he may succeed to that position, when the time arrives when that Government shall be formed, because I am sure by that time he will have learned, during his years of old age, more discretion than he has displayed here to-day. I may say, Sir, that I am not personally displeased that this matter has come before the House in its present shape. Ever since the result of the election in the county of Haldimand was announced, my friends and myself have been attacked from one end to the other of this broad Dominion, in the public press and from the public platform, as having

done something indecent or disorderly in connection with the recount in the county of Haldimand. And so I say to-day, for my own sake and for the sake of the county which I only desire to honorably and honestly represent in this House, that I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter before the House, that I may have the opportunity of saying a few words in defence of those who have been attacked, as well as a few words in defence of myself. Hon. gentlemen opposite are, of course, very much displeased with the result of that recount. Perhaps it is well known to members of this House, as well as to the people of the country, that the county for which I sit to-day, as a supporter of the right hon. leader of this Government, has, for the last half century, been returning supporters of hon. gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House; so that I can well understand those gentlemen finding fault, and expressing their regret as well as their disgust, when they see those counties that through the long years of the past have stood by them, suddenly passing from their grip and returning members to support the right hon. leader of this House. I may also say, Sir, that another cause brings deep regret to the minds of these hon. gentlemen. Hon. members of this House are well aware that a vote was had in the county of Haldimand in the month of September of last year. It is not meet for me to-day, Sir, to discuss the reasons why the county of Haldimand was carried so strongly by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, because there are other gentlemen in the House who may perhaps be able to say more upon that question than myself. I see the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in his place to-day. That hon. gentleman had committee rooms in various portions of the county of Haldimand, and I have no doubt that if he were to-day to rise in his place he might be able to give this House some intelligent and pleasant information with regard to the success of his cause in the county of Haldimand. At all events, I can only say that his friend, Mr. Colter, of whom the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has spoken, said the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was worth one hundred votes to him in the county of Haldimand. I think that is good evidence that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is exceedingly popular in the county of Haldimand, or that he carried an article with him which was even more popular than he was himself. However, I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like the reversal of that verdict which was given by the people of Haldimand last September, because we were told from one end of this country to the other that the result of the contest in the county of Haldimand was but the local outbreak of that general storm which was to sweep the Government of the right hon. gentleman from power; and from one end of Canada to the other you heard that verdict of September given as evidence that the Government was tottering to its fall. I desire to say that I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to hon. gentlemen from the Province of Nova Scotia. I listened with especial pleasure to those hon. gentlemen because in the section of country from which I come we heard that the Province of Nova Scotia was to go solid for the incoming Government of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), as I have no doubt they heard that our section of the country was to go solid for that hon. gentleman. Well, I have to say to-day, Sir, that the members for the Niagara peninsula of the old Province of Ontario, stand here linked hand to hand as a solid file of supporters of the right hon. Premier. We were told even in that Niagara peninsula itself that the Opposition would carry every single seat in that district, and bets were, I believe, freely offered that we would not succeed in one single constituency. We were told that the then hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) who was retiring, would have as a successor a gentleman who would support hon. gentlemen opposite; and yet my hon. friend from

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Monck (Mr. Boyle) comes here with a majority quadruple the majority which his predecessor received. We were told that Welland was to be wiped out of existence, as a constituency supporting this Government, and yet it increased its majority one hundred per cent. We were told that South Wentworth was solid for the Opposition, and yet my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Carpenter) sits for this county. We were told that Lincoln would go solidly for hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet Lincoln increased its majority for my good friend near me (Mr. Rykert) to the extent of five hundred per cent. And worse than all, old Haldimand, which had never broken its record, elected me to sit for that constituency as a supporter of the right hon. Premier. So I can well understand that those hon. gentlemen do not care particularly for the result in the Niagara peninsula or in the county of Haldimand. Coming more closely to the question before the House, I may say that, so far as the county of Haldimand is concerned, neither myself nor my friends have anything to conceal, as we have nothing to regret in connection with that election. It is true very many bitter things have been said, much to the injury of myself and of other gentlemen connected with that recount. But I have this to say, that I have refused answering those matters. I have refused to take those matters up either in the press or on the public platform, because the case was to come before the courts of this country, and I was willing to leave my vindication and the vindication of my friends to those higher courts to which the case has been referred. So far as the hon. gentleman's attack upon the judge of the county court is concerned, it appears to me that it must seem as out of place as it is unjust, unkind and untrue. The best legal opinion I can secure advises me that his judgment will be sustained. I have no doubt that the members of this House and the people of this country are also willing to wait till the proper time arrives, and a final judgment is given in regard to matters in connection with the election in the county of Haldimand. However, my hon. friend has entered into a rather detailed statement regarding some matters in connection with that recount. Let me say to him and to this House, that not one single illegal, irregular or improper step was taken by me or by any of my friends in connection with that recount. It is true, the hon. gentleman has insinuated—nay, more, he has stated boldly—that it has been publicly stated that a gentleman, who was formerly an hon. member of this House, but who now occupies a seat in the Senate of Canada, I refer to the Hon. Lachlan McCallum, had improperly influenced a county judge in connection with the recount. I have only to say, with reference to that, that I think that gentleman is sufficiently known in this House, and in this country, to render unnecessary any humble defence of his character which I might make in this Chamber; and though I say nothing regarding the personal honor of my hon. friend from West Elgin, it will be well for him if, when he comes to the years of that gentleman, he stands as well with the people of this country, and with his compeers, as does the late hon. member for Monck. I feel warmly on this subject, because I feel that it is unmanly to stand in this House and attack a gentleman, who is absent, with a base insinuation, when he stands as an honorable man before this House and this country. I must say I thought the hon. member for West Elgin was too dignified and too much of a gentleman to make such a statement, and I really regret that my expectations in that respect have not been verified on this occasion.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to order. I am charged with being unmanly, with having made base insinuations, and with not being a gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the expressions are rather strong, and I cannot say that they are parliamentary. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I withdraw, then, the expression "base insinuation."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, before I withdraw, I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw his statements regarding a member of the Upper House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must simply withdraw what he said. The expression "base insinuation" is not parliamentary, neither is the word "unmanly," nor the statement that an hon. member of this House is not a gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If I said anything unparliamentary, I beg to withdraw it. But I still express my regret that a gentleman who is absent from this House should have his character attacked by an hon. member in this Chamber. I have only to say, in connection with the recount in the county of Haldimand, that the proper legal steps were taken. After the first result was declared, namely, a majority of thirteen for Mr. Colter, I took the pains to go from one to another of the various scrutineers throughout the county and obtain a history of the ballots which were rejected either for Mr. Colter or for myself. I also took the pains to enquire, as well as I could, of any ballots having been counted which they deemed improper or illegal; and after considerable pains and expense, I came to the conclusion, advised by the solicitor whom I had employed, that there was a chance of securing the seat by a recount—by having those ballots which were improperly marked for my opponent rejected, and others which were improperly rejected counted for myself. Therefore, the proper deposit was made, and the proper proceedings were taken to have that recount. I may say that there were technical objections by which I was advised by my solicitor the seat could be secured without any recount of the ballots at all; but I preferred not to take advantage of any such technicalities, and advised my solicitor not to do so, because my desire was that the person having the legal majority of votes should be declared elected, and should take his place in this House; and I am sure the hon. members of this House will award to me the desire to be honest and fair in this matter, as I am bound to award to them the desire only to get at the right. I have nothing to be ashamed of in connection with the Haldimand election or recount. I have the evidence of the Reform organiser of the county, the secretary of the Reform convention, that no fairer, squarer, purer election was ever run in the county. Therefore, I say I have nothing to hide, nothing to be ashamed of. My only desire is, that this whole matter shall be fully enquired into by the courts. I have no fear of the judgment of the superior courts in the matter, and I have as little fear if the people are again appealed to and asked to give their judgment between Mr. Colter and myself and the public questions that divide us. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House for the kind attention they have given me, and again express my desire to have nothing more than my rights, than which I will accept nothing less.

Mr. CASEY. Before the motion is adopted, as I have no doubt it will be, I must make some very brief reference to the remarks of my young friend who has just sat down. He says I have shown bad taste in bringing this matter up because it is now before the courts. Well, Sir, it is before this House also, because the conduct of certain of our officers is involved in it. The conduct of the judge, as to whether he acted properly in this recount, is before us, and we have a right to remove him from the bench if we find he did wrong. We have the same right to enquire into the conduct of the returning officers. As to the taste I displayed, I am very sorry indeed that I did not please the hon. gentleman; but I think the amount of bad taste I exhibited

does not stand out in glaring contrast to his own speech. In fact, the personal feeling appeared to be all on one side, namely, on his. I have no wish to attack my hon. friend, or to degrade him in the opinion of his friends or the country. I have a very high opinion of his family. I think his brother who lives in my county, and is president of the Reform Association there, has made greater advance in the science of politics than he has. So there can be no possible personal feeling on my part towards my hon. friend. But he told us a fact which is very interesting: he told us that the county of Haldimand has been continuously returning Reformers for the last half century. That is exactly the point. It has returned a Reformer in every election during the past half century or so, and we believe it has returned one this time again. We have not the slightest doubt that a Reformer was elected there, but by the action of the county judge was unjustly deprived of his seat. It may not be the fault of my hon. friend that it was done, but we charge that it was done, and that thereby the will of the majority of Haldimand was defeated. The hon. gentleman refers to Mr. Colter's victory at Haldimand during last summer, and he said no doubt it was largely due to the exertions of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar).

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it not out of order to say that any man has been dishonorably, dishonestly, and unjustly deprived of his seat?

Mr. CASEY. Not at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not unless the hon. member suggested or stated that it had been done by a member of this House.

Mr. CASEY. I distinctly avoided that. I said that my hon. friend alluded to the victory of Mr. Colter last summer in Haldimand, and said it was largely due to the exertions of the hon. member for West Ontario. No doubt that is true. My hon. friend did work hard. He is a very powerful speaker, he is a powerful stumpster, and he did a great deal to elect Mr. Colter; but at the same time the credit is not due to him alone. There were other gentlemen working in Haldimand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You were there.

Mr. CASEY. I was there myself, but I do not refer to this in order to claim credit to myself. I did my little best, but I do not think I did much. But there were other hon. gentlemen there from the opposite side. The right hon. the First Minister was down in Haldimand, visiting the newly enfranchised Indian voters and holding interviews with them. The hon. the Minister of Interior was there and addressed meetings at Cayuga and elsewhere. The hon. the Minister of Justice was down there also and addressed meetings. I do not remember whether any other Minister visited the county, but another gentleman whom we have long expected to be a Minister went down and addressed meetings. I allude to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). To these gentlemen alone may be attributed the fact that Mr. Colter had such a handsome majority last summer. If the present member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) were really elected, as the returning officer states, by a majority of the people, I believe it was due to the other fact that he secured the absence of these Ministers from the county on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman gives me what I may call a scolding for attacking my hon. friend, the late member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), in his absence. It would be quite impossible to discuss the matter at all without stating what were the charges, and my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) will know, when he is a little longer acquainted with me, that I have as high a personal

opinion of the hon. gentlemen referred to as most members, but I have to state what are the charges against him in order to obtain the papers. Therefore the outcry about attacking a man in his absence is perfectly absurd. The hon. member for Haldimand seems to think I have accused the late member for Monck of something wrong, something that Mr. McCallum considered wrong. Mr. McCallum has been charged with this publicly, he has been for some months attacked, and has never, as far as I am aware, taken any means to prosecute those who have made charges against him, or to disprove the charges. I would judge from that, knowing the hon. gentleman's high sense of honor and warmth of disposition, that he does not believe he did wrong, or that the wrong charged to him is calculated to injure him among his friends, and I do not believe that the charge of using undue influence was calculated to injure him among his friends. But I find my hon. friend has not gone into any details. He has made no statement with regard to the conduct of Judge Upper, but has fallen into the usual error of young speakers, of making assertions without giving facts. He has told us several times that everything connected with the election was clean and straightforward, but he has said nothing about details, and given no explanation of appearances, which, to our mind, point the other way. Therefore, I am in exactly the same degree of darkness in regard to these transactions after the hon. gentleman's explanation as before, and I hope the papers will give us more light than the hon. gentleman has been able to give us. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not see fit to give us some of that, no doubt, very full information he has in regard to the matter, and thus to clear it up and save further consideration. That is all I have to say in answer to the hon. gentleman's remarks, and I hope he will find, if he remains in this House a few years more, as may unfortunately happen for our side, that it is quite possible to discuss these matters, and even the conduct of individuals inside and outside the House, without exciting any personal feeling.

Motion agreed to.

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Mr. MILLS moved for :

Copy of the letter of resignation by Sir Charles Tupper of the office of High Commissioner, showing the date of such resignation ; also a statement showing the date when the Government House (the residence of the High Commissioner in London) was vacated, and showing in whose care the house has been placed since its vacation ; also a copy of the commission now in force, together with any instructions which may have been given to the present Commissioner ; also all correspondence between Sir Charles Tupper while High Commissioner and the Government, relating to his visit to this country, to his resignation of the office of High Commissioner, to his re-appointment, if he has been re-appointed, and relating to his acceptance, for the present, of an office in the Administration.

He said : I do not propose to enter into any discussion of this motion. I delayed making it two or three times, expecting the Minister of Finance would be in his place, but perhaps the hon. gentleman would be able to give some information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The papers will be brought down at once.

Motion agreed to.

ENQUIRY AGAINST A. LABERGE.

Mr. Fiset moved for :

Copies of all papers connected with the enquiry held in 1885 by J. L. Anctil, Deputy Inspector of Post Offices, in the matter of A. Laberge, Postmaster at Ste. Luce Station, on a complaint made by Mr. Jean Baptiste Caron, respecting a letter containing money, addressed to Mr. Luc Vaillancourt, of L'Islet ; together with all letters, documents, &c., furnished to Mr. J. L. Anctil by J. B. Caron, in support of his claim.

Mr. CASEY.

(Translation.) He said : Before the motion is agreed to, I believe the House will need a few explanations. In 1885, J. Baptiste Caron, junior, of the Parish of St. Luce, sent to Mr. Vaillancourt, cartwright, of L'Islet, a money letter, containing \$52, of which there were two twenty-dollar bills, one ten dollar bill and a two-dollar bill. Seeing that his receipt was a long time coming, Mr. Caron went to the post office at Ste. Luce ; it was a few days after the mailing of his letter. Mr. Laberge told him that he would soon get his receipt, and, in fact two days after Mr. Caron had his receipt, but, as the receipt appeared rather peculiar to him, he was not satisfied, and seven or eight days after he sent one of his friend to see Mr. Vaillancourt. It was nineteen days since Mr. Caron had sent the letter, and Mr. Vaillancourt had not yet received the money. Hon. gentlemen will please observe, that in the meantime Mr. Caron had had a receipt from Mr. Vaillancourt, although Mr. Vaillancourt had not yet received the money. It was evidently a forged receipt. The money letter reached Mr. Vaillancourt at the same time as Mr. Caron's friend, and, instead of containing two twenty-dollar bills, one ten-dollar bill, and a two dollar bill, it contained five dollars bills. Into these facts, Mr. Caron asked Mr. Sheppard for an enquiry, which was granted. Mr. Sheppard sent Mr. Anctil on the ground to make this enquiry. Witnesses were summoned, and proved the facts which I have just stated, that the money letter was opened, was delayed for nineteen days, and a forged receipt was sent to Mr. Caron when Mr. Vaillancourt had not received the money. However, this enquiry did not result in anything, Mr. Laberge has continued to be Postmaster of Ste. Luce station, and I believe he still holds that office. Mr. Caron, seeing that he had not obtained justice, on the 17th of December, 1885, wrote the following letter to Mr. Sheppard.

" W. G. SHEPPARD, Esq ,

" Post Office Inspector,

" Quebec.

" SIR,—The papers which I have remitted to Mr. Anctil, with regard to a complaint I made in your office, being useful to me, please be so kind as to return them to me, because I see that this affair did not deserve your attention ; and oblige,

" Your obedient servant,

" JEAN BTE. CARON, JUN."

Such is the charge made before the Post Office Inspector, Mr. Sheppard, and, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to remark at once that I do not wish in any way to attack the memory of the late lamented Mr. Sheppard, nor do I wish to attack Mr. Anctil. I will gladly believe that these gentlemen have done their duty, but, at all events, here is a serious neglect which deserves some few explanations from the hon. Postmaster General. This is not the only complaint which has been made against Mr. Laberge. Here are a certain number for which no enquiry has been asked, for the simple reason that justice had not been obtained in the enquiry held in 1885. You will please to remark, Mr. Speaker, that I would not say what I am about to say had I not within my hands written documents to prove these facts. Ubalde Bouchard mailed at St. Luce Station, a letter containing \$45 and addressed to Mr. Rioux of St. Arsene. That money never reached its destination. As Bouchard could neither read nor write, and as he was convinced that the money had reached its address, he thought no more about it. It was only several months after, that Mr. Rioux meeting Mr. Bouchard, spoke to him about his money. Bouchard was quite astonished to find that Mr. Rioux had not yet received the \$45 which he had sent to him. He called on Laberge, the postmaster, who admitted that he had not sent the money. But that is not all. Mr. Bouchard writes a letter to Mr. Rioux, in which he sends him \$5 as interest on the \$45, and as Mr. Rioux knows that Bouchard is perfectly responsible, the moment he pays him the interest on his money, he is satisfied. Well, this letter which I have

here, is a forged letter, and advisedly sent to Mr. Rioux. I cannot say whether it was sent by Mr. Laberge and signed with the name of Ubalde Bouchard. It is only several months after, nine or ten months after, that this new fraud is detected. Has Mr. Laberge made any arrangements with Mr. Bouchard? It is quite probable, but at all events this fact explains to you, Mr. Speaker, how it is that although this letter had been opened the postmaster has continued to be employed as such. That is not all, Mr. Eustache Desrosiers who has been lumbering for Mr. Price goes to Metis to get his pay, which was to be sent to him according to the promise of his employer. It will be remarked that it is pretty hard for a poor workingman to be obliged to travel twelve or fifteen leagues to go after his pay. He goes to Metis, he sees Mr. Blair, the agent of Mr. Price, and Mr. Blair tells him that the money has been sent several days before. Well, says Mr. Desrosiers, I have not received it. Go back to the post office says Mr. Blair and enquire again. Desrosiers goes to the postmaster and tells him that Mr. Blair has sent him his money and that he has not received it. The post master says: Wait two days more and you will get it, and in fact, two days after he received his money. But that is not all yet. Messrs. Paul Côté and Ubalde Bouchard, the same Bouchard already mentioned, had each of them mailed a letter at that post office, last spring (1886.) The letters were addressed to a Mr. Telfer, sewing machine agent, at River du Loup. They took a certificate of post office registration and two months later Mr. Telfer went to their houses and demanded the payment of the machines he had sold them, saying that he had not received the money. They went to the post office and it was agreed that the letters would be forwarded the next day, after two months' delay. It appears they were forwarded. Perhaps there was no theft in this case, but why such a delay in sending money letters? It is not all yet. Pierre Roy's case is about the same. He sent money, \$14, to Mr. Hébert, of Metapedia, for cattle bought from this gentleman. After waiting about a fortnight, as he had not received his cattle, he wrote to his man, and this time he took the trouble to go and mail his letter somewhere else. The answer came immediately: How could I send you your cattle? I have received no money from you. In the parish of Ste. Luce no more registered letters are mailed in the post office of Ste. Luce Station. Then Mr. Pierre Roy goes to see the postmaster, Mr. Laberge, and this gentleman tells him that he had forgotten to send the money, but would send it soon. Well, here are some direct charges. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, and do not the House think with me, that it is high time that such breaches of trust should cease? Not only have money letters been opened, not only have other letters been delayed very long, but there are forgeries which are perfectly established. Still this man was retained in his office from 1885 to 1887, and I do not know whether he is still in office or not. Without wishing to cast any blame on either the Post Office Inspector or the Postmaster General, in the name of decency, in justice for the public of Ste. Luce, or in justice for the representative of this county, I think that a serious enquiry, not a delusive enquiry such as the enquiry already held, should be instituted, so that justice may be done to everybody.

Motion agreed to.

STATION OF ST. IGNACE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for :

Statement showing the names of parties who tendered for the building of a station on the Intercolonial Railway in the parish of Cap St. Ignace, county of Montmagny, with the amount of their several tenders; and copies of all papers, plans, documents, correspondence, &c., in relation to tenders called for in connection with the building of the said station.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, this motion cannot be granted for the following reason: The Minister of Railways says that in fact tenders have been received, but these tenders have not been accepted, and as he is about to enquire into this matter, if he has not already done so, it would not be fair towards the persons who tendered in the first place to make their tenders known, because it would inform intending tenderers of the price which they could expect to demand. Therefore, the hon. member will please withdraw his motion and not insist on having these papers brought down.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Have the tenders been advertised for or will they be shortly called for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The tenders which are to be called for are public tenders in the ordinary form.

Motion withdrawn.

DISMISSAL OF NAPOLÉON GIASSON.

Mr. DOYON moved for :

Copies of all correspondence in the possession of the Department of Indian Affairs respecting the dismissal of Mr. Napoléon Giasson from his position as measurer of stone, at Caughnawaga, in the county of Laprairie.

(Translation.) He said: Mr. Speaker, in putting the question I have put yesterday, and in making this motion, my only purpose is to ascertain the degree of justice with which public employés are treated during election times. Mr. Napoléon Giasson was measurer of stone at Caughnawaga. The hon. Premier, in answer to the question put by me yesterday with regard to the cause of his dismissal, answered that he was dismissed because he had been intoxicated, had acted in a disorderly manner at a county meeting and had even insulted one of the candidates. The hon. Premier did not tell me that it was the electors who complained of Mr. Giasson having acted in a disorderly manner, nor has he told me which of the two candidates had complained. I hope this honorable House has already understood that I am not the man who complained of the behavior of Mr. Giasson at the public meeting of Laprairie. More than that, the hon. Premier added that a constable was obliged to eject him from the meeting. Unfortunately, for the sake of truth, it must be said that there were no constables there, or at any rate, if there was one, he was not *sui compos* enough to arrest others, which can be proved in proper time and place and I think it will be done shortly. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand that the candidates to an election were by the fact itself under the shield of the Government, but I could understand that a member should have the benefit of the protection of the Government. During my election, and since, I also have had to put up with slanders and unfairness on the part of certain public officers, and had I then known the good heartedness of the Government, I myself would have come and deposited a tear in the handkerchief of the hon. Minister. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would extend to me the same fatherly feeling, and I hope that if I should lay before the House those slanders which are constantly repeated against me by certain Government officials, at times when they are sober and at other times when they are in the same state as that described by the hon. Premier as being that of Mr. Giasson, I hope that the Government will make it their duty to protect me and to withdraw their favors from these employés. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier did not say that Mr. Giasson had not done his duty; he did not say that he was not competent to discharge the duties assigned to him. He simply said that he had absented himself from his work; and it must be known that on the 15th of February last, not only the public officers but everybody else was absent from his work. It was a duty, since the law makes it a duty for every citizen

to vote, and if it was a duty for civil servants to vote as well as for the rest of mankind, it was also a duty for them to go to the nomination in order to hear the discussion on the politics of the country, in order to be posted on such matters and to be able to give a judicious vote. I must also remark to this House, that according to the testimony of the contractors themselves, by whom Mr. Giasson was employed, he was very well qualified, and, even more than that, he had a retentive memory, and they often consulted him about matters of the past, and he would always put them on the right track. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, persecution has become a regular system. One must worship the Government's golden calf or perish. It is sad to relate, but it is true. Will the hon. Minister, say that they were guided by public interest in this affair? Will they say that they have acted in the interest of public morality? Will they say that their purpose has been to teach electoral franchise, the new system to the Indians and half breeds? No; it is in order that every civil servant may understand in the future that he must vote for the Government or lose his situation. That is the long and short of it. Just as though the money received by these employés, came out of the pockets of the hon. Ministers. But it is very well understood in the country that the salaries paid to civil servants come out of the pockets of the people, of the pocket-books of the people, and that everybody should be treated with equal justice. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will shortly put before the House a few very edifying facts with regard to certain Government employés. To-day, I will confine myself to humbly praying the Government to be pleased to give back to Mr. Giasson the position which was taken away from him, and by so doing they will give justice to a man who performed his duty. My only motive for making this demand, is to obtain justice for a man who has always done his duty in a satisfactory manner. Before concluding I must remark that there are in the reporters' gallery, certain insects which ought to be treated with *rough on rats* because that is the best vermin exterminator. Some reporters do not care about telling the truth, but they care a great deal about serving their party, as may be seen by the *Daily Citizen* of the 11th of May and *La Minerve* of the same date. Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House, I thank you for your attention.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) My hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) has chosen a very bad time and a very bad subject for his maiden speech in this House. When I say a very bad subject I have no intention to defame the man he has dealt with and whom he knows to be somewhat characterised as being a bad subject. But launching into parliamentary eloquence to defend a man and defending him as this man has been defended by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), amounts to very little short of losing one's time. The hon. member has not dared to say that the charges brought against this man who was dismissed from the service of the Government were false. They are well founded; and the speech of my hon. friend can be boiled down to two points, one of which is not correct while the other is false. My hon. friend has enlarged upon popular rights; he has stated that these rights apply as well to civil servants as to others, and that these civil servants have exactly the same right to speak and to act during elections as the ordinary electors. My hon. friend must know that this is a doctrine which is not supported by any of the leaders of the two political parties which are dividing the country. A few years ago the hon. leader of the Government which preceded the present Administration has laid down in this House the rule which applies to civil servants, and a fair and just rule it is, I think. The rule is this: No Government, the present Government no

Mr. DORON.

more than the previous Government, have any intention of depriving civil servants of their right to vote. And therefore, my hon. friend was right when he said that it was a public duty to go and vote. But he was wrong when he said that it was a duty for them to attend public meetings on nomination day. This is his false point. Perhaps my hon. friend forgets what the statute says on that point, or, perhaps, he does not know why the statute was passed, which did away with nominations where people were required to manifest their opinions by raising their hands. Under the old law, public nominations were an obligation; it was one of the stages of the election. They were abolished, and why? Because these meetings were unfortunately too often the occasion of such scenes as that in which so disgraceful a part was played by the man who is the object of the motion which is now made by my hon. friend. The day of political nomination with calling of the names and raising of the hands has been abolished, the sale of liquor was prohibited and the closing of bar rooms was ordered in order to avoid riotous meetings when the electors are called upon to perform their electoral duties. Therefore my hon. friend is wrong when he says that Mr. Giasson, a civil servant, was not only justifiable, but that it was a public duty for him to go to the public meeting to inform himself. His *protégé*, besides, does not appear to have gone there to inform himself, if we are to judge by the acts which are charged against him and which are not denied. He took his education elsewhere than in the statutes and he does not seem to have acted as an elector nor as a spectator at that meeting where he had no business to go. I said a moment ago that the leader of the Government which preceded the present Administration had expounded before the House a proposition which, I think, is the rule that ought to govern civil servants during elections. They are not deprived of their right to vote; they have a right to cast their votes. If they are asked their opinion, they have a right to give their opinion. But it ought to be forbidden to a civil servant, or to an employé of this House, to openly and actively take part in electoral contests. This is a fair proposition, which ought to be admitted by everybody. If we wish that our electoral and parliamentary institutions should work fairly, the Government cannot have in their public offices men whom they might have under circumstances when the violence of a debate must necessarily create a want of confidence and a malevolent feeling between the employé and his employer. Such is the reason why the employés of this House are blameable and run the risk of being dismissed if they actively and openly take part in politics. Likewise, I think there is a perfect reason and justification on the part of the Government to dismiss a civil servant who publicly and actively takes part in an election against the Government who employ him. My hon. friend says that the money given to civil servants does not come out of the pockets of the Ministers, but comes out of the pockets of the people. It is well enough to say that on a husting, but it is not quite proper in a parliamentary meeting. But I will perfectly excuse my hon. friend, who is quite fresh from the hustings, for having laid down that proposition. There is no harm in that besides, but it was useless to say so, everybody knows it. However, if the money received by an employé does not come out of the pockets of the Ministers, his duty and public justice ought to hinder him from actively and publicly canvassing during elections against the Government which gives him his living. Therefore, my hon. friend will be satisfied, I am sure—for I know his high sense of justice—when the correspondence for which he has moved, will be brought down, and when he shall see that the employé who was dismissed is an employé whose conduct has been such as to deserve suspension and dismissal from service, just as the dismissal took place.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) I have only one word to answer. The hon. Secretary of State has just said that the Government was perfectly justifiable to dismiss any civil servant who publicly meddles with politics.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) No; who canvasses against the Government who employs him.

Mr. DOYON. Oh! If he works for the Government it is all right. You have perfectly stated that. Have you not?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perfectly.

Mr. DOYON. In my county, on the platform and elsewhere, the principles of justice are recognised, but it seems that here they must be ignored; because really if you were to put all the civil servants on an equal footing, in the county of Laprairie, and elsewhere, you would be obliged to supersede a good number who have publicly and openly meddled with politics during election time; but, of course they did not canvass in my favor and it is very fortunate for them according to the principle which you have just expounded. It is a rickety sort of justice, allow me to say it.

Motion agreed to.

VACCINATION OF INDIANS ON FILE HILL RESERVE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Copies of appointment, vouchers, papers and correspondence, showing appointment of Dr. Dodd, of Regina, to visit File Hill Reserve for the purpose of vaccinating Indians, the length of time he was employed upon said service, and the amount of money he received for the same.

He said: I have information which leads me to suppose that the service might have been much more economically performed than it was in the way chosen by Lieutenant Governor Dewdney. It is said that he employed Dr. Dodd at a salary of \$20 a day, to visit the File Hill Reserve to vaccinate Indians. His residence was sixty miles from the reserve, and equally competent men could have been secured at Qu'Appelle, which is within a short distance of the reserve, at a much smaller charge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps I may give the hon. gentleman informat on which will do away with the necessity of pressing his motion. This medical man, Dr. Dodd, vaccinated 1,417 of the Indians of File Hills, between October 16th and December 8th, 1885, at broken periods; he was paid \$560 for vaccinating these 1,417 Indians, being about 24 cents per head, the usual charge everywhere else being 50 cents per head.

Mr. CHARLTON. That information, I presume, will cover all the points which are called for in my motion, and, as we will have it in *Hansard*, I will consider that sufficient.

Motion withdrawn.

MEDICAL ATTENDANT AT THE QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Vouchers, papers and correspondence showing the appointment of James Collings, M.D., as medical attendant of the Indian children at the Industrial School for Indian children at Qu'Appelle, under the care of Rev. Father Huguonard, the length of such service as medical attendant, and the amount received for the same; also the date of appointment of M. M. Seymour, M.D., as medical attendant of the Indian children in said school, the length of time during which he has served as medical attendant for the children of said school, and the date and amount of payment received for such service.

He said: I am informed that Dr. Collings received for this service the sum of about \$15 for fourteen months' service as medical attendant, and his successor has received something like \$450 during July and September, 1886, and further sums. If so large a discrepancy exists, it is perhaps worth

while enquiring why it is, and it is for this reason that I move for the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The memorandum sent me by the Department is this:

"Dr. Collings appears to have only made two visits to a patient at the school in October, 1885, for which he was paid \$43. Dr. Seymour was appointed on July 15th, 1886, at \$50 per month. He is still employed."

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps in this case the papers had better be brought down, because the fact that Dr. Collings performed the duty for fourteen months for \$15 would hardly be a warrant for allowing his successor to be appointed at \$50 a month. While I am on my feet I might ask whether the vaccine supplied by Dr. Dodd took in the case of those Indians on the File Hill Reserve, whether the vaccination was successful?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, I do not know that. Motion agreed to.

ANNAPOLIS FORT.

Mr. JONES moved for:

Return of correspondence between the Department of Militia and all persons at Annapolis or elsewhere applying for the purchase of military lands at Annapolis, with valuation placed on such lands by applicants.

He said: I move for this information because I have been informed that there has been some correspondence between the Department and various parties in that neighborhood who were desirous of obtaining the old Government property at Annapolis, and that representations have been made respecting the value of the property very much below its real value. I only refer to the information which has been conveyed to me. Apart from the idea of the value of this property, it appears to me that it would be almost a regrettable circumstance if the Government, for so small a sum of money, were to part with, or sell, or otherwise alienate a place of such historical value as the lands at the Fort of Annapolis Royal. They are connected with the early history of our country, and I hope the Government would be rather disposed to hold on to them and improve them to a certain extent than to dispose of them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no objection whatever to the papers being brought down and the whole of the correspondence being laid on the Table. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be very much to be regretted indeed if an old fort like the Annapolis Fort, an historical fort like that, should be disposed of at any price, such as the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. JONES. Hear, hear—or at any price.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In Canada we have a good many of these old historical landmarks, which, I believe, as much as possible, should be kept as a part and parcel of our history; and I, for one, should very much regret to see the old Annapolis Fort transferred, except for such reasons as really would make up for the loss we would incur as a people in allowing these old landmarks to disappear.

Motion agreed to.

FISHING ON LAKE ERIE.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Correspondence between Department of Marine and Fisheries and holders of fishing licenses on the shore of Lake Erie in reference to claims for rebate of license fee or other relief to such license holders in consideration of injury to their fishing appliances by storm in the autumn of 1886.

He said: This motion concerns largely some of my own constituents and those of other hon. members representing

counties on the north shore of Lake Erie. Gentlemen from Ontario will be aware—I do not know whether it was general or not—that we had two very unusually severe storms last autumn, one, I think, about the middle of October and the other in the beginning of November, coming from a south-western direction, so that the whole of our north shore was exposed to the violence of the waves. I know, as a matter of fact, that in my own riding, and I believe in other ridings, nearly all the fishing appliances used on that north shore are destroyed. By fishing appliances I mean pound nets, and apparatus for that purpose. Scows laid up on the shore, sails, &c., all were destroyed. I know one fisherman in my own riding who had all his capital invested in this business, and who was utterly ruined, I may say, inasmuch as it is almost impossible for him to go on with his business. I think there is a very good reason for asking the Government to make some rebate, or to grant some bounty to those fishermen on account of the almost total destruction that came upon their appliances during those storms. It has always been the policy of the Government to foster the fishing industry in the eastern part of our Dominion, and a good policy it is too; but, I believe, that the same policy should be applied as well to our inland waters. These inshore fisheries are a source of very considerable wealth to the country, and draw considerable trade from the United States, and I think the Government would be acting in the interest of the country and dealing generously with these fishermen, in returning the licenses, or giving them such other consideration as they think will meet the case. I think a number of those fishermen have applied, either directly or through the fishing inspectors, asking for some relief of this kind. I wish to have this correspondence in order that the House may be more fully informed about the matter than I can inform them in a few brief remarks. I take this opportunity of pressing these claims as strongly as possible upon the Government. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his place, but I hope some of his colleagues will remind him that the matter has been brought up. This is not a matter concerning one neighborhood alone, but one which concerns a very considerable extent of country. I may mention the counties of Essex, Kent, Flgin, North Norfolk, Haldimand, Monck and Welland, which are all more or less interested in this matter, and I believe the members from those counties would sustain the Government in granting a consideration to the fishermen.

Motion agreed to.

SHIPMENTS OVER THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ELLIS moved for:

A return showing the quantity of grain of any kind in bushels carried over the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup to Halifax during the period July 1st, 1885, to March 31st, 1887, with the net amount of money received for freight thereon, and passed to the credit of the same railway.

He said: There has been a great deal of complaint in the eastern part of the Dominion with regard to railway freight rates. The complaint is that freight from the west is carried at a much less rate per bushel, per ton, or per car, than freight is allowed to come from the east. The rates from the east are much higher than the rates from the west. The hon. Minister says in his report that the railway has been operated during the past year at a loss of \$104,000. Now, there is a presumption that the loss is largely due to the fact that articles like grain are carried at a much less rate than they ought to be carried. I may also say, while on this subject, that there is a good deal of complaint with regard to the coal rate. It is complained that the rate at which coal is carried is not fair, inasmuch as a higher rate is charged for a shorter distance than for a long distance.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to the motion. I do not know whether I can give it in bushels, but if I can, I will; I will give the hon. gentleman the quantity of grain carried, in some way, but the argument used by my hon. friend is not a very sound one. If we are going to carry grain, we have got to carry it at such a price as we can get it to carry. We are competing with other lines, and if we cannot carry it as cheaply as other lines, we cannot get it. But if we get more return freight going east, it does no injury. As long as freights going west are carried at fair prices, if we carry this in our empty cars that carry freight down to the east at a very low rate, as we must do if we carry it at all, I say it does not injure the freight going the other way, it does not increase the rate. For instance, we have carried coal at a rate that does not pay, but we are developing the resources of the country by doing so. The whole of the lower Provinces are pressing the Government to do so. It is exactly the same with the wheat that is carried from the west to be shipped at Halifax; we either carry at a rate that we can get it to carry, or it goes by some other route.

Mr. ELLIS. If the hon. gentleman's argument is good, it ought to work both ways. The very same rule should apply to freight coming west from the east, as to freight going east, and if trade is to be developed, it should be developed by a fair application of the rates all round.

Mr. JONES. I think the explanation given by the Minister of Railways, while it may apply in the way in which he made it apply to that one branch of the subject, would not cover the whole ground of complaint. I have taken the ground before now that the Intercolonial Railway is a public work and one which we never expected to be remunerative, and, therefore, it should be placed somewhat in the same position as the canals which are intended to increase and benefit the commerce of the country. The inward rates over the Intercolonial Railway from abroad to western Canada are very much less than they are for local industries along the line, or for those larger industries in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, such as our cotton mills and our sugar refineries. I can say, from my own experience, that while goods from England for Montreal come at a very low rate, a *pro rata* rate on the steamer's freight, sugar and cotton, and those goods, sugar notably, for Montreal and Toronto, pay a much larger proportionate rate than do the through goods from England. Consequently, I think the Minister's attention might be properly directed to that subject. In connection with that matter, I may say that whenever it has been found that the canal rates have been too high, or that they require to be lowered so as to place Montreal in as fair a position in that respect as New York, the Government have reduced the rate; and I do not complain of their doing so. There may be circumstances which render it proper for the Government to take action and not allow the trade to go to a foreign port, when, by a slight reduction on the charges made by our own public works, it may be diverted to our own channels; and in that way I think also the rates over the Intercolonial Railway should, as far as possible, be reduced on all local industries such as those to which I have referred. I hope this subject will receive the attention of the Minister. That hon. gentleman may say, and say very properly, that the rates over the Intercolonial for those articles are as low or lower than the rates over any other private road. But that is no answer. It will be found, if the hon. gentleman will look into the subject, that the rates obtained for grain for export are very much lower (I am not finding fault with him) than would be charged over any private road for the same distance; and, therefore, I say that our local industries, which are of a much greater importance to this country than the small amount of exported grain which goes by way of Halifax, should be considered as favorably

as the other branch of this subject. I hope the hon. gentleman will look at the subject in that light.

Mr. POPE. It is an undoubted fact that sugar and iron shipped from Liverpool to Montreal would not come in any quantity whatever over the Intercolonial except for the *pro rata* charges we have arranged, and that is the reason why they are carried at a cheaper rate than are goods manufactured in the Lower Provinces. With respect to the statement made that the road does not pay, I may say that I have endeavored to increase the freight rates, and, if I remember rightly, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) protested again that proposition. I tried to equalise the rates, thinking that such a policy would develop the iron business in the Lower Provinces. It was, however, so strongly objected to, and in fact it worked in such way that the iron and sugar for the west came through a foreign port, and it was abandoned. So we are obliged, as we are often obliged in railway matters, to accept very low rates in order to secure this trade. There would never be a bushel of wheat shipped from Halifax except for the reduced rates. In operating the Intercolonial Railway we find that we are very liable to carry empty cars going east, and if we can only obtain a low rate for the freight carried in that direction, it is better than moving the cars empty, in fact, the road actually makes money if we get any traffic going eastward. That is the ground I take in this matter. I never expect the Intercolonial Railway to pay one copper of interest, but I do think it ought to pay running expenses, and that the rates should be adjusted with this object.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman has referred to rates on iron. I think he will remember that he proposed to raise the local rates on iron, but he saw that that would be unfair to the furnaces along the line, and that it would take effect along the line, and that it would have the effect of sending all the freight by way of Portland. I think both the hon. gentleman and his party recognise that fact.

Mr. KENNY. I do not understand that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) found any fault with the Minister of Railways for the low rate at which grain was carried. With respect to the Minister's remark about the Intercolonial never paying, I would remind him we should never have had a national existence without the Intercolonial, and the great mission of that road is to foster and encourage intercolonial commerce, and we do not expect the Government to derive any revenue from it. As regards the rates for which the Intercolonial is obliged to carry imports to points like Montreal during the winter and to western Ontario during the summer, I may say that the Intercolonial is obliged to carry that merchandise at low rates because it is competing with the routes *via* New York and Boston; and it is in the interest of Canada that the Intercolonial should carry those goods even at those low competitive rates, because the labor in connection with handling these goods and running the road is Canadian labor instead of American labor; and it is in the public interest that the rates on grain going east should be low, and the rates on through goods must necessarily be low. My colleague has referred to the rate charged on sugar. If the Minister would consider that that is an all-the-year-round rate, that the road is carrying that sugar not only during the winter months when the operating of the road is more expensive than during the summer but all the year round, I think he would find that the sugar rate was a very remunerative rate. I was sorry to hear him find fault with the rates on coal, because it is encouraging a large industry from which the whole Dominion derives great advantage, and I hold that the Intercolonial rates on through goods must necessarily be low, and lower than the rates on merchandise from local industries in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I desire to point out to the Minister of Railways an important matter which appears to have been overlooked by the Department. We should all like to see the Intercolonial pay, but there is one matter in respect of which great advantage might be conferred, and that is in regard to the carrying of flour. The arrangement made for Halifax, and it has been in force for some time, is this: the man who will bring in 2,000 barrels of flour per month will be entitled to a rebate of 10 cents per barrel on the freight; if 1,500 barrels per month, to a rebate of 7½ cents per barrel; if 1,000 barrels per month, to a rebate of 5 cents per barrel; but if only two or three cars per month, to only 2½ cents per barrel. Now, the consequence of that is, that every man cannot bring in so large a quantity as 2,000 barrels, and those who bring in small quantities cannot afford to sell as cheaply as those who bring in large shipments. The result is that the smaller dealers have to get their flour by way of Boston, and the Intercolonial Railway and the Government of Canada lose the freight upon that flour. I think this regulation should be stopped, and that there should be a uniform rate of so much per barrel upon flour and other freight, so that the man bringing in a small quantity would get the same rate as the man bringing in a larger quantity. I may mention as an instance that last fall the rate from Chatham to Halifax was 50 cents per barrel, but the man bringing in 2,000 barrels got a rebate of 10 cents per barrel, so that his rate was really only 40 cents, while the man bringing in two or three cars per month had to pay 47½ cents, so that he could not compete with those who received the larger shipments. The result of this is that there are thousands of barrels going from Ontario, *via* Boston and New York, to Halifax and St. John, that should go over the Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial Railway. To Charlottetown alone the firm of which I am a member sends 10,000 or 12,000 barrels every year, and every barrel of it goes *via* Boston or New York, and the freight which should go over the Intercolonial Railway is lost to that road. With that road running through the country, and with the various lines of steamers which connect with it, why should they not establish such a rate as would cause this freight to be sent to Prince Edward Island, and all over New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. It is a lamentable fact that, with the facilities which we have for carrying this flour, there is a line of steamers running regularly from Boston every Saturday for Halifax and Prince Edward Island, and those steamers are laden with flour and other freight which should go over the Intercolonial Railway. I think this is an important matter, not only in the interest of the Province of Nova Scotia, but in the interests of the whole Dominion; and now that the attention of the Government has been called to the matter, I trust that such steps will be taken as will lead to the development and increase of this traffic over the transcontinental line.

Motion agreed to.

ARREARS DUE CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved for:

Return showing the amount of arrears now due to the Chippewa Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior on the surrender of lands made by them under the Robinson Treaty, and all correspondence between the Indian Department of the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government of Ontario, relative to the same, since the 3rd day of May last.

He said: In 1879 this matter was brought to the attention of the Government and a return was then moved for. A return was also moved for last year, and yet the matter still remains in the same position. There is a large amount of money due by somebody to these Indians who surrendered their lands under the provisions of the Robinson Treaty, and I would like to ask the Superintendent

General whether any progress has been made towards obtaining a settlement of these arrears. Whoever may be in fault, it is a hard case that these Indians, whose means are not very large, whose revenue under the Robinson Treaty is not very large—it is hard upon them that, through the failure of either the old Province of Canada or of the Province of Ontario, or of the Indian Department, or through the failure of whomsoever it may be, they should from year to year be kept out of the arrears which all Governments have admitted to be due them. The claim was admitted by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); it has been admitted ever since; indeed, it has never been disputed, but so far the arrears have not been paid. Perhaps the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs can give us some information on the point—he can inform us, at any rate, whether any further correspondence has taken place. Of course, if nothing further has transpired since the return was last moved for, there would be no object in my making the motion; but I wish to call the attention of the Government to the case, and ask them if it is in their power to cause this matter to be settled, so that these men may get the arrears which everybody admits to be due to them, and of which, for many years, they have been deprived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to this motion, especially as, I think, a letter or two has passed between the Dominion Government and that of Ontario since the last papers were brought down. It is certainly a hard case. These Indians have a right to the money due them under the Robinson Treaty. The difficulty is that the obligation rests on the old Province of Canada, and the accounts between the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario still remain unsettled. The hardship of the case was admitted by the Mackenzie Government, and although the matter belonged altogether to the two Provinces and not to the Dominion, that Government—and I think properly—made an advance, in consequence of the hardship suffered by the Indians, with the understanding and the expectation that it would be recouped by the two Provinces. From circumstances beyond the control of the Dominion Government, these two Governments have never yet settled their accounts; no payment could be got from either of them, and the poor Indians are suffering in consequence of that state of affairs. Again and again we hear that the Finance Ministers of the two Provinces are to meet and settle the accounts finally, but no settlement has been arrived at. What is to be done I scarcely know. We cannot compel the two Provinces to settle their accounts, and, unless the Dominion Government should apply to Parliament for a grant of money, to be paid to those Indians and to be kept out of the subsidies of both Provinces, until they have a settlement, I see no other way of settling with the Indians. In the meantime the papers will be brought down.

Mr. DAWSON. This is a matter which has been brought up in the House from year to year, and it is one which affects a large number of Indians in my constituency. The First Minister has suggested what I think would be the best way of settling the matter, that is, that an appropriation should be asked for from Parliament, that the Indians be paid and the amount charged to whichever of the two Governments is found to be liable for it. There is a very large amount due to these Indians who in the meantime are suffering. If the plan suggested by the right hon. gentleman were adopted, and the money paid over to the Indian Department for the benefit of the Indians, a great deal of good might be done in the way of establishing schools, aiding them in their farming operations and in a great many other ways. In many parts of the district I represent, the Indians are suffering considerably, not alone from withholding from them the

Mr. O'BRIEN.

amount which as my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said is justly due them, but owing to the advance of settlement. But there are other ways in which they suffer not from the fault of the Government perhaps, but from the advance of civilisation. The Indians are changing their habits, and in the change they are suffering. There is one thing to which I wish to call particular attention. In the Robinson Treaty it was stipulated that the Indians should have the right of hunting and fishing in the territory they had relinquished. The wording of the Treaty is as follows:—

“And the said William Benjamin Robinson, of the first part, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government of this Province, hereby promises and agrees to make the payments as before mentioned, and further, to allow the said chiefs and their tribes, with full and free privilege, to hunt over the territory now ceded by them, and to fish in the waters thereof, as they have heretofore been in the habit of doing.”

Here a stipulation is made to allow the Indians to fish in the waters where they have been accustomed to fish, and everybody knows that, when the wild animals of the chase disappear, fishing is the chief support of the Indians. When the white people come about them, all they have to subsist upon is the fish they can take. While we make this stipulation in their favor, we at the same time give people licenses to set pound nets, with which they scoop up the fish so that few are left for the Indians. This is the case in many parts of Algoma. For instance, the mouth of Garden River is so filled with pound nets that the fish cannot get up that river, and they are in consequence often in a state of starvation. Notwithstanding that the fish are disappearing, and the Indians suffering, there are other ways in which they are improving, from the improved management of Indian affairs, from the fact that liquor is being kept from them, and from the progress they are making in a great many places in agriculture. On the Island of Manitoulin there are 2,000 Indians who are now in a position to export wheat. If they continue to progress in this respect they will very soon be independent of the fisheries, but until that time comes I think they should be protected. It would be highly desirable if these large amounts which have been so long due to them could be placed somewhere where they could get the benefit of them. A certain portion ought, at least, to be available for establishing schools and obtaining agricultural implements.

Motion agreed to.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. JONES. I see it stated in the press that the Government have decided not to send any more cruisers out for the protection of the fisheries pending arrangements in contemplation. I would ask the First Minister, also, if the Government have received any further information in the nature of a reply to Lord Salisbury's proposal to the American Government, and whether that will be brought down as soon as it is received.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will repeat his question to-morrow, perhaps I can give him a fuller answer. I am not at all aware of any decision not to send out cruisers, nor am I aware of any answer having been received to Lord Salisbury's proposal. Of course it may have reached His Excellency without having yet reached us. Any papers that may be received will be brought down, if it is in the public interest to bring them down, and I suppose it is.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no Private Bills on the paper that we can do much with to-night, and it will be for the House to say whether they desire to go into any of the Public Bills and Orders. If not, we might adjourn now.

Mr. EDGAR. There are Public Bills and Orders ready to be gone on with. There is that relating to the Dominion Elections Act, which I am afraid, if postponed, may not be reached.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let that stand. I dare say there will be a Government measure on that subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Government propose to introduce a Bill to amend the Election Law?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said, perhaps. It is under consideration whether we shall not bring down a Bill on that subject during the present Session. If not, the hon. gentleman can press the Bill. I will undertake to give him an opportunity to do so.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing names of all candidates at the promotion examination held at Ottawa, beginning on 1st March, past; names of all who passed such examinations, copies of all examination papers submitted to such candidates; also statement showing whether any, and if so, which of such candidates were examined at such examinations later than the said 1st of March, and what questions were submitted to such candidate or candidates?—(Mr. Oasey.)

Return showing the names and addresses of all parties engaged, whether on the permanent staff of Civil Servants or otherwise, from the 1st of January, A.D. 1886, to the 1st of May, 1887; the kind of work performed, the amount of wages paid per annum, per month, or per day. Also, the names and addresses of all parties that have performed work for or under the direction of any Department, and the remuneration or salary paid.—(Mr. McMullen.)

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company, and to change the name thereof.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Sir Donald A. Smith.)

Bill (No. 81) to confirm and amend the charter of incorporation of the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Grandbois.)

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. GIROUARD moved:

That John R. Dunn, the returning officer charged with the writ of election for the electoral district of Queen's County, N.B., be ordered to attend at the Bar of this House without delay to answer for his conduct in returning as elected the candidate who had not the majority of votes cast at such election, as recommended by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) asked, In what counties, or section of counties in Nova Scotia will the officers of the Geological Survey Department survey during the coming summer? Is it the intention of that Department to make any special examination of the gold-bearing districts of western Nova Scotia?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In the counties of Nova Scotia, Pictou, Halifax, Guysboro', it is not proposed to make any special examination of the gold-bearing districts this year. I think the hon. gentleman has already had a letter from the directors, explaining the reasons.

BARRINGTON HARBOR, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) asked, Have tenders been asked for the construction of a new lightship to be placed at Barrington harbor, Shelburne County, Nova Scotia? If so, how many tenders were received by the Department? Has any contract been awarded; if so, to whom and for what price? What provision does the Department propose to make for supplying that station until a new lightship is completed?

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders were invited in February last for the supply of a suitable vessel for a lightship at Barrington, N. S., and nineteen tenders were received. No tender has yet been accepted or contract awarded. Instructions have been given to Mr. J. R. Kenny, keeper of the lightship, to have such repairs made to the old vessel as will render her sufficiently seaworthy for the summer months, and to have her placed at her station.

BOILERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BUILDING.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What length of time has elapsed since the boilers in the engine-room adjacent to the House of Commons have been inspected? What condition were they found to be in? What pressure of steam is allowed? How many years have the boilers been in use?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The mechanical engineer of my Department has supplied me with this answer: The boilers were inspected last month (April); they were found in good condition; there was 50 lb. of steam on locomotive-shaped boilers, and 35 lb. of steam on Cornish boilers. The locomotive-shaped boilers have been in use since January, 1875, and the Cornish boilers have been in use since 1865.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR FOR QUEBEC.

Mr. GUAY asked, Has the Government appointed a Post Office Inspector for the district of Quebec? If they have done so, who has been appointed? If they have not done so, who has filled this office since the death of Mr. Sheppard? and what has been his salary?

Mr. McLELAN. No appointment has been made. The duty has been performed by the Inspector at Three Rivers. The salary is \$2,000.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY—FREE ADMISSION OF MATERIAL INTO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that the United States Government has refused to permit Canadian contractors engaged in the construction of the Short Line Railway, through the State of Maine, to take with them from Canada free of duty, the plant, machinery, &c., used in the fulfilment of their contracts? Has the Government taken any action in reference to the matter; and if so, what action?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, I may state that we have no such information.

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY ACTS.

Mr. WATSON. As, at the request of the Government, my resolution was allowed to stand over, I would ask if they would place it as the First Order for next Tuesday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow it to be the First Order for Wednesday next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would hardly do, because on Wednesday we terminate notices of motion at six, and we may have a long debate on this, so that it would be inexpedient to fix it for that day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the hon. gentleman's courtesy in giving way in this matter, I suppose we must do what he wants, so we will say Tuesday and make it the First Order of the day.

Ordered, that Mr. Watson's motion be the First Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In rising to move that you leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee of Ways and Means, and taking advantage of this opportunity to make a statement to the House, I wish to say in the outset that, recognising as I do the great ability of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the manner in which he was enabled to discharge the duties of the position I now occupy when he was Finance Minister during the period that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and recognising as we all do, the great ability of the gentlemen who, on this side of the House, have served in the same position under the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, I must ask for the considerate indulgence of the House on this, the first, occasion that it has become my duty to occupy that position. I do not propose on the present occasion, to go over the ground that has been so fully occupied by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have preceded me. It will be recollected that, under a comparatively low tariff, Canada enjoyed a very marked degree of prosperity during the first seven years of Confederation, but it must not be forgotten that during that period the industries of Canada enjoyed a great protection which arose from the dislocation of the labor market in the great Republic to the south of us, and which placed us in a very different position to that which at a very early period afterwards we occupied. When that change came, and when the languishing industries of Canada impressed the Finance Minister of that day; when, instead of large surpluses, large deficits succeeded year after year, the Opposition of that day urged upon that hon. gentleman that he should reconsider the position and that he should endeavor to give increased protection to the industries of Canada which would prevent them from thus languishing and from being destroyed. We were not successful, I will not say in leading the hon. gentleman himself to the conclusion that that would be a sound policy, for I have some reason to believe that he had many and strong misgivings on that question, but, at all events, we were not able to change the policy of the gentlemen who then ruled the destinies of Canada. As is well known, that became the great issue at the subsequent general election of 1878, and the Conservative party, being returned to power, pledged to foster and promote the industries of Canada as far as they were able, brought down a policy through the hands of my honored predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, whose absence from this House I am sure gentlemen on both sides all deplore; and I have no hesitation in saying that the success of that policy thus propounded and matured from time to time, has been such as to command the support and confidence of a large portion of the people of this country down to the present day. As I have said before, with ample material under my hand to show by contrast the great advantage that resulted from the adoption of that policy, I do not propose to take that course on the present occasion. The elaborate statements made by Sir Leonard Tilley, and the exhaustive statements made by my hon. friend who occupied the position of Min-

Mr. WATSON.

ister of Finance a year ago, I think, render it entirely unnecessary that we should occupy the time of the House in going over the same ground. But I must be permitted to draw the attention of the House for a single moment to the change that has taken place in the opinions of the great political economists of the day on this question, as an abstract question of political economy. No person who has carefully watched the progress of public events and public opinion, can fail to know that a very great and marked change has taken place in all countries, I may say, in relation to this question. In the United States of America they hold, with the strongest tenacity they, perhaps, have ever held, to the principle of protection. In England, where it was a heresy to intimate anything of that kind a few years ago, even at the period to which I am referring, a great and marked change in public opinion has taken place. Professor Sidgwick, a learned Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in that great university, and the gentleman who read, at the great meeting of the British Association in 1886, a paper on political economy, has published a work in which opinions, that would have been denounced as utterly fallacious and heretical at that time, have been boldly propounded as the soundest and truest principles of political economy. But, Sir, I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House in recounting, as I could, the numberless evidences that we have of a change of public sentiment on that subject. The committee appointed by the Imperial Parliament to consider the question of the depression of trade, has, of course, adhered to the general line of the free trade policy that has so long prevailed in that great country; but it is equally worthy of note that statesmen of the first rank, that men occupying high and commanding positions in public affairs in England, have as unhesitatingly committed themselves, in the minority report, to the strongest opinion in favor of what is termed fair trade, or fair protection to British industry. I am precluded, however, I am happy to say, from the necessity of going into this question as a question of political economy, or of reasoning it out in the abstract, for another and a very important reason. Since the last Session of this Parliament, as is well known, the hon. gentleman who, with such distinguished ability, leads Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House, has, in the presence of the great electorate of Canada, announced his entire conversion to the principle that we have so long maintained from this side of the House. The re-election of that hon. gentleman to the position of leader of that great party in this House and in this country, is viewed with uniform satisfaction on this side of the House for two reasons: first, because of the hon. gentleman's eminent qualifications for that distinguished post; secondly, because we regard his re-election to that high position as an affirmation by hon. gentlemen opposite that at last the time has come when this country may congratulate itself upon the fact that the great capitalists of Canada who are interested in developing the resources of the country can put their capital into these great Canadian industries without any fear of disturbance arising from a change of Administration. Under these circumstances I feel it would be wasting the time of the House, and perhaps more than wasting the time of the House, for me to do more than express the gratification I feel that the time has come when we are all at one upon this great and important question, and when the only issue can be how best to carry out and how best to make the principle successful that has commended itself so entirely to the satisfaction of the great body of the people of this country. Now, Sir, I will pass at once to a brief notice of the financial position that Canada occupies at present.

With regard to the receipts and expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1886, it will be found that the late Finance Minister, in his speech delivered in this House

on the 30th March, last year, estimated that the total receipts on account of Consolidated Fund would amount to \$33,550,000. The Public Accounts, which have been duly distributed to the hon. members of the House, show that the actual amount received was \$33,177,040.39, showing that the late Finance Minister's estimates were almost literally verified. As a matter of fact, his calculation of the Customs yield was realised within \$150,000, but the main difference arose from the receipts from Excise, which did not come up to expectations. It must be realised, however, that all through that year Canada suffered particularly from other causes, in addition to the ordinary depression of trade felt all over the world. I may remark just here that although it was the bad fortune of hon. gentlemen opposite to be in power at a time when a very marked and serious depression in trade existed, not only in Canada, but in all other countries, there has been, recently, an equal depression of trade in Great Britain, in the United States and in most other countries of the world. Canada has suffered more or less from that depression; but the fact that she has withstood that period of depression and emerged from it as she has done, is the best evidence of the wisdom of the policy that the Government had adopted and the people had endorsed. Now, Sir, in the early part of the year the effects of the rebellion in the North-West were severely felt, and altogether an unanticipated calamity took place that produced a very sensible effect upon the trade and business of the country, and paralysed business in a very marked degree, as such an event undoubtedly would, shutting off, as it necessarily did, immigration and preventing capital from coming into the country, and preventing people coming to settle here to a greater extent than would otherwise have been the case. In addition to that, Sir, we had the great commercial centre of this country, the great city of Montreal, suffering under an unusual and unexpected calamity from the very extensive outbreak of small-pox, which placed that great commercial centre in comparative quarantine for many months, producing, of course, most disastrous effects on the trade of the Dominion. On the other hand, the late Finance Minister estimated the total expenditure at \$38,126,287.61. This was increased in the actual amount expended to \$39,011,612.26. The difference may be said to be made up by the charges for suppression of the rebellion in the North-West, which were estimated at \$2,300,000, whereas the actual expenditure on this head was \$3,177,220.50, and in addition there was an increased charge on account of Mounted Police of \$1,029,369.20, as against an estimate of \$332,241.66. These expenditures were unavoidable and had to be met, and, unfortunately for the Dominion, the deficit of last year was the consequence. It may be argued that this expenditure in connection with the North-West rebellion, not being of an ordinary character, should be regarded as a capital expenditure, and it is proposed to adopt this course with sums paid in the current fiscal year to complete these services, and also with payments to be made to sufferers by the rebellion. Coming now to the outcome for the current year it will be found that the late Finance Minister, in his statement made to Parliament at its last Session, estimated that the revenue from all sources would amount to \$34,500,000. Probably in making this estimate he took into consideration the depression under which Canada was suffering in common with all parts of the world, and made an estimate accordingly. However, from the returns up to date, which have been laid before the House, it will be seen that the amount expected was under-estimated; that Canada has in fact emerged from her depression, and that, instead of a revenue of \$34,500,000, it is believed that the year's income will in round numbers amount to \$35,300,000. It may be interesting to state in connection with this point that the columns of the *Statist* of the 5th February last, in reviewing

the financial and commercial history of England for 1886, contain the following:—

"There is some cause for satisfaction at the general course of business throughout the year. People in business have shaken off their long languor and depression, have found at last that things have touched bottom, and have been more disposed to go ahead. There are many circumstances not altogether reassuring, and some trades, it would seem, have hardly participated in the general improvement; but on the whole, merchants are more cheerful, and an impetus has been given to trade which cannot but last a good while, unless some untoward event should happen."

Hon. gentlemen, I dare say, are aware that a very distinguished statistician, Mr. Giffin, is responsible for that statement. To notice the details of the estimate made above, it is expected that Customs will yield \$22,000,000; in Excise it was estimated that the yield would be \$7,000,000, but whether much of this yield was anticipated in the previous year, or whether the habits of the people are becoming more and more temperate, it is not thought by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department that the income from this source will be more than \$6,000,000. The miscellaneous items will be about as estimated, viz., \$7,300,000, making a total of \$35,300,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are now speaking of the present year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. Turning to the expenditure side of the statement we find that the whole sum expended to the 30th April last, as shown by the returns submitted to this House, has been \$25,935,548.30 from which as has been mentioned before, it is proposed to deduct and charge to capital \$210,085.52 miscellaneous charges in connection with the North-West rebellion. The further charges on the Consolidated Fund services will probably be:—To complete interest payments \$4,500,000; sinking funds, \$600,000; and for miscellaneous services of all kinds and descriptions, \$4,760,000. It is probable, therefore, that the expenditure may be about \$35,600,000, leaving an apparent deficit at the end of the year of \$300,000, and I have no doubt it will be found when the year has expired, if the revenue comes up to the expectations formed, that this estimate will be about correct. I think, in view of the position in which we unfortunately found ourselves a year ago, it will be a matter of sincere congratulation to this House, as I am sure it will be to the people of this country, to know that we will close this year under existing circumstances with a deficit of no more than \$300,000—practically one account balancing the other, because that is so small an amount the slightest change will affect it one way or the other. I now come to the probable outcome for the year 1887-88, on which we must leave the ground upon which we have stood up to the present time of having tangible data as a basis and deal to a considerable extent with what we regard as probabilities. As to the probabilities for the year commencing 1st July next, which are purely a matter of estimate, the Government believe that if the present state of trade continues, and they see no reason from present appearances of any diminution, and taking into account the changes in the tariff, the revenue from Customs will amount in round numbers to \$22,500,000. I am informed by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue that after close calculation the result next year from Excise will be a revenue of \$6,400,000, of which, in round numbers, spirits will yield \$3,500,000; tobacco, \$1,600,000; cigars, \$710,000; and malt and malt liquors, \$100,000, the balance being made up of receipts from licenses and from miscellaneous sources. From miscellaneous revenues, including post office, railways, interest on investments and all other incomes, it is safe to assume that the amount realised will probably be \$7,500,000, making in all an estimated revenue during 1887-88 of \$36,400,000. Hon. members have before them the estimate of the expenditure likely to be made for the several services of the year 1887-88, and unless the hon. the Minister

of Public Works should require further grants to complete services under his control, or to satisfy the requirements of the country, it is not likely that the Supplementary Estimates, to be brought down, will add largely to the sums therein shown to Parliament. Under these circumstances, the surplus that is shown by the comparison of the amount of revenue, which I have just estimated at \$36,400,000, will give a very fair surplus for the coming year 1887-88, unless, as I have said, the Minister of Public Works should prove too strong for us, and obtain a larger amount than I hope he will find it necessary to ask. It is usual to enter into details explanatory of the variations in the several estimates of expenditure, and for the information of the House this plan will now be followed. Taking the capital expenditure during the year, it will be seen on examination of the Estimates, that as regards redemption of public debt a sum of over \$870,000 will be required to take up bonds issued by the Province of New Brunswick prior to Confederation, which bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent. and which mature during the coming fiscal year. It will be found that so far from that being a cause of regret, it will be a source of advantage to the Government, because they will be enabled to reduce the charge for interest on those bonds from 6 per cent. to a much lower rate than we are obliged to pay. With regard to the expenditure under the charge of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, it will be noticed that, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, Parliament is only asked to vote \$180,000 to cover expenditure in British Columbia, against an authorised expenditure during the current year of \$922,000. For the Intercolonial Railway there is an increase of expenditure required of about \$260,000; for construction account this House will be asked to vote less than last year, but in consequence of the estimated large increase in the traffic over the line, new rolling stock will have to be purchased to the extent of \$318,000. As will be seen on reference to the Estimates, Parliament will be asked to vote the sum of \$800,000 for the construction of the Cape Breton Railway, against an authorised expenditure for the current year of \$500,000. Coming next to the question of canals, an increase has been asked of about \$330,000. While the older canals require less money to complete the necessary works at present under construction, a new vote is asked for \$1,000,000 towards the construction of a canal at Sault Ste. Marie; and I may say that, so far as can be judged from the information in our possession, I believe that sum will be found entirely adequate for the construction and completion of that work. The amounts chargeable to capital, under the control of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, will be reduced in consequence of the completion of the Esquimalt graving dock. The sum asked for the Public Building, Wellington street, is \$200,000, against \$110,000 for this year; for the construction of Port Arthur harbor and for Kaministiquia River, \$90,000, against \$70,000; and a revote will be required for Cape Tormentine harbor of \$100,000. The hon. the Minister of the Interior will require an extra sum of \$45,000 on capital account to provide for the payments for surveys, &c., in connection with Dominion Lands. Turning now to the several items of Consolidated Fund expenditure, and taking first, interest of public debt, it will be found that an increased amount of \$380,000 is asked for. In round numbers this sum will be about what is required for interest on deposits received and to be received from the savings banks. The sinking funds require an addition of about \$60,000, which, in fact, is the natural increase owing to the investment of the interest of the funds now held, and which is offset by the addition of that amount to the interest on investments. For Charges of Management there will be a small decrease, chiefly made up by the abolition of certain offices, the maintenance of which the requirements of the Dominion no longer demand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

In civil government the increased charge is \$39,875, the major portion of which is made up of increases to the Department of the Interior and to the Post Office Department. These will be fully explained when the separate votes are under consideration; but it may be mentioned here that the services under these Departments are continually growing with the growth of the country, and cannot be kept at stationary figures as in the case of the other Departments. In Administration of Justice the total increase is \$18,100, made up of new services, as follows:—Maintenance of Prince Albert jail, \$5,000; new junior judge, County Court of Ontario, at \$2,000; five judges of Superior Court, North-West Territories, \$20,000, instead of \$12,000 as previously required, and the salaries of five sheriffs, at \$500 each. In Penitentiaries, the service having been thoroughly overhauled by my hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Justice, there will be found a saving of \$3,356; and it is believed that when the scale of salaries which the House has been asked to sanction, is put into force, the service will be put on a better footing, and in the end a saving will be effected of some thousands of dollars. In Legislation there is an increase of \$102,375, almost the whole of which is to meet expenditure in connection with the Franchise Act, which it is estimated will require during the coming year \$200,000 against a vote of \$100,000 asked last year. In Arts, Agriculture and Statistics the increase asked for is \$82,333.33. Hon. members, on looking at the estimate for this service, will find that the sum of \$60,000 voted last year in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition is dropped out, and similarly is omitted the \$15,000 to cover the expenses of the census of Manitoba, no further sum being required for those purposes. On the other hand, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture will require to set in operation and maintain the experimental farms, which it is expected will be in full working order during the coming year. For this service the sum of \$90,000 is asked, as against \$30,000 in the previous year. Parliament will also be asked to vote, and that it will do so most cheerfully I have no doubt, £20,000 sterling as the contribution of Canada towards the Memorial of the Jubilee of Her Majesty's reign, viz., the Imperial Institute of the United Kingdom, the Colonies and India. I wish to say just here a few words in passing with reference to both those subjects, the great Colonial and Indian Exhibition and the proposed Imperial Institute. It would be impossible for me to find any language in which I could adequately do justice to the deep interest, the unwearied assiduity and the unflinching support given to the Colonial and Indian Exhibition by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It is well known that the proposal to have a great Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London during the past year originated with His Royal Highness, and that he threw himself into that work with all the ardour and assiduity that the most enthusiastic colonist could exhibit or desire. That exhibition was purely a Colonial and Indian Exhibition. No British exhibitor could find place in it for any British product whatever. The entire exhibition was confined to the display of the products of India and the Colonies, and when it is remembered that noblemen, private gentlemen and capitalists in England, subscribed no less than £150,000 sterling, as a guarantee for an exhibition in which no British exhibitor could exhibit anything belonging to the United Kingdom, the best possible evidence, I think, is afforded of the deep and abiding interest that is felt in England in regard to the Colonies and India. I need not speak of the success of that exhibition, because the Minister of Agriculture, under whom I had the honor of serving, has already laid on the Table of this House, a report which I made in regard to it, and in which will be found clearly and succinctly stated everything connected with the exhibition, which I thought would be of interest to the House. I may say, however, that out of the success of this great ex-

hibition grew the proposal on the part of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, for the establishment of a permanent Indian and Colonial Institute. But I must not pass away from the question of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition without, in the first place, tendering my hearty thanks to my old colleagues, who gave such a warm and enthusiastic support to that measure, to the Parliament of Canada who sustained them in giving that support, and I also wish to tender my equally heartfelt and sincere thanks to the Governments of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia for the zealous and hearty manner in which they co-operated with me and with the general Government in making that exhibition as thoroughly successful as it proved to be. And I feel it especially due to the Hon. Mr. Mowat, to the Hon. Mr. Fielding and the Hon. Mr. Blair, as gentlemen representing Governments which were not supposed to be exactly in harmony with the general Government, to say that I received from them and their colleagues just as hearty and enthusiastic support as I did in any other part of the country. I desire also to express my cordial thanks to the people of Canada—to the exhibitors, without whose hearty co-operation, and the zeal and assiduity with which they threw themselves into the work, that great exhibition could not have been attended with the beneficial and lasting results to Canada that I believe will attend it. In many cases they had a direct interest in doing so, because they had reason to believe that their exhibits would have the result of extending their trade and developing the industries in which they were engaged. But in many other cases, when no such hope existed, there was the patriotic desire, thoroughly exhibited and heartily carried out, of making this exhibition, irrespective of the expense involved to the exhibitors, all that the most enthusiastic Canadian could desire that it should be. I say that I believe that lasting beneficial results will accrue to Canada from that exhibition. It was found that we were enabled to take a high position, not only in the estimation of England, but I may say in the estimation of the world; for that exhibition was visited by hundreds of thousands of people, not only from the continent of Europe, but from the great Australian colonies and all the outlying portions of the Empire; and an impression has been produced that has tended to elevate Canada in the eyes of the world to a position that this country has never before occupied. The best evidence of that fact is that the *London Times*, which we do not always consider the most enthusiastic journal in regard to the interests of Canada, but which some of us have been inclined to believe has been more pro-Australian than pro-Canadian, covered a whole broadside of its issue with a minute and admirable account of the Canadian Court; and it has afterwards filled its columns again and again with statements showing the greatly advanced position Canada has attained. I say the best evidence is afforded by the attitude of that paper and other leading British journals, of the great advance Canada has made in connection with that exhibition. We had, of course, the additional advantage of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has attracted the attention of the people of England and the people of all countries to the position we occupy to an extent that has also produced the most widespread and valuable influence upon our best interests. I am able here, Sir, to ask for a reduction of \$50,000 a year in the vote for the immigration service. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration feels that, in consequence of the great advantage that Canada has secured in connection with that exhibition and in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the efforts made by that company to disseminate information in regard to Canada, in which they are, of course, deeply interested all over the world, it is not necessary to ask for so large a sum,

and we have reason to believe that the reduced amount will be productive of greater results, in connection with the influences to which I have referred, than would the larger amount. But, Sir, I want to say a single word in reference to the Colonial and Indian Institute. As is, I dare say, known to many hon. members of this House, I felt it my duty to visit this country in connection with that subject, when it was being actively pressed by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and the parties interested in it. I visited this country for the purpose of obtaining support and co-operation for that undertaking, and I must thank my old colleagues for the manner in which they responded to that application, by the pledge to ask Parliament to vote £20,000 sterling towards that Institute as a memorial of the Queen's Jubilee. It was found that Her Majesty preferred that the memorial to celebrate her reign should take the form of a Colonial and Indian Institute rather than any other form; and under these circumstances it was believed that no difficulty would be found in raising an adequate sum of money to permanently endow that institution, and to retain to India and the Colonies in the Institute the benefits which to some extent they enjoyed in connection with the exhibition then being held. And here I must repeat my thanks to all the Local Governments which I visited for the hearty manner in which they co-operated in the undertaking. They were satisfied that great benefits had accrued to Canada from the exhibition, and they were prepared to give the heartiest support to the proposal for a Colonial Institute. The proposal, as propounded by His Royal Highness, was, as you are aware, that it should be purely a Colonial and Indian Institute. That idea has been somewhat extended and enlarged. It was found that the commercial classes of England, the city men and others, felt that it was necessary in founding a memorial to Her Majesty in the form of an Institute, that the United Kingdom should be embraced as well as the colonies. I am not quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that we were not ourselves somewhat responsible for that change. I am afraid that our exhibition was a little too good. I am afraid the effect produced on the minds of a great many of the commercial and manufacturing classes in England was that Canada was becoming a rather dangerous competitor, and it was rather desirable that we should not have the field left entirely to ourselves. But, at all events, from whatever cause it arose, the result was that the commission appointed by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to revise the proposal as originally made, composed of the leading men of all classes and parties in England, decided that it was necessary that the United Kingdom should be embraced, and that it should be an Imperial Institute of the United Kingdom, the Colonies, and India; and here I propose to take the House into my confidence on a subject in which some little interest has been manifested. I was in communication, as I shall point out at a later period, with the Government in regard to a proposed treaty with Spain; and having received a letter from the Finance Minister on that subject, as well as a communication from my right hon. friend who leads the Government, in regard to the proposed Imperial and Colonial Institute, I felt that it was desirable that we should have personal communication on both of these questions. Under those circumstances I cabled to my right hon. friend to say that if he approved of it, I would take a run out to Canada so as to have an opportunity of discussing those two questions fully with him and his colleagues before proceeding any further. I received promptly his approval of my visiting Canada; and when I landed in New York I learned for the first time that a general election was to take place in this country. I not only learned it for the first time, but I will say with all frankness to the House that I was surprised at that information. I had previously learned the result of the Local elections that had just been held in the Province

of Ontario; and while down to that period I thought it not unlikely that there might be an appeal to the people this season, after those elections I felt it unlikely that any appeal would be made until after this Session of Parliament. I mention that in order to show that this important question was receiving my attention. Well, unhappily for myself, I may say, I visited this country; and after I arrived here my right hon. friend laid an embargo upon me, and I was obliged to leave all those enjoyments and pleasures which have been so much descanted upon in this House and elsewhere; I was obliged to leave my comfortable residence in London and go into the campaign without that health or strength that I required for such a service. I may say that, notwithstanding the changed position of this question, so far as the colonial interest is concerned, I have no doubt every member of this House will be only too glad to vote the sum of £20,000 sterling as our contribution to the Imperial Institute for the United Kingdom, the Colonies and India. Not only in consequence of the interest that we naturally feel in an institution of that kind, and which, I hope, will receive the hearty support of all classes of the people in this colony and in all the other colonies, but because we feel that if there is a portion of Her Majesty's dominions that has a right to be thankful for the blessings which have attended Her beneficent reign during the past fifty years, it is the people and Parliament of Canada. So far, it may be said that all the estimates I have touched indicate increases, but I will just say here that I have naturally perused, as I suppose the hon. gentleman opposite used to peruse, the comments of the press, when he laid his estimates on the Table. I perused them with some interest, in the hope not only of finding something interesting but instructive; but while I have often found a disposition to criticise on the ground of extravagance, I have failed to see in a single instance any suggestion on the part of any portion of the press criticising these estimates, as to where the estimates as brought down could be reduced without injuring the best interests of the country. I can only say I shall be grateful to any of my hon. friends opposite or on this side who will point out any instance in which we may safely and judiciously pare down these Estimates without interfering with that progress and development of the country which every person knows lies at the very foundation of Canadian prosperity.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you pare them down if I make the suggestion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly. It is one of the privileges our Constitution gives to members of this House, that they may propose reductions in the Estimates; but, wisely and fortunately for us, they are not permitted to propose increases, or if I rightly recollect and know anything of my hon. friend, I am afraid he would propose an increase rather than a decrease.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am afraid it would not be acceded to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Coming now to the estimate for Immigration, it will be found that there is a decrease of \$50,000, as we believe the time has come when this saving can be effected without detriment to the public interest, and without at all interfering with what is the great object of the Immigration Department and the Government, namely, to limit the immigration brought to this country to agriculturists, to farm laborers, domestic servants, and capitalists who have the means of entering upon the possession of land and its cultivation. In Quarantine, the same estimate is asked as was voted the previous year. Taking next the service Pensions and Superannuation, the amount required is estimated at \$13,000 in advance of the provisions made in the previous fiscal year, and this increase is chiefly due to the new item for pen-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

sions to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers, and Police Scouts in connection with the rebellion of 1885. I was not here when the discussion on that subject took place, but I have no doubt that the House arrived at the wise decision that the services of these parties were entitled to recognition on the part of the House, in the same way as recognition has been given to the forces sent out specially to that country, for the purpose of suppressing the insurrection. An increase of \$57,000 is asked for Militia, of which \$47,000 is required for the batteries and the cavalry and infantry schools. A sum of \$10,000, a new vote, is asked for a barracks in British Columbia, which the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, when the House goes into Committee of Supply, will explain fully. The House will now come to a series of estimates in connection with services in which it is proposed to effect a saving. And I hope I shall not meet with any opposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in carrying out those intentions. There is first, Railways and Canals chargeable to income, where a saving is proposed of \$23,000, which is more than accounted for by the completion of the road system and bridge accommodation of the Lachine Canal. In the voluminous services under the control of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, it is proposed to effect a general saving, and it is hoped that as the works under that Department are now gradually arriving at completion, there may be a permanent saving under this head. One new item, however, for \$80,000, is introduced for buildings and fencing, in connection with the Experimental Farm. The House wisely, I think, although I had not the pleasure of taking part in that discussion, arrived at the conclusion that the great farming interest of the country, that most vital and important interest, was entitled to the expenditure of a certain amount in connection with experimental farms, and I have no doubt that, wisely and judiciously administered, this expenditure will be a source of great profit, not only to the older portions of the Dominion, but especially to the new portions now being opened up for settlement. The decrease in the amount asked for Mail Subsidies and steamship subventions, arises from two items, the discontinuance of the votes for subsidies for steam services between the ports in the Gut of Canso, and between New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Great Britain. It is but right to state under this head that tenders have been invited for steam service between Canada and the West Indies, and it may be that a vote will also have to be submitted to Parliament in this connection. With regard to Ocean and River Service there is an increase of \$81,550, of which maintenance and repairs of Government steamers require \$19,750, whilst the expenses in connection with the Canadian registration of shipping, including printing, require the balance of \$1,800. In Lighthouse and Coast Service, the net increase is \$3,500 on a service requiring over \$570,000. The increase is in the salaries and allowances of lighthouse keepers, and is spread all over the Dominion; and I am quite certain no one will recognise more than the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the wonderful economy which has been exhibited in that service, and I should not be surprised to hear from that hon. gentleman a complaint against any proposal to reduce the expenditure. It is right, however, to note that the Cape Race light, which was recently transferred to the Dominion by the Imperial Government, is responsible for \$1,000 of this increase. It has been found practicable to reduce the requirement for Signal Service by \$1,500. There has been added to the grant for Meteorological Observatories \$5,000, of which full details are given in the Estimates, the increased cost of telegraphing, and the incidental expenses in connection with this service necessitating the increase. It is not proposed to ask for any additional amount on account of Marine Hospitals or Steamboat Inspection. The esti-

mates for Fisheries show a decrease of \$23,500, caused chiefly by a reduction of the amount to provide for the cost, maintenance and repairs of the Government protection steamers, as it is thought that the appropriation can be safely reduced to this extent. After revision it has been found that the requirements for the Geological Survey can be reduced by \$1,700. For Indian Affairs an increase, all told, is asked of \$2,619, and it is believed by the officers of that Department that the amount asked this year will not require to be supplemented. There is a decrease of \$16,500 in North-West Mounted Police, notwithstanding that the force has been reorganised and placed on a proper footing. This decrease is caused by the reduction of the amount for repairs, renewals, replacement of horses, &c. In Miscellaneous it will be found that there is an increase of \$100,000, entirely made up of the cost of plant required for the Government printing office and bindery, and this being a first cost will not be a permanent charge.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$100,000, and that is expected to cover the entire service. Not only the entire service, but, as before stated, it is practically a capital charge, although not placed to capital account. It is a charge for the service, which, once provided, will not require to be repeated. Coming to Collection of Revenues, under the head of Customs, it will be seen that the hon. the Minister of Customs for the service under his control requires an increase of \$28,300, full details of which are given in the Estimates, and further explanation will be given by my hon. friend when the vote is being discussed in committee. I may say in passing, if there is an hon. Minister to whom the House is always disposed to give anything he asks, it is my economical friend who administers the Customs Department, and who is much more eager to get money out of other people's pockets than he is to expend any belonging to the public. Suffice it to say, however, that more than half of the increase is at the port of Montreal. In Excise the increase asked for is about \$14,000, being made up of increases of salary to the outside officers of that branch; increase for the preventive service; and an additional amount to enable the Department to purchase wood-naphtha and similar articles, for issue to bonded manufacturers, a charge which is, of course, more a matter of account than anything else, because the bonded manufacturers are bound to refund the money. In Weights and Measures there is an increase of \$3,750, for salaries, rent and fuel, &c. Railways and Canals chargeable to Collection of Revenue require an additional amount of \$235,837, of which repairs and working expenses of railways take \$224,600, caused mainly by the additional sums asked for locomotive power and car expenses and maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway. I may say in reference to that, that the House ought always to receive with great satisfaction a proposal to charge to capital account any sum for the Intercolonial Railway, and for this reason, that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is never able to ask a single dollar to be charged to capital account for that service except for the purpose of providing additional rolling stock to meet new and increased business. The larger the sum, therefore, that my hon. friend is able to show to the House that he is entitled to receive as chargeable to capital for the Intercolonial Railway, is the strongest and clearest evidence of the progress and development of the country and of the freight which is being carried over the Intercolonial Railway; because that is the only ground upon which he can ask that a dollar should be put to capital account. My hon. friend tells me, and the House will be glad to hear it, that the business on the Intercolonial Railway, the freight carried over it, has doubled since 1876, and I could give this House no better evidence of the remarkable and

steady progress the country is making than the statement contained in those words. There is also included in this amount the charge for maintenance of the Eastern Extension Railway, and for car expenses, Prince Edward Island Railway. The small increase outside of railways, under this service, is due to an increase in the amount asked for repairs and working expenses of canals. Public Works chargeable to Collection of Revenue, will require a decreased sum of \$26,000, caused by a reduction of the amount for telegraph lines in British Columbia by \$28,000. Under the head of Post Office, a total increase of \$45,864 is asked, and taking into consideration the great increase in the business of that Department which is constantly taking place, the additional amount asked from Parliament is comparatively small. Those who will take the trouble to read the statement of the late Minister of Finance, as to the development of the Post Office up to a year ago, and will observe the enormous increase in the number of letters sent, in the mileage which is constantly taking place in that Department, will find in it a complete justification for this increase, and the best possible evidence of the steady progress and development that our country is making. There only now remains an increase of \$16,872 to be noticed in Dominion Lands chargeable to Collection of Revenue, and this is made up of a variety of causes, which will be explained by the hon. the Minister of the Interior when the House is in committee. As a good deal of discussion has taken place in this House, and especially out of this House, on the extent of the public debt, I intend to offer to the House a few statements in regard to that very important question. I propose to present to the House certain statistics in regard to the debt of the Dominion, and the expenditure since Confederation for capital charges. On the first of this month the gross debt of the Dominion stood at \$270,072,855.27, and the net debt, \$225,105,961.08, being a decrease of net debt in the month of April of \$759,870.01. I may say, at once, that I would take off both the gross debt and the net debt, for all practical purposes, \$10,000,000, and that because it is represented by a thoroughly good and available asset, in the shape of the lands obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in payment of \$10,000,000 of their debt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to find that that statement meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I knew it would meet with their approval, because, when I am able to congratulate myself and the Government and the country on the fact that we had been enabled to make an investment of \$10,000,000 in the purchase of lands at \$1.50 an acre, which these gentlemen estimated a few years ago at \$3, \$4 and \$5 an acre, the House will see that I am not only justified in striking off \$10,000,000 from our debt, but also in congratulating the country on making a very excellent bargain. There is this great advantage also, that one of the most formidable charges made against the contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and a charge which I always felt had a great deal of force in it—perhaps I felt it even more strongly upon that occasion than I expressed to the House—was the fact that that contract handed over twenty-five million acres of the domain of Canada—a great country of itself—to a single company. Therefore, we not only had the good fortune, by making this arrangement, to obtain this land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, reducing the principal objection which I think could be brought against that contract in regard to the large monopoly of land in the hands of one company, but we obtained it on terms which I am sure will result at no distant day in replacing all that money and more in the Treasury of Canada. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not receive \$1.50 an acre for the land.

It cost the Government \$1.50 an acre nominally to obtain it, but it must not be forgotten that a part of the arrangement was, in regard to the payment by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of \$20,000,000 in cash, that the Government could not call upon them to pay for five years; and that it was at the time of this unfortunate insurrection in the North-West, as my hon. friends opposite will fully recognise, very undesirable to go back to the English market and ask for a loan of \$20,000,000 only one year after we had been to that market, very undesirable that we should go to that market under such very disadvantageous circumstances, with a falling revenue and an insurrection in the North-West, circumstances that were likely to be made use of by all parties who were interested in depreciating the securities of Canada. Not only was that the case, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in order to secure the purchase of their lands by the Government at \$1.50 an acre, had to provide that \$20,000,000 in cash. How did they do it? They had to do it, Sir, by substituting 5 per cent. bonds for the payment of a debt of \$20,000,000 on which they were only obliged to pay 4 per cent. for five years. The Government were, under the arrangement, only entitled to 4 per cent., but to raise the money to pay this debt the Canadian Pacific Railway had to float their bonds, and they were floated at a small discount on the 5 per cent. bonds, so that at least, at the very best calculation, they lost a million dollars in interest in order to make a sale of the lands, and they reduced the amount received by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company per acre for their lands to \$1.35, which was all, therefore, that they received. I mention that in passing, merely. But, Sir, I have not taken that into account here; it is, to a certain extent, an aside. I may explain to the House that this increase which accounts for more than the total increase of the debt last year, is more than accounted for by that purchase of lands which we hold at \$1.50, which were estimated a very short time ago by hon. gentlemen opposite to be worth \$3 or \$4, or \$5 an acre, and I should be extremely glad if, at no distant day, their highest estimate were realised. Well, Sir, at Confederation the net debt, by the Public Accounts, was \$75,728,641.37, which deducted from the present net debt shows an increase since 1867 of \$149,377,319.71. Let us now examine how this large sum has been expended; because I need not say to the House, that everything depends upon what there is to show for the debt. Suppose that it represented war, as the great increase of the debt of England represents; suppose it represented war, as the great increase of the debt of the great Republic to the south of us represents—we would then have serious cause to be alarmed, we would have serious cause for regret, at finding so large an increase in the net debt of the country. But, Sir, if, instead of representing war, instead of representing that which would deteriorate and injure the country, it represents valuable public works, works that are not only constructed for the purpose, but are calculated rapidly to develop the country, to increase its progress and prosperity, and to make an abundant indirect return to the revenue of the country for the expenditure, then, I think, you will all agree with me that there is no cause for alarm, no cause for anxiety. Now, let us examine that. I find that since Confederation to the 1st of July last, increased grants have been allowed to Provinces to the extent of \$30,743,392.69. Now, Sir, that will not become a question of controversy here, for the good and sufficient reason that it was the policy sustained by an overwhelming majority of the members of both sides, of the most independent and intelligent men of this House, as a sound and wise policy. Therefore, no exception will be taken to that, but we may fairly deduct that from the increased net indebtedness, because it was not an expenditure, it was a transfer from the Provinces to the Dominion. Dominion Lands chargeable to capital, to the same date, \$2,566,689.36; and, Sir, no person would be

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

found at the present day who will question that sum as a wise and judicious expenditure. Eastern Extension Railway, \$1,286,551.63; the Intercolonial, \$1,224,348.15; the Canals, \$32,132,280.73; the Miscellaneous Public Works, in which are included the Public and Departmental buildings Ottawa, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, the land and cable telegraph lines, and the harbors at Cape Tormentine and Port Arthur, \$2,947,723.65; the North-West Territories, cost and organisation, \$2,920,000; the Pacific Railway, \$60,864,430.61, to which should be added the amount of debt cancelled by return of lands, \$10,189,521.33, or, in all for the Pacific Railway, \$71,053,951.94; the Prince Edward Island Railway, \$212,288.27, and the Short Line Railway, \$184,801.83. In addition it may be mentioned that various railways have received subsidies in accordance with the several Acts passed by the Dominion Parliament, to the extent of \$3,312,494. All these charges as so far shown, are to the close of the last fiscal year; since that date and to the first of the present month further sums have been paid for the before mentioned services to the extent of \$4,706,062.46. The aggregate of the several sums just mentioned, to the 1st May, is \$183,292,584.76, and the net debt to the same period showed an increase since Confederation, as before stated, of \$149,377,319.71, from which it will be seen that in addition to making due provision for all ordinary expenditure, in addition to building custom houses, post offices and other public buildings throughout the Dominion, in addition to providing for an efficient lighthouse system, Canada has paid for the several capital charges since Confederation the large sum of \$33,915,265.05 beyond the increase in the net debt. Or, if we take these figures in another way and exclude from the increase of the net debt \$149,377,319.71, the several allowances to the Provinces \$30,743,392.69, and taking the balance \$118,633,927.02 as for public works only, it will be found that for the three large services before mentioned namely, the Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the canals, the cost has been \$134,412,580.82, or \$15,778,653.80 more than the whole net debt exclusive of the allowances to the Provinces. So, Sir, I think, in view of the statements I have made to the House, hon. gentlemen opposite will be relieved, and every person who has reflected upon this matter will be relieved from the apprehension that the Government of Canada are recklessly plunging the country into indebtedness for anything of an unjustifiable nature, that for all our net debt, there are large and most valuable public works, works of such value and of such importance to the country, that I am quite sure that my hon. friend opposite—if he has a recollection of the speech that he delivered, standing here in 1874, when he conjured up before our imagination an outlook as to the liabilities in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the face of which this entire increased indebtedness would sink into insignificance—will now feel that he may congratulate the House and congratulate us upon occupying the position of having accomplished that great transcontinental highway, having not only completed the Intercolonial Railway, but extended a great line of intercommunication from sea to sea, linking all these Provinces together, and accomplishing that which at no distant day will be a great highway of intercommunication between Europe and the East—I say he will congratulate us upon occupying a position of a very enviable character. There is this to be borne in mind that, great as is this expenditure, it is all for works that once done never require to be repeated. There is no man in Canada, there is no man in this House or out of it, who will not say that it is not of the most vital importance to Canada, that it is not a matter of absolute necessity at this hour, that we should have a great iron band of intercommunication binding all these various Provinces together, and giving us the means of free and rapid and easy communication from one

portion of our country to another. In order to accomplish that gigantic work—which we have accomplished, and far below the expenditure which hon. gentlemen contemplated would be involved by Canada—in order to complete it even at a remote period, the boldest of us felt that, necessary as it was to engage in it, there was a danger that it would strain the credit of Canada. We all felt that it was a gigantic undertaking for the Government of Canada, representing as it did a population of only five millions of people, to carry out that which is now regarded, in connection with our population and the time occupied in its construction, as the most marvelous and wonderful work of the age. I repeat that the boldest of us felt that it might strain the credit of Canada, but we felt also that there was no alternative; that if this country was to be bound together, if we were to make Confederation a fixed fact, it was necessary to bring the remotest Province into easy and rapid communication with the centre of the country. We all felt the vital importance of opening the enormous fertile North West Territory for settlement and for population. We all felt the vital importance of developing the trade and commerce of Canada, and bringing all the trade and commerce through Canada that it was possible to bring. But as I have said we had our misgivings as to whether it might not strain to some extent the credit of the country. What is the fact? The fact is we have this gigantic work in full progress, we have the earnings rolling up in millions from year to year, altogether exceeding anything that the most sanguine man in this House contemplated in connection with the project; and we find ourselves in this position, that instead of the credit of the country being strained, it is now standing at the very highest point it ever attained. When we proposed to undertake grappling with this gigantic work, my hon. friend opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows that our three and a-half per cents were selling on the English market at about 90. To-day I am in a position to congratulate this House and the country, that, so highly favored are the securities of Canada, so eminently has the position of Canada advanced in the estimation of the capitalists of the world, our three and a-half per cent. securities have already changed hands at par. Before passing away from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and what it has done for the country, I should like to allude to the fact, that during the five months of last year—I am now speaking of it as a through line of intercommunication—although the line was only open for five months of last year, during that period seven cargoes of tea and other commodities were brought over the line from China and Japan to the principal cities of Canada, and St. Paul, Chicago, New York and other points in the United States; and that only from seven to eight days were consumed in delivering freight from Vancouver to Montreal and New York. Not only so, but there has been a most gratifying increase in the development of traffic over the road. As indicated in the following comparison of earnings for the past three years, the growth of local traffic has also been most gratifying, and there is every prospect that this growth will be even more rapid in the future:

	1884.	1885.	1886.
Passengers.....	\$1,980,902.30	2,859,222.93	3,170,713.69
Freight.....	3,410,365.39	4,881,865.48	6,112,379.89
Mails.....	85,736.83	137,151.92	205,024.18
Express.....	95,671.63	172,303.01	206,872.41
Parlor and sleeping cars....	43,492.60	73,523.55	118,658.99
Telegraph and miscellaneous	134,352.47	244,426.08	263,154.43
Total.....	\$5,750,521.27	8,368,493.12	10,081,803.59

I presume it is not necessary to add another word in order to show this House and the people of Canada the high point we have reached in connection with this work. I now propose to say a few words in regard to the position Canada has attained. I have already stated to the House that I do

not propose to institute any invidious comparison between the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite and ourselves. I propose to take a wider range. I propose, and I shall occupy but very little time in doing it, to give to this House the evidence that the position of Canada at the present moment is one of which we might justly be proud. I have referred to our position in connection with the construction of that great national work, and I have referred to the very important and vital position of our credit in that relation. But I am happy to be able to say that I do not expect to be obliged to use that credit, high and great as it is. I am happy to be able to tell the House that at this moment we have no floating loan, that there is not one dollar of floating loan chargeable to Canada. I am also able to give the gratifying assurance to this House that the Government have no expectation of being obliged to resort to the capitalists of England for any new loan for a long period to come; and I am quite sure that this is a statement which no Finance Minister has had the good fortune to be able to make for a very long time past. The great works that were essentially necessary to the progress and development of Canada have been completed, and we anticipate that the income from the savings banks, the money deposited by the savings bank depositors with us, will be quite equal to meet the capital required to take up the New Brunswick loan, which shortly becomes due, and meet any other incidental capital charges that may fall upon the Government. I have been asked by many parties to consider the question of a reduction of the rate of interest we pay depositors in the savings banks. I do not propose to entertain that proposition, and for this reason: That gratifying as that might be to the banking institutions, there is something still more important to which the Government are bound to look, and that is, the giving of due encouragement to the wage-earners, to the working classes of this country, the giving to them the strongest incentive to save instead of spending their earnings. I may say that the result of the reduction of the rate of interest payable by the Government to them would not be warranted, for the reason that, although we might obtain money at a somewhat lower rate, than the 4 per cent. we pay to the depositors, when all the charges incidental to it are taken into consideration, I do not think that the balance would be such as at all to justify the Government in taking a step that strikes me as being one that would be greatly prejudicial to the great mass of the working classes of this country. Now, in order as I have said, to save the time of the House and avoid going over the rather tedious details of these comparative statements, showing the position we occupy, I have had diagrams constructed—not diagrams to illustrate the position of public affairs on these questions, as between the two political parties of the country, but taking a wider range, going back to the commencement of Confederation, the time when in the interests of Canada the great step was taken of uniting those Provinces together.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask if in these statements, which I suppose include a statement of the savings banks, there is given the amount held over the sum of \$500, and those over the sum of \$1,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I have not gone into that statement, although I shall be very glad to discuss the matter with the hon. gentleman, because I am inclined to think there is a point in it, and, as the Government are not extremely anxious to draw money from any source, I am inclined to think that the time has come when it may be worth while to see that the savings banks are used for the proper and legitimate objects for which they were instituted.

Now, I may say that the first of these diagrams shows the deposits by the people in the chartered banks, commencing with Confederation, and giving the eighteen years from 1868 to 1886, inclusive. These figures which may be seen at a glance in the diagram, make a very gratifying exhibit of how steadily and rapidly the country has advanced, as shown by the evidence of the deposits of the people in the chartered banks of Canada :

DEPOSITS BY THE PEOPLE IN THE CHARTERED BANKS OF CANADA.

1868 (June 30).....\$32,808,104	1878 (June 30).....\$66,503,757
1869.....38,823,333	1879.....63,635,952
1870.....50,767,100	1880.....77,891,498
1871.....55,763,067	1881.....86,507,571
1872.....53,986,818	1882.....99,100,729
1873.....55,547,607	1883.....99,364,760
1874.....65,991,047	1884.....92,413,313
1875.....58,367,942	1885.....99,383,673
1876.....63,320,858	1886.....103,583,950
1877.....63,241,128	

Then the deposits in the savings banks cover the same period :

DEPOSITS IN SAVINGS BANKS OF CANADA.

1868 (June 30).....\$ 4,360,692	1878 (June 30).....\$14,222,074
1869.....5,723,567	1879.....14,702,715
1870.....7,591,978	1880.....13,237,496
1871.....9,367,941	1881.....24,331,202
1872.....10,526,376	1882.....31,098,718
1873.....12,933,894	1883.....35,189,426
1874.....15,101,195	1884.....38,003,116
1875.....14,125,477	1885.....41,980,776
1876.....13,838,201	1886.....45,072,886
1877.....13,391,014	

DISCOUNTS GIVEN BY THE CHARTERED BANKS OF CANADA.

1868 (June 30).....\$ 50,500,316	1878 (June 30).....\$124,888,552
1869.....53,572,307	1879.....122,502,537
1870.....62,252,569	1880.....118,916,970
1871.....83,969,766	1881.....144,139,875
1872.....107,354,115	1882.....177,521,800
1873.....117,646,219	1883.....177,222,569
1874.....133,731,260	1884.....160,459,183
1875.....123,786,038	1885.....158,209,174
1876.....128,645,238	1886.....165,044,608
1877.....126,169,577	

Then I give the total imports into Canada, in the several years from 1868 to 1886, and they show a most gratifying increase, notwithstanding the large decrease arising out of the active condition of so many great industries in Canada :

TOTAL IMPORTS OF CANADA.

1868 (June 30).....\$ 73,459,644	1878 (June 30).....\$ 93,081,787
1869.....70,415,165	1879.....81,964,427
1870.....74,814,839	1880.....86,489,747
1871.....96,092,971	1881.....105,330,840
1872.....111,430,527	1882.....119,419,500
1873.....128,011,281	1883.....132,254,022
1874.....128,213,582	1884.....116,397,043
1875.....123,070,283	1885.....108,941,486
1876.....93,210,346	1886.....104,424,561
1877.....99,329,962	

TOTAL EXPORTS OF CANADA.

1868 (June 30).....\$57,567,888	1878 (June 30).....\$79,323,687
1869.....60,474,781	1879.....71,491,265
1870.....73,573,490	1880.....87,911,458
1871.....74,173,618	1881.....98,290,823
1872.....82,639,663	1882.....102,137,203
1873.....89,789,922	1883.....98,085,604
1874.....89,351,928	1884.....91,406,496
1875.....77,886,979	1885.....89,238,361
1876.....80,966,435	1886.....85,251,314
1877.....75,875,393	

Then, Sir, we have the tonnage employed in the shipping of the country, showing an increase of over one million of tons notwithstanding, as every person knows, how very depressed that industry has been :

SHIPPING EMPLOYED, NOT INCLUDING COASTING VESSELS.

Tons Register.	Tons Register.
1868.....12,982,825	1878.....12,054,890
1869.....10,461,041	1879.....11,646,812
1870.....11,415,870	1880.....13,577,845
1871.....13,126,028	1881.....13,802,432
1872.....12,806,160	1882.....13,379,882
1873.....11,748,997	1883.....13,770,735
1874.....11,399,857	1884.....14,359,026
1875.....9,527,155	1885.....14,084,713
1876.....9,911,199	1886.....13,968,332
1877.....11,091,244	

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

For the coasting trade I have no data earlier than 1876 :

COASTING TRADE—TONNAGE EMPLOYED.

Tons.		Tons.	
1876.....10,300,939	1882.....14,791,064	1877.....8,988,862	1883.....15,683,568
1878.....11,047,661	1884.....15,473,707	1879.....12,066,633	1885.....15,944,421
1880.....14,053,013	1886.....16,368,274	1881.....15,116,766	

The railway mileage is another evidence—and one of the most marked and striking evidences that possibly any country in the world can show—of the rapid and steady progress that Canada has made, and in that respect, as the House knows, we are still rapidly and steadily increasing :

RAILWAYS IN CANADA.

June 30.	Miles.	June 30.	Miles.
1868.....2,522	1878.....6,143	1869.....2,580	1879.....6,255
1870.....2,679	1880.....6,891	1871.....2,950	1881.....7,260
1872.....3,018	1882.....7,530	1873.....3,609	1883.....8,726
1874.....4,022	1884.....9,575	1875.....4,826	1885.....10,773
1876.....5,157	1886.....11,618	1877.....5,574	

The next table shows the number of tons carried, and with respect to it I have only data which enable me to go back to 1876 ; but as will be noticed, between that year and 1886, the tonnage of freight carried has considerably more than doubled so that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will not be alone in the ability to boast that the tonnage on his roads has more than doubled since 1876, for the tonnage of the whole of the railways of Canada has a good deal more than doubled during that period :

RAILWAYS IN CANADA—TONS CARRIED.

Tons.		Tons.	
1876.....6,331,757	1882.....13,575,787	1877.....6,859,796	1883.....13,266,255
1878.....7,883,472	1884.....13,712,269	1879.....8,328,810	1885.....14,659,271
1880.....9,938,858	1886.....15,608,128	1881.....12,068,325	

Then, Sir, there is another indication, and perhaps one of the most conclusive of the condition of the great mass of the people—and I am not speaking of the working classes, merely, but of the great body of the people who require to have some regard for the future—and that is life insurance. I am only repeating a very trite observation, the originality of which is certainly not due to myself, in saying that there are few indications of the condition and the prosperity of the people which surpass that of the ratio of life insurance. It is found that just in proportion as a country is prosperous and the people well off, they naturally and prudently invest their savings in life insurance, and the figures in regard to Canada are, in this respect, very striking indeed :

LIFE INSURANCE IN CANADA—NET AMOUNT IN FORCE.

1869.....\$35,680,082	1878.....\$84,751,937
1870.....42,694,712	1879.....86,273,702
1871.....45,825,935	1880.....90,260,253
1872.....67,234,684	1881.....103,290,932
1873.....77,500,896	1882.....115,042,043
1874.....85,716,325	1883.....124,186,875
1875.....81,560,752	1884.....135,453,726
1876.....84,344,916	1885.....149,962,146
1877.....85,687,903	1886.....171,309,688

Fire insurance is not, perhaps, an equally strong test, although it also is a very conclusive one, for although people ought to use fire insurance in proportion to their poverty, we find, as a matter of fact, that the rule is just the reverse—that they insure in proportion to their ability to do so. The figures in this respect are also very gratifying, indicating that the Canadians are not only a prosperous, but a prudent people, as regards fire insurance :

FIRE INSURANCE IN CANADA—AMOUNT AT RISK.

1869 (Dec. 31).....	\$188,359,809	1878 (Dec. 31).....	\$409,899,701
1870.....	191,591,586	1879.....	407,357,985
1871.....	228,453,784	1880.....	411,563,271
1872.....	251,723,940	1881.....	462,210,969
1873.....	278,754,835	1882.....	526,856,478
1874.....	306,848,219	1883.....	572,264,041
1875.....	364,421,029	1884.....	605,507,789
1876.....	454,608,180	1885.....	611,794,479
1877.....	420,342,681		

Then as to business failures I have no data which go back beyond 1873:

BUSINESS FAILURES IN CANADA.

1873 (Dec. 31).....	\$12,334,000	1880 (Dec. 31).....	\$ 7,988,000
1874.....	7,696,000	1881.....	5,751,000
1875.....	28,843,000	1882.....	8,587,000
1876.....	25,517,000	1883.....	15,872,000
1877.....	25,523,000	1884.....	18,939,000
1878.....	23,908,000	1885.....	8,743,000
1879.....	29,347,000	1886.....	10,387,000

I think, Sir, I need not detain the House longer to show, and I am quite sure every member of the House will agree that these statistics afford the most reliable data for ascertaining the condition of the country, that the present outlook of Canada is one of the most gratifying character. I have already alluded to the sources which were drawing an increased number of immigrants into this country. I may say that the total arrivals, from the 1st of January to the 30th of April, 1886, were 22,723, while during the same period in 1887, the number has run up to 30,864. Of these the total number who settle in Canada was, in 1886, 12,666, against 17,609, in 1887, or an increase of over 5,000 settlers as compared with the same four months of the previous year. The total number of passengers to the United States through Canada, and I state this, because while we prefer immigrants, especially those with agricultural capabilities and those with capital, to remain in the country, we have no objection to any number of persons who are going to the United States, making use of Canadian channels of communication to get there—the total number of passengers to United States was 10,057 in that period in 1886, and 13,255 in the same period in 1887. Then, Sir, I will refer for a single moment to another evidence—which will probably be regarded by the House as more conclusive than all of those to which I have alluded—of the fact that we have passed the period of serious depression which Canada has suffered in recent years, and that the outlook for the future is all that we can possibly desire. I speak of it as a serious depression, and I notice that some hon. gentlemen opposite look almost incredulous, and why? Not because the same depressing causes and influences have not been in operation in Canada that have been in England, the United States and all other countries, but because here depression has been almost unfeared. Instead of suffering as the country suffered during the previous period of depression which has visited Canada, we have passed through a period of almost equal depression almost without knowing it, and why? Because, Sir, the changed policy of the country, the activity of our industries, the employment given to our own people, the keeping of the money in the country and distributing and expending it among our people, and the great expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway have enabled Canada to pass through what would otherwise probably have been as serious a depression as existed before, without scarcely knowing that such a thing as depression existed. Now, Sir, with regard to revenue, I am able to state to the House that the Customs revenue, the Excise revenue and the miscellaneous revenue all show a steady, marked and valuable increase for the last ten months of the year; and comparing 18-5-86 with 1886-87 the only exception that will be found in the following table—and its perusal will be most gratifying to every member of the House—refers to those periods in 1835-86, when the anticipated changes in the Tariff led to a very inordinate amount of revenue being

collected in one or two months. That, however, of course does not affect the general statement, because it was simply discounting the revenue.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS FOR YEARS 1885-86 AND 1886-87.

Service.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	January.	February.	March.	April.
Customs, 1885-86.....	\$ 1,587,706 34	\$ 1,739,695 63	\$ 1,744,459 54	\$ 1,680,142 37	\$ 1,294,879 37	\$ 1,308,901 84	\$ 1,269,606 80	\$ 1,545,849 90	\$ 2,669,094 82	\$ 1,393,637 57
do 1886-87.....	1,703,973 90	1,861,238 29	2,274,244 79	1,868,115 40	1,515,614 36	1,756,945 27	1,691,841 48	1,749,408 96	2,055,497 22	1,851,571 61
	+ 116,267 66	+ 121,532 67	+ 529,785 25	+ 177,973 03	+ 223,734 99	+ 448,043 43	+ 331,334 68	+ 183,559 65	+ 613,597 60	+ 457,944 04
Excise, 1885-86.....	308,346 47	305,107 18	353,742 20	442,791 14	471,123 35	535,214 20	407,079 88	493,786 80	1,917,359 02	167,088 91
do 1886-87.....	351,763 69	376,152 90	420,019 29	497,950 54	523,568 82	561,129 99	472,423 76	499,502 78	539,487 10	544,825 48
	+ 43,417 22	+ 71,045 72	+ 66,277 09	+ 55,156 40	+ 54,445 47	+ 41,916 79	+ 45,344 18	+ 64,294 02	+ 1,377,891 92	+ 387,736 54
Miscellaneous, 1885-86.....	436,638 62	458,073 58	402,970 31	595,777 00	631,618 84	488,514 20	907,638 12	448,546 89	750,577 93	591,606 27
do 1886-87.....	447,325 17	648,983 84	403,940 82	616,395 38	675,641 40	533,914 60	664,140 04	300,732 30	299,454 77	676,172 33
	+ 10,686 65	+ 190,910 26	+ 970 51	+ 20,618 38	+ 44,022 56	+ 55,400 40	+ 243,496 08	+ 147,814 69	+ 451,123 16	+ 83,566 06
Total Revenue, 1885-86.....	2,324,691 23	2,502,876 38	2,501,172 05	2,718,713 51	2,397,621 56	2,302,630 24	2,581,322 50	2,489,192 99	5,337,031 77	2,142,922 78
do 1886-87.....	2,503,052 76	2,866,365 03	3,098,204 90	2,974,461 32	2,719,324 56	2,841,959 86	2,707,405 38	2,469,644 03	2,894,419 09	3,071,569 42
	+ 170,361 53	+ 363,488 66	+ 597,032 85	+ 255,747 81	+ 322,703 02	+ 545,359 62	+ 126,082 76	+ 28,548 96	+ 2,442,612 68	+ 929,243 64
Aggregate Revenue, 1885-86.....	4,835,567 61	5,389,417 79	5,487,612 69	5,437,427 02	4,115,243 12	4,611,144 44	5,282,727 88	4,958,835 98	10,631,450 86	5,284,485 06
do 1886-87.....	5,173,104 52	6,314,730 81	6,585,817 59	6,411,882 84	5,437,948 12	5,458,114 06	5,990,132 76	5,428,483 92	13,525,869 95	6,353,141 46
	+ 337,536 91	+ 925,313 02	+ 1,098,204 90	+ 974,455 82	+ 1,322,705 00	+ 846,969 62	+ 707,404 88	+ 469,647 94	+ 2,894,419 09	+ 1,068,656 40
	+ 553,850 18	+ 1,160,883 03	+ 1,401,430 84	+ 1,726,633 86	+ 2,272,193 49	+ 2,395,276 26	+ 2,395,276 26	+ 2,364,717 30	+ 75,885 38	+ 853,361 26

— Decrease in 1886-87 over 1885-86.

+ Increase in 1886-87 over 1885-86.

In the month of February there is a decrease of \$28,548 and in March a decrease of \$2,442,612, due to the cause I have mentioned, of an anticipated change in the Tariff, and in the month of April we have again an increase of \$929,246; or, deducting the items to which I have alluded as abnormal, and not fairly to be taken into consideration, a total aggregate increase during those ten months—a steady, constant, regular increase, from the last of July up to the end of April—of no less than \$853,361.76; and I am sure, Sir, I can give the House no more complete evidence than that, as to the position the country occupies. Now, Sir, I think it will not be necessary for me to detain the House a moment longer in pointing out the evidences which exist on every hand—evidences that he who runs may read—and evidences of the most conclusive character, that Canada has passed the period of depression which she has suffered, and that we are again entering upon a career of very marked and considerable prosperity. There is, however, Sir, a single cloud on the horizon, and it is right that I should spend a moment in giving that a passing notice—that is, the question of threatened non-intercourse on the part of the great Republic to the south of us. Now, Sir, I need not say to the House that the question of the protection of our fisheries has not been a party question in this House. The protection of our fisheries was urged by hon. gentlemen opposite and their press throughout the period since the abrogation of the Washington Treaty, probably with more vehemence than it was urged by the members and press supporting the Government. All parties were at one, that it was the duty—a duty from which no Government in Canada could for a moment shrink—that we should maintain the admitted—I will not say the rights—but I will say the admitted rights that, by long prescription and through a long course of years, had been frankly admitted by the highest authorities in the United States as belonging to Canada. The time has not yet come, and I trust it never will, when any Government in this country will be permitted by this House to shrink for a single instant from temperately and judiciously maintaining in a fair and unflinching manner the admitted rights of the people of this country. I need not tell the House that, even at the risk of exposing this Government to the obloquy and attack, to a certain extent, of hon. gentlemen opposite, we said to the Government of the United States, so anxious are we this question should be settled amicably, if you will undertake to submit to the Congress of the United States a proposal for an international commission to dispose of it in the manner in which enlightened nations are accustomed to deal with controversies of this kind, we will allow your fishermen to enjoy the privilege of fishing in our waters throughout the season without interference or obstruction. And they did that, although our fishermen did not obtain the corresponding right of bringing the fish caught by them into the American market free of duty. But it was felt by this Government that while we were bound to protect the rights of Canada, while we would use every effort men could use to obtain a fair and favorable reciprocal arrangement with the United States—and I may say that I had the honor of being sent on a confidential mission by the Governor General previous to assuming my duties in England, and had a long and interesting communication with the late secretary Frelinghuysen on that subject; I may say I regard it as a great calamity, as a misfortune, that the administration of which he was a member had not been returned to power, and that his life had not been spared to carry out what, I am certain, he was prepared to carry out. The result was that a Democratic president was elected in the United States and a Democratic administration was formed, but that administration had not, as hon. gentlemen know, a majority in the Senate; and although the Government of the United States in good faith carried out

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the engagement with the Government of Canada, and sent down a proposal to dispose of this matter by an international commission, their proposal was rejected by the Senate. It was for that reason, and not because I wish to express any preference for one party or the other in the United States, that I said I think it was a misfortune that the recommendation of the Democratic President and Government had to be acted upon by a Republican Senate. That proposal was rejected, and Canada was forced, as you all know, *ex necessitate rei*, to adopt the policy of temperately and judiciously, but firmly, protecting the rights of Canadian fishermen in Canadian waters, and I am glad to be able to state that during my term of office as High Commissioner in London, when I had constant and frequent intercourse with the great statesmen of both of the political parties in that country in relation to this question, whether Lord Granville or Sir Michael Hicks Beach, or Lord Derby was in the Colonial Office—whoever the person was, whatever party was in power, whether Lord Idesleigh or Lord Roseberry was in the Foreign Office, or whoever might be representing the Government—I met the firm and unqualified desire, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to study carefully what were the undoubted rights of Canada and the Kingdom; and I speak, not of one but of both parties, I speak of the Governments which represented both the great parties in England, when I say I found on their part the steady and uniform desire and determination firmly to maintain Canada in the assertion of her just and legitimate rights. I believe that anxious as are Her Majesty's Government, and everybody knows how extremely anxious they are to avoid the slightest cause of difference with the Government of the United States, the time is far distant when the Government of England will shrink in the slightest degree from giving fair and candid consideration to whatever the claims of Canada may be in relation to that question. Under these circumstances, I think we had a right to expect from the Congress of the United States a different course to that which they pursued. When the President of the United States sent this appeal to Congress for an international commission, what did the people interested in the fisheries say? They said: "We do not want to have anything to do with Canadian waters; we want no international commission; the fish have all turned south, they are all coming into our waters; we do not require to go into Canadian waters at all; we want no commission, no international arrangement, but simply to keep ourselves to ourselves, and let the Canadians do the same." I think that is very much to be regretted. I think the interests of that great country and the interests of Canada alike are bound up in close commercial relations and in extended reciprocal relations. I have no hesitation in saying so. It would be in my judgment a great calamity and misfortune if anything were to prevent reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States which would be, as they were when they existed before, alike beneficial to both countries. We know we were satisfied with reciprocity, but we do not conceal from ourselves, because the statistics of their own country prove it beyond question, that advantageous as was the Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 for twelve years to the people of Canada, it was infinitely more advantageous to the people of the United States. We know that, satisfied as we were with the arrangements made by my right hon. friend in connection with the Washington Treaty, that, advantageous as those arrangements were to the people of Canada, the statistics on both sides of the line prove that they were infinitely more beneficial to the great Republic to the south of us. But, as I say, we were met by the proposal to arm the President with the power of declaring non-intercourse. I do not believe he will put that power into force, and I am strengthened in that belief by the letter which the President of the United States addressed to the parties

who communicated with him on the subject, and which showed that that gentleman, armed with this tremendous power, fully recognised the enormous interests that had grown up under that peaceful intercourse between Canada and the United States, and that he was fully alive to the momentous responsibility that would rest upon his shoulders if he should put it in operation. He might well feel that; when the statistics of his own country prove that during the 50 years to which the President alluded as having been expended in creating between the United States and Canada an enormous commerce and strong ties and relations, the people of the United States had sent into Canada no less than \$1,200,000,000 worth of products of the farms and manufactories and various industries of the United States, and that, in addition to that \$1,200,000,000 worth of American products sent into Canada, they had also sent in \$200,000,000 of foreign products, whereas Canada, during that 50 years, had sent into the United States but \$1,050,000,000 products in all; leaving a balance of trade during that 50 years of no less than \$350,000,000 in favor of the United States. Now, these figures show that, large as are the interests which Canada has, the United States has a still larger interest in maintaining those friendly reciprocal relations that have enabled these two countries, the great Republic to the south of us and this rising Dominion of Canada, to steadily progress as friendly rivals in commercial enterprise, and in developing as best they could the resources of the two countries on both sides of the line. I hold in my hand a statement showing Canada's trade with the United States for a period of fifty years, comprising three periods, the first period of thirty-three years from 1821 to 1853, prior to the Reciprocity Treaty; the second period from 1854 to 1866, under the Reciprocity Treaty; and the third period from 1867 to 1879, that is from the date of Confederation to the adoption of the protective policy. I have separated the latter, not in order to draw any party distinction, but to show how the trade of the United States is affected by the revenue tariff, and by the protective policy which was afterwards adopted. Then there is the fourth period, embracing the time since the protective policy was adopted. The statement is as follows:—

CANADA'S TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

1st period, 33 years, 1821-53—

United States exports to British North America—	
Home products	\$ 110,152,214
Foreign products.....	27,064,495
Total exports to British North America.....	\$ 137,216,709
United States imports from do	67,794,426
Balance in favor of United States.....	\$ 69,422,283
Average annual balance in favor of United States	\$ 2,073,402

2nd period, 1854-66—

United States exports to British North America—	
Home products	\$ 300,808,370
Foreign products.....	62,379,718
Total exports to British North America.....	\$ 363,188,088
United States imports from do	267,612,131
Balance in favor of United States.....	\$ 95,575,957
Average annual balance in favor of United States	\$ 7,351,766

3rd period, 1867-79—

United States exports to Canada—	
Home products	\$ 477,164,790
Foreign products.....	34,653,810
Total exports to Canada.....	\$ 511,818,600
United States imports from Canada.....	399,423,586
Balance in favor of United States	\$ 112,395,014
Average annual balance in favor of United States	\$ 8,645,770

4th period, 1880-86—

United States exports to Canada—	
Home products	\$ 297,542,282
Foreign products.....	16,932,329
Total exports to Canada.....	\$ 313,874,511
United States imports from Canada.....	274,947,511
Balance in favor of United States	\$ 38,927,000
Average annual balance.....	\$ 5,561,000

These figures are instructive, because they show that our American neighbors, so far from having any reason to complain of the closest commercial relations which have existed between us, have been very largely gainers under every system which has operated during the last fifty years. That is the solitary cloud upon the horizon, but it is not without its silver lining. Had this threatened non-intercourse been carried out, had any President, armed with such a power, under any circumstances been induced to put it in operation, what would have been our position as we stood half a dozen years ago? I ask this House what would have been our position under such a condition of things if this Government had not carried out the policy of completing at the earliest possible moment a great transcontinental railway from the port of Montreal to the shores of the Pacific Ocean? During the late insurrection the value of that policy was established beyond controversy. On that occasion it was shown that Canada had saved in blood and treasure, by the fact of being able to utilize that line of communication in order to send the gallant yeomanry of the older Provinces to the scene of the troubles, more than would cover the \$30,000,000 which I asked the House to grant as a loan, even if it had been made a gift, and we had never received a dollar of it back again except in the service which we received from the advanced position to which that company was enabled to carry that great national enterprise, and which enabled us to send our forces over that line. But what would be our position to-day if we stood with this threat of non-intercourse flaunted in our faces and knew that we were dependent on American channels of communication for our connection with the rising city of Winnipeg, the capital of the Province of Manitoba, and the great North West of this country? What would have been our position if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not penetrated the Rocky Mountains, if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had been adopted, and there was no line north of Lake Superior or through the Rocky Mountains to connect us with British Columbia? In that case we would have been at the feet of our American neighbors, instead of, as we are to-day, though only five millions of people, being able to say to them, that deeply as we would deplore so mad and so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our own lines of communication and have the most complete means of communication from the furthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea. As I said before, this cloud, this only cloud has its silver lining. Non-intercourse would not be an unmixed evil. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if this policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves, and that the commerce of Canada, which to-day is building up New York—I am speaking of the through traffic—which to-day is building up Boston and Portland, would be carried through ex-

clusively Canadian channels to Canadian ports, and would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrew's, St. John and Halifax with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand. Still further, I say that I believe that, if that policy of non-intercourse were carried out, strong as is the sentiment of free trade in the minds of the Imperial Government and the Imperial Parliament, still, consistently with the policy which Lord Salisbury laid down when he was interviewed by the sugar refiners and was shown by them that the bounty-fed sugar was crushing out the industries of the United Kingdom, and when he said that, strongly as he had adhered to the policy of free trade, he considered that a condition of things of that kind would warrant the Imperial Parliament, without departing from their present policy of free trade, in retaliating by imposing a duty equal to the bounty on the sugar which came into competition with the refiners of the United Kingdom. That policy has only to be carried a very short step further to lead Her Majesty's Government to the conclusion, that they would owe it to Canada and to themselves, as being the power under which Canada is happy to serve, to meet that policy of non-intercourse by such a different mode of treating the grain from the United States of America and the grain grown in Canada, as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the great farming industry of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change in this Dominion. Sir, I never expect the time will come when non-intercourse will be adopted; and I am sanguine from my own knowledge of the growing sentiment of public men in England of the vital importance of Canada to the Empire, and their duty to give us all the support to which we are entitled, that if such a policy were adopted we could derive that benefit from it, and it could be done without any injury to any interest in the Empire. The competition between the wheat of India and that which could be grown in Canada under such an enormous impetus to that growth, would be sufficient to prevent any material advance in the price of bread to the British consumer. So, looking at this question in all its bearings, while I felt bound to give it a passing notice, and while I most earnestly hope that no such policy will be adopted; while I have not the slightest idea that it will, I say that should it be adopted, great as is the American Republic, enormous as is their population, they will find that Canada feels that she has as great and as valuable a portion of this North American continent under her management and control and to be developed, as that lying to the south of us; and they will find the people of this country, on both sides of politics, a united band of patriots who, sinking every other consideration will say that whatever Government is in power they owe it to their country, they owe it to themselves, to show that there will be no faltering in maintaining to the utmost the undoubted and admitted rights that belong to the people of Canada. Now, Sir, I may say that I recognise the fact that under the protective policy that we have adopted, and which, as we know beyond peradventure, the country most heartily approves and endorses, the great stimulus that has been given to Canadian industries has enabled them largely to overtake the consuming power of the country. We know that the result has been that which we all apprehended it would be, a fall in prices, and that the people of this country would enjoy as the result of that development of our industry by a protective policy, an opportunity of obtaining everything that they required and as cheaply as they would if that policy had never been put into operation. Now, under these circumstances, what we must especially do, what I think it behooves any person charged with the responsibility of governing this country to do, what it behooves this Parliament to do, whether hon. gentlemen sit on one side of the House or the other,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

is to adopt all the means in our power of developing the trade and business of our country. The efforts of the Government have been directed to that end. I may say, Sir, in that relation, that in 1879 Sir Alexander Galt, before his appointment as High Commissioner for Canada in London, was charged with the duty of endeavoring to negotiate with Spain a treaty of advanced commercial trade relations with Cuba and Porto Rico. That treaty, hon. gentlemen know, Sir Alexander Galt was not able to carry to completion, and when I had the honor of succeeding him in the office of High Commissioner, he left for my information and perusal a document in which he said that he found himself greatly hampered in discharging the duties imposed upon him by the Government of Canada, because he only stood in the position of a commercial commissioner, and it was necessary that all his negotiations with the Government of Spain should be filtered through Her Majesty's Minister at the Court of Madrid. At a subsequent period I was instructed by the Government of Canada, when Sir Leonard Tilley was Finance Minister, to take up that question and endeavor to arrange for improved commercial relations. It became more imperatively necessary for Canada than ever, because the United States' Government had succeeded in arranging a *modus vivendi* with Spain, which placed all their exports, their ships, and everything they had to send to Cuba and Porto Rico, upon infinitely more advantageous terms than the products of Canada. I addressed myself to the discussion of this question with Her Majesty's Government—and I may say that the Colonial Office at once put me in personal communication with the Foreign Office, and I was instructed to take the subject up with them—and the result was that after a full discussion of the whole question, the Foreign Office communicated to the Colonial Office not only that they had decided to allow Canada to negotiate such treaty with foreign countries as her own interest required, in conjunction with their own Minister, but they had decided that the representative of Canada must be clothed with plenipotentiary powers, and be placed upon an equal footing. Although I have not been able to bring down the correspondence moved for by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) for the reasons stated, that this matter not being terminated, the correspondence cannot, with advantage to the public, be laid upon the Table until a conclusion is arrived at. I will, however, read to this House an extract from a letter sent by the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, dated 26th July, 1884, and forwarded to me for the information of the Canadian Government:

"If the Spanish Government are favorably disposed a full power for these negotiations will be given to Sir Robert Morrier"—

Who was then Ambassador of Her Majesty's Government at Madrid—

"and Sir Charles Tupper jointly. The actual negotiations would probably be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper; but the convention, if concluded, must be signed by both plenipotentiaries, and be entered into between Her Majesty and the King of Spain, with the special object of regulating Canadian trade with the Spanish Territories specified in the convention."

I am quite certain that the House will appreciate the great importance of that arrangement, and they will feel that the discussions that have taken place in this House have no doubt done good in relation to that question. They will feel that another step has been gained by the concession from Her Majesty's Government in this matter of trade negotiations, and that Canada is to have the freest and fullest scope. But more than that, while they are prepared to give plenipotentiary powers to the representative of Canada, whoever he may be, as selected by the Government to negotiate those treaties, we are to have this vantage ground—and I draw the attention of the House to it as a very important one—we are to have all the aid and sympathy and support of Her Majesty's Government, through Her Majesty's Minister, at whatever place these negotiations

may be carried on. Now, I may say that subsequently the Government of Spain intimated that they would like us not to proceed with these negotiations at present until an elaborate treaty which was arranged between Spain and the United States, had been passed upon by the American Senate. We were anxious to comply with the recommendation, and for this reason: If our proposition to Spain were accepted, it would be found to be utterly worthless if the advanced and extended treaty between the United States and Cuba and Porto Rico had been carried into effect. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the Senate of the United States rejected that treaty, and I may say that subsequently Her Majesty's Government were enabled to negotiate a treaty with Spain as between England and Spain herself, the colonies not being included. I at once drew the attention of the Colonial and Foreign Offices to the great injury that would result from Canada not being included in the treaty. I took up the question with Her Majesty's Government. I pointed out what were our requirements. I communicated with Sir Clare Ford, and pointed out what Canada required, not only that she should be placed under the most favored nation clause in Cuba and Porto Rico, which Germany and France enjoyed, but that she should obtain the advantage which the United States had obtained by the abolition of the 10 per cent. specific duty. Sir Clare Ford entered most heartily into that question, and I am glad to be able to say that without the concession of anything—and I point this out to hon. gentlemen who have discussed this subject a good deal, for it is a most important feature that a dependency of the Crown, a portion of the British Empire without any concession on our part (and we were prepared to make considerable concessions)—we obtained from the treaty negotiated by Her Majesty's Government and from concessions given by Her Majesty's Government in relation to wine duties there, and which do not affect us in the slightest, a proof of their anxiety to do justice to Canada, and we obtained everything the United States enjoyed under the *modus vivendi* which had been negotiated between Spain and the Government of the United States. I point that out as evidence of the advantages we enjoyed, not only that great liberty was conceded to us, but that every advantage was given to us, and our interests were promoted by Her Majesty's Government in treaties sought to be arranged between Great Britain and foreign countries. Since that period I am glad to be able to inform the House that the Government of Spain approached myself through Her Majesty's Minister at London, and approached Sir Clare Ford through the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Madrid, stating that they were now ready to take up the question of an enlarged arrangement between Canada and Spain as touching the trade between Canada and Cuba and Porto Rico. So important do I consider this question that I proposed to the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) to allow me to return to Canada and discuss with him before going to Madrid the whole question of this proposed arrangement from which I believe the trade of this country may receive a great and valuable impulse in connection with those important Spanish Islands. As the House is aware, I received permission from the right hon. gentleman to return here, but it appears he had other duties for me to perform before I should turn my face towards Madrid. However, I do hope that, when Parliament rises at a very early day, the right hon. gentleman will allow me to return to London and proceed at an early day to Madrid, where I believe there is an opportunity of advancing the interests of Canada in a very marked and important degree. Now, Sir, I say that, consistent with that policy, we propose to aid in developing trade—I should not say we, because the Government had anticipated me before my return—and I found tenders were invited for steam communication between the West India Islands and Canada, and as will be gathered from the report of Mr. Wylde,

who was sent as commercial commissioner to ascertain what opportunity existed for extending our trade, there is an opening for a very large and extensive trade, especially provided we can succeed in negotiating such a treaty as I have every reason to believe will now be found procurable. Canada now enjoys, to a very large extent, the fish trade with Cuba and Porto Rico. Our fish is just what they require, and I believe they obtain from the United States Canadian fish which passes through American hands. Not only so, but there is a large flour, lumber and potato trade to be built up and business done in a number of articles of general consumption, and this business is open to us if a favorable arrangement can be made. In order to show that this Government are alive to the importance of developing intercommunication, and to show how they estimate the importance of developing Canadian trade through every possible channel, I may say that tenders have been invited by the Postmaster General for a rapid steam service across the Atlantic in order to utilise our great transcontinental highway, for we think the time has come when in the interests of the Dominion as fast and as good a service should exist between France and England and Canada as is to be found between either Germany, France, England or New York. If by any means we can succeed in establishing such a line of rapid steamers on the Atlantic we will not only make this a great transcontinental highway and rapidly develop our trade on the Pacific, but I believe we will be able to deliver the mails in Boston and New York, certainly in Chicago and all western cities, a very considerable time before they could be delivered through any other channel. I can only say that Canada will be delighted to do that work for the Republic, and we shall be most happy to have this Dominion made a channel of communication either for their commerce or their mails or their passengers. I am quite sure there is a great field there for Canadian development, and that subject is engaging the attention of the Government. We have at this moment a commercial agent in Australia, where there is also a wide field for the development of Canadian industries. The gentlemen charged with the duty of administering the affairs of the various Australian Provinces at the Colonial Exhibition, were deeply impressed with the enormous strides made by us in the various branches of manufactures, and again and again they said to me: "Why cannot we obtain from British Provinces the goods we obtain, and carry on with them the trade we now do with a foreign country, the United States." The Government of Canada, as has already been stated to the House, with a view to establish a great traffic in the east, an intercommunication with China and Japan, have agreed to give £15,000 yearly, out of £60,000 required, provided Her Majesty's Government furnishes the additional £45,000, to ensure a rapid service from Vancouver to Yokohama and Shanghai, and Hong Kong in China. The Canadian Government have further agreed to give £25,000 per annum, provided £160,000 per annum, the amount required, is raised in England and the Australian colonies, in order to have a rapid line of steam communication between the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and all the islands of Australasia, including New Zealand.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite sure, Sir, that the House has listened with very great pleasure to the evidences I have been able to lay before it, of the undoubted condition of progress and prosperity that Canada enjoys. I am quite sure, Sir, that no member of this House can fail to be gratified at the indisputable evidence, furnished by everything that can indicate a condition of progress and prosperity in a country, that Canada is at this moment in

an exceedingly prosperous condition, and that the outlook for the future is all that we can desire. But, Sir, I may ask the House for a single moment, to what do we owe that condition of progress and prosperity, upon which we are all able to congratulate ourselves at this moment? I am quite certain that the answer will be found in the words—National Policy. It is the National Policy which has lifted Canada out of the position that it occupied a few years ago; it is the National Policy that has enabled it to pass through what otherwise would have been a period of great depression, without seriously feeling it; it is the National Policy that had vivified every industry in this country, that has furnished employment for Canadian hands on Canadian soil, that has kept the money of the country within the country, and that has diffused prosperity from one end of this country to the other. But, Sir, I drew attention to the fact that production had, to a considerable extent, overtaken consumption, and that the necessity was imposed on the Government of endeavoring to find outlets for the industries of Canada, by extending and developing our trade with other countries. I referred to the efforts we were making in connection with lines of steam communication, but I omitted on that occasion to refer to the fact that the sanction which was obtained from this House to establish a line of steam communication with France has, as you know, Sir, not been successful up to the present moment. But I am glad to be able to say that the appropriation placed by Parliament at the service of the Government for that purpose is about to be utilised, and that a strong French company are preparing to put on a line of steamers between France and Canada that I have no doubt will render that effort on our part as successful as the others. Now, Sir, I intend to invite the attention of the House to a new field for the development of the National Policy. We have applied it to the great cotton industry; we have applied it to the woollen industry; we have applied it to innumerable industries all over Canada, and with marvellous success. But, Sir, there is a field, perhaps the most important, still untrodden. There is a field still unoccupied that presents greater possibilities and greater opportunities than any other for developing Canadian industry, and it lies at the very root and foundation of the National Policy in all countries where it has been adopted. I refer to the iron industry. I say, Sir, that while we have adopted the National Policy with reference to other industries, while we have taken a leaf out of the book of our great neighbors to the south of us—and we are always delighted to avail ourselves of their experience, in order to benefit ourselves—while we have adopted to a certain extent their policy in reference to other great industries, in relation to this, the greatest industry of all in this country and in all countries where iron and coal are found to abound, we have neglected up to the present hour to do justice to this great Canadian industry. Sir, the Government of the United States, after the most careful and elaborate consideration of this question, after appointing a commission to go from one end of the Union to the other, to collect information and investigate the subject to the very root in all its bearings, adopted a thoroughly sound, rational, and scientific policy. They adopted the cardinal principle at which we are aiming, and that is the application of the principle of protection in reference to the amount of labor consumed in the production of the article. Now, Sir, down to the present hour there has never been an effort made, such as I believe can be made, to adopt in all its bearings that scientific application of the principle of protection to the labor involved. What we have already aimed at—what we have to a large extent attained—has been the development of the industries of the country, by protecting the industries of the country. But, Sir, in relation to this, the great industry of Canada, the great industry of Great Britain, the great industry of the United States, of Germany, of Belgium; one

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

of the greatest industries of France and one of the greatest and most important industries of all the great countries that possess iron and coal, we have down to the present time ignored that fundamental principle of the application of the system of protection in proportion to the labor involved. What have we done? The United States adopted in regard to the iron industry, the policy of applying a certain Tariff to pig iron. They imposed a duty of \$6 a ton; they have imposed a duty of \$6, \$7, \$8, \$9 or whatever number of dollars a ton was necessary, in order to establish the industry within their borders. At the present moment, however, their tariff is \$6 a ton, imposed on every ton of pig iron coming into competition with a ton of pig iron produced in the United States. And, Sir, they have graded that duty—not with mathematical exactness, but to a large extent graded accurately their tariff upon the iron industry of the country, just in proportion to the amount of labor, the number of days' labor, required in order to produce a ton of any particular quality of iron. What have we done? Why, Sir, we have at this moment a bounty of \$1.50 a ton on pig iron and \$2 a ton duty upon pig iron. What then? Giving a protection to the production of a ton of pig iron, we have a duty, instead of three times as great, as the United States have adopted—or from twice to three times as great—on the puddled bar, we have a duty of \$1.70 per ton. So that while we protect the inferior article, the lowest form in which iron is presented, we have so constructed our tariff as to make it utterly impossible to utilise and derive a benefit from it, by grading our tariff in proportion to the amount of labor involved. Now, Sir, if there is a country in the world to which the iron industry is important, it is Canada, and why? Because we possess the coal and we possess the iron ore and we possess the fluxes; and therefore it is necessary to develop the great iron industry within our borders, and yet down to the present moment we have left almost untouched, this enormous, this almost illimitable field for the extension of our National Policy. The national importance of the iron industry is seen at once when we take into consideration the fact that it furnishes the material necessary for agriculture, for commerce, for manufactures, for offence and defence, and for all other manufactures, with scarcely an exception. It becomes, for these reasons, the most important of all the industries of the country. So valuable is it regarded, that all nations who have the means of developing that industry, have addressed themselves to that work as one of prime importance. The means of developing the iron industry of a country depend, first, upon the possession of the ore; second, upon the possession of the coal or other fuel that is required to utilise it; third, upon the possession of the fluxes, and fourth, upon the proximity of these articles to each other, and of the facilities for transporting the product from the points where it is manufactured to the great centres of the country, where it is to be used as an article of commerce. Now, Sir, Canada occupies in this regard a vantage ground over almost every country in the world. England possesses coal and iron ore to an almost illimitable extent; but the House will perhaps be surprised to learn that even England, with all its ore and all its coal, imports from Spain, a thousand miles away, more ore than is required to manufacture the entire production of steel in England. The United States possess almost unlimited quantities of iron ore and coal; but they have no such advantage as Canada enjoys. Their iron and coal are widely separated from each other—so widely separated that the ores of Wisconsin and the Lake Superior region are sent a thousand miles away to Pittsburg to the coal area to be manufactured into iron. In the southern States they have coal and iron in close proximity, but with this drawback, that they are over a hundred miles from the seaboard, over which distance the manufactured article has to be transported by rail. France, which has developed a great iron

industry, has to import both iron and coal. That country has both ore and coal to some extent, but no less than 35 per cent. of the ore manufactured in France is imported from a long distance. Belgium has plenty of coal, but imports iron ore from Germany. A large amount of iron ore manufactured in Belgium, which has become so powerful a competitor of England in iron, is manufactured from ore imported from Luxembourg; but it sends all the way to Spain for the ore used in the manufacture of Bessemer steel. If these countries, without the advantage of having iron ore and coal in close proximity, can import, one or the other a thousand miles and carry on the manufactures of iron, what can Canada do, which has the great advantage of possessing illimitable coal fields and illimitable stores of iron ore in close proximity? England and the United States both form notable examples of what can be done in the development of a great industry by protection. I need not tell this House that the most extreme protection that ever was adopted in any country in the world was adopted in England in connection with the manufacture of iron. England not only imposed high duties on iron coming in from abroad, but when it was discovered how coal could be used instead of charcoal and the manufacture of the steam engine was brought into play, it actually prohibited the workmen who were acquainted with those processes from leaving the country in order to retain the industry within their own borders. The United States recognising that the manufacture of iron within their own borders lay at the very foundation of that protective policy that has made that great country as flourishing as it is to-day, at the very foundation of that great policy that has enabled them to grapple with a gigantic war debt and sweep it away by hundreds of millions until to-day they are only embarrassed by the difficulty of knowing how to get rid of the revenue that is furnished by that policy. I say, Sir, recognising that this question of the iron industry lay at the very foundation of their national policy, they adopted a high protective tariff, and after the most careful, the most scientific, and the most elaborate investigation, they graded the tariff in relation to the different branches of the iron trade in order to furnish just such protection as the amount of labor entering into the creation of any article of industry involved. And thus, Sir, recognising the great principle of protecting first and above all the labor of the country, they have built up an iron industry that has astonished the civilised world. Germany imported 100,000 tons of pig iron in 1860; and it exported 1,000,000 in 1881—how? By adopting the policy that has prevailed in Canada of giving a feeble protection to the production of iron in its lowest stage, and leaving all the others unprotected to come into competition with it? No, but by adopting the true principle of protecting the labor that entered into the production of iron in all its departments; and thus, instead of being dependent, as it was, upon other countries for its iron, it has become a great exporter, as you see, of that commodity. The production of pig iron in the world in 1865 was 9,250,000 tons; in 1883 it had gone up to 21,000,000 tons, showing that all that is necessary in order to extend to an unlimited degree the use of iron is to be able to produce it, and showing also that it affords a field for the application of the sound principles of the National Policy that no other industry in the country affords. The result of this policy may be briefly stated that during last twenty-one years, from 1865 to 1885, the increase in the production of pig iron in Great Britain has been 76 per cent. In the United States, 456 per cent.; in Germany, 237 per cent.; France, 64 per cent.; Belgium, 64; Austria and Hungary, 152 per cent. So has the iron industry, under a national policy adopted for its development and its protection, flourished in all these countries. Of course, England when she became, under the most rigid and determined system of protection ever adopted in any country of the world, so advanced as to out-distance all other countries to such an

extent that she thought she could adopt the principles of free trade, she adopted those principles; and she adopted them under the delusion, propounded by Mr. Cobden and sincerely believed in by that distinguished man, but proved by the result to be utterly fallacious, that if England, with her advanced position of mistress of the industrial arts of the world, adopted the policy of free trade, all other countries would be obliged to follow in her wake. And what is the result? It is that instead of following in her wake, France and Germany and all these countries have held fast by the national policy of protecting their own industries, and the consequence is that they are at this moment in a position to paralyse to a large extent the industries of England with all her advantages of iron and coal in close proximity. By their protective policy they are developing and advancing their industries in a way that England finds herself incapable of keeping up with, and the result is that Belgium and Germany are keen competitors on English soil with the great English industries. The time is not long since, when charcoal iron was one of the most important industries in Ontario and Quebec. I have no hesitation in saying that if the protection we have given to cotton and woollen and all other industries of Canada be applied to iron to-morrow, it will show what the past history of Canada has shown, that these charcoal iron industries will again be in full blast, and that in Ontario and Quebec they will become most essential and important industries to-morrow as they were in days gone by. Every person knows that charcoal iron is the most valuable product of iron; every person knows the increase of value of charcoal iron; every person knows that the great difficulty is the cost of producing it, but there is no country in the world that has such a field for the production of charcoal iron as the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. What have you, Sir, in these Provinces? You have the ore in illimitable quantity, you have a boundless field for the production of the ore, and you have, running along through the same tract of country, magnificent forests adapted to furnishing the charcoal. At present what are the people obliged to do? Those who go into the wilderness to make a farm have to spend their valuable labor in cutting down this timber, and consuming it on the ground without receiving anything from it. Vivify, give protection to the iron industry, as you have given it to cotton, woollen, and everything else, and what will be the result? It will be, that when a man goes into the forest to make a farm in Ontario or Quebec, the most valuable product under his hand will be that which he has to spend all his labor and capital now in wasting. You will have colonisation extended in Ontario and Quebec as nothing else could extend it. The experiments recently made by some of the great lines of railway in the United States have shown, as the result of scientific analysis, that the mode of making the life of a rail infinitely greater than it is, is to have incorporated in the rail a large portion of charcoal iron, and under this recent discovery, there is a field for the development of charcoal iron, that will go far to make it one of the leading industries of Canada. There is at present, as you know, in Ontario, running through a large number of counties and townships, a most valuable deposit of iron ore. A railway has been built to Central Ontario, over 100 miles long, to carry this ore to Weller's Bay, to be shipped across the lake to Charlotte, Oswego, and other points on the American side. Well, from Oswego and Charlotte on the American side to the anthracite coal field, is only 150 miles, and I say that, under a policy which will give iron the protection we give to everything else in Canada, under the National Policy, you will have the ships that convey the ore to Oswego or to Charlotte, or to any of those places from Kingston, Cobourg and Weller's Bay, bringing back the anthracite coal, and you will have the establishment of blast furnaces at Cobourg, Kingston and Weller's

Bay, that will give the iron industry of Ontario the same position it occupied years ago. I may attract your attention, Sir, for a single moment to the relative importance of these industries. We have given to the manufacture of sugar, and the manufacture of cotton, and the manufacture of woollens, a large protection with the result we anticipated, of building up these industries and rendering them flourishing. In addition to that, we have from 1868 to 1884, admitted \$2,950,000 worth of machinery free into Canada, in order to give increased protection and development to these industries. Now, Sir, the relative importance of these industries may be shown by the following figures, compiled in regard to the United States. It will be found that in the refining of sugar and molasses in the United States, there are forty-nine establishments employed. The capital invested in these is \$27,432,500; the number of males employed over 16 years of age, 5,832; the number of children and youths, 25; the amount paid in wages during the year, \$2,875,032; the value of materials, \$144,698,499; and the value of the product, \$155,484,915. So much for sugar. In the manufacture of cotton goods there are 1,005 establishments, in which the capital employed amounts to \$219,000,000; number of males employed 64,000; females, 91,000; and 30,000 children. The total amount of wages is \$45,614,419; the value of materials, \$113,765,000, and the value of the product, \$210,000,000. Of woollen goods, the number of establishments is 1,990, \$96,000,000 of capital is employed, 46,000 males, 29,000 females and 10,000 children are engaged; \$25,836,000 is paid in wages; the value of the material is \$100,000,000 and the value of the products \$160,000,000. Now, come to iron and steel, and you will see at a glance by the comparison how entirely the iron and steel industry distances all the other industries of that great country, in regard to the amount of capital employed, of people engaged, and the result. Of iron and steel industries there are 1,005, the capital employed is \$230,000,000; the number of males above sixteen years of age engaged, 133,000; of females, 45; of children, 7,730; the wages paid out are \$55,476,875; the value of material is \$191,000,000; the value of the product is \$296,000,000. So you see that, great as are the cotton and woollen industries in the United States, as regards the employment of a vast population and the support of a great body of people in connection with these various industries, the iron industry far outstrips and leaves everything else in the rear. Now, charcoal iron from bog iron ore was formerly an important industry both in Ontario and in Quebec, and charcoal iron was also made in Carleton, N.B., where to-day, under a policy of fostering this industry in the same way as the cotton and woollen and other industries have been fostered, that blast furnace in Carleton would again be lighted up and would be the foundation of a new and extensive industry in the Province of New Brunswick. The following table, which I have had sent to every member, in order to make the matter more distinct, will show the Canadian iron trade at a glance:—

IMPORTS OF IRON AND STEEL AND MANUFACTURES THEREOF INTO THE DOMINION FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FOR YEARS

1868	\$ 6,885,365	1879	7,952,295
1869	7,385,780	1880	10,128,660
1870	7,750,867	1881	12,955,855
1871	10,808,645	1882	17,499,488
1872	15,913,179	1883	20,080,274
1873	25,435,020	1884	14,790,727
1874	20,700,387	1885	11,415,713
1875	18,199,198	1886	11,053,365
1876	12,965,117		
1877	11,082,331	Total.....	\$253,210,512
1878	9,398,306		

This large amount of \$253,000,000 was paid out in hard cash by the people of Canada to support the iron industries of other countries while our own country teemed as no country in the world teems with all the materials necessary

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to manufacture iron, the coal, the ore, the fluxes, everything that is necessary, and with the labor of our country unemployed. Of this amount \$94,819,630 was free and \$158,330,882 dutiable. There is also a table showing the balance of trade, and how much is accounted for by the importation of iron and steel and the manufacture thereof. You have only to look at that in order to see that the balance of trade against Canada is largely and at once accounted for. If you subtract the amount of imports paid by Canada for iron to sustain the iron industries of other countries, you will find that it is nearly equal to the amount by which our imports have exceeded our exports, and, if you want to balance the trade of the country, if you want to have no outgoing beyond the incoming of the country, cut the Gordian knot, put this iron industry upon the same footing and foundation that you have put all the other industries of Canada, and you will sweep away to a large extent the balance of trade which stands recorded against Canada up to the present time. The imports have amounted to from fourteen to fifteen millions annually since Confederation. As I shall show you directly, there is no country in the world that is consuming iron to a greater extent than this Canada of ours. The consumption of iron in the whole world is 33½ lbs. per capita. In Canada the consumption is 260 lbs. per capita. In 1883 Canada imported at the rate of \$1.55 per capita. Assuming an average of \$35 a ton, that would represent 260 lbs. per capita, which makes Canada the third country in the world in the consumption of iron. Great Britain is the first, the United States the second and Canada the third of all the countries in the world in regard to the consumption of iron. The following table shows the consumption of imported iron, steel, and manufactures in Canada and in the United States, since 1863:—

CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA OF IMPORTED, IRON, STEEL AND MANUFACTURES

Year.	Canada.	United States.	Year.	Canada.	United States.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.		\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1868.....	2 01	0 80	1878.....	2 40	0 18
1869.....	2 17	0 74	1879.....	2 00	0 20
1870.....	2 25	0 81	1880.....	2 49	0 91
1871.....	3 01	1 09	1881.....	2 98	1 00
1872.....	4 55	1 30	1882.....	4 05	1 02
1873.....	7 01	1 39	1883.....	4 56	0 75
1874.....	5 77	0 81	1884.....	3 32	0 60
1875.....	5 15	0 46	1885.....	2 28	0 50
1876.....	3 46	0 28	1886.....	2 20	0 61
1877.....	2 89	0 22			

From this it will be seen that in the United States they produce most of their own iron, whilst we import ours. Now, I will turn the attention of the House for a moment to a matter which lies in close proximity to this question of the iron industry, and that is the coal trade of the country. The following table shows the consumption of coal in the Dominion since 1868:—

TOTAL CONSUMPTION OF COAL IN THE DOMINION.

Years.	Net tons of 2,000 lbs.	Years.	Net tons of 2,000 lbs.
1868.....	714,893	1878.....	1,665,814
1869.....	636,704	1879.....	1,748,164
1870.....	859,630	1880.....	2,094,844
1871.....	852,217	1881.....	2,260,630
1872.....	1,227,653	1882.....	2,708,654
1873.....	1,398,403	1883.....	3,086,689
1874.....	1,454,636	1884.....	3,556,673
1875.....	1,362,363	1885.....	3,439,745
1876.....	1,466,531	1886.....	3,515,769
1877.....	1,751,031		

The total production of coal for the Dominion is shown in another table:

TOTAL PRODUCTION OF COAL IN THE DOMINION.

Years.	Net tons of 2,000 lbs.	Years.	Net tons of 2,000 lbs.
1868.....	623,391	1878.....	1,109,595
1869.....	687,527	1879.....	1,152,783
1870.....	734,285	1880.....	1,456,795
1871.....	804,431	1881.....	1,514,542
1872.....	1,038,349	1882.....	1,845,548
1873.....	1,228,852	1883.....	1,831,819
1874.....	1,068,166	1884.....	1,997,368
1875.....	998,104	1885.....	1,973,987
1876.....	950,483	1886.....	2,104,170
1877.....	1,020,875		

I may say that an unlimited increase, so to speak, is quite within the possibilities of the legislation of this House. I need not tell the House that, notwithstanding that great increase in the production of coal in Canada, a large number of the coal mines of Canada—take, for instance, those in Pictou, those in Cape Breton—which depend on the sea, are closed for something like six months in the year; and that upon a safe calculation it may be said that an enormous amount of loss of working power is caused by the fact that they are only able to work half time in consequence of a want of demand for the article itself. Now, the protection of iron in this country will give to the coal industry of this country such a development as will enormously increase the demand for labor in connection with the mining of coal and of ore. The manufacture of charcoal in the timbered country I have already referred to, and to the enormous amount of labor it will involve. The principle of the American tariff I have already explained. They have created this great iron industry in the United States by giving to the labor employed protection just in proportion to the amount of days' work consumed in producing the article, whether it was a ton of pig iron, a ton of puddled bars, a ton of bar iron, or the manufacture in its very highest state. Our policy, as I have shown, is diametrically the reverse, and the result is that while they have been building up this magnificent iron industry in the United States and at the same time steadily and enormously reducing the cost of iron in that country, we, with all that nature has done for us in the most unbounded and unstinted manner, furnished with all the raw material necessary to make our country great and prosperous, are allowing to pass away this golden opportunity of reaping a harvest by creating great national industries, giving increased labor to the people, and thus building up great and thriving communities, and furnishing profitable employment to thousands and tens of thousands of additional inhabitants to our country. We are allowing other countries to reap the benefit, other countries not half so well situated as we are for the production of iron—reap this golden harvest that lies unconsidered at our feet. Now, Sir, this was done in the United States by following a policy the very reverse of ours. I may just say before passing away from the question of coal, which we have developed so successfully, that instead of increasing the cost of coal to the people of this country, I hold in my hand a table showing that the price paid in the city of Montreal for bituminous coal in 1877, was \$4.50 per ton, while in 1886 the same coal sold for from \$3 to \$3.50 per ton. Now, the United States, graduating their tariff upon the amount of labor employed in producing the article, put \$6 a ton on pig iron; our duty is \$2. They put \$6 a ton on cast iron scrap and old shell; in Canada it is free. They put \$16 a ton on puddle bars, blooms, &c.; ours is 10 per cent., or \$1.70 per ton. They put \$6 per ton on wrought scrap; under the Canadian tariff it is free. They put \$16 and \$22, according to sizes, on bar iron, spike, rod, &c.; our duty is 17½ per cent., about equal to \$5 per ton. They put \$20 a ton upon thick hoops and sheets; ours is 17½ per cent. They put \$28 per ton upon thin sheets; ours is 12½ per cent. On cut spikes they put \$25 per ton; ours is equivalent to \$13.45, more nearly assimilating to

theirs. Now, it is impossible to read those two tariffs of the United States and Canada without seeing at a glance why it is that while they have made the iron industry the most successful and most important industry in that country, we are standing still at the threshold, looking idly on, and leaving all these undeveloped treasures to lie at our feet, and only wanting the adoption of a sound and rational policy, the adoption of that National Policy that has placed Canada in the proud position it occupies to-day, by applying it to other industries; waiting, I say, to have that same policy applied to the iron industry of this country to give us an increased development that will, I believe, be found to surpass all the other industries of our country, just as the figures I have read of the woollen and cotton industries of the United States shows that they have been surpassed transcendently by the iron industry of that country. Sir, imagine the helpless position Canada would be in in the event of war. What could the country do without iron? I do not believe the child is born that will witness a war in Canada. I regard the position we occupy as one that gives the best possible assurance that we will have peaceful progress within our borders. But while that is the strong probability, is it not worth while for us to consider what a country would do, that is consuming 260 pounds of iron per head of the population, if they were cut off with no iron industry within the country to meet the emergency, and to give us that supply which is absolutely necessary for the progress and advancement of every other industry within our border. Why, Sir, our position is a helpless one at present. Belgium, Germany and England combined to put up the price of steel rails in Canada \$5 a ton, and you had to pay that increase in consequence of the fact that you had no iron industries in your country, and to-day you may be paying for wrought iron pipe enormously above what the article costs, because those countries at this moment have agreed to put up the price to the consumers of wrought iron pipe in this country. Now, I say it was only a short time ago that England, Belgium and Germany combined, and Canada had to pay, and did pay, \$5 a ton more for every ton of steel rails imported into the country than we ought to have paid, because we, in our present condition, with our country filled with iron, filled with coal, filled with limestone, and all in close proximity to each other, have not had the sagacity, we have not had the courage to adopt the same rational policy in regard to this industry that we have adopted with regard to others. Why, Sir, in this very county of Ottawa, the country teems with iron ore as rich as any in the world. All through this region there are unbounded forests to furnish charcoal, and all that is wanted is fair and legitimate protection to vitalise and develop the industry and give employment to the people, and aid at the same time the colonisation of those rich tracts of country by furnishing to the poor men who go into the forests the means of getting a fair price for the timber they are now obliged to waste, in order that they may cultivate the land. How do you suppose the combination between England, Germany and Belgium was broken up, under which we were paying \$5 a ton more for our rails? Strange as it may seem, it was broken up by means of the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company broke it up by giving an order for steel rails to the United States, instead of to that combination, teaching the people in England, Germany and Belgium that we were not so prostrate as they supposed, not quite so helpless as they supposed, and that led to breaking up the combination, because they became alarmed at the fact that in the United States, where rails were \$159 a ton only a few years ago, the price has been brought down to \$26, showing the influence of this rational policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is new.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not only a National Policy, but it is a rational policy. It is a policy that is national because it is rapidly making Canada a nation, it is a rational policy because the very foundation of reason is in a Government, a Parliament, a country furnishing employment to the mass of the industrial people. Well, Mr. Speaker, twenty years ago iron rails were made in Toronto and Hamilton, and within the next twenty years we will make all our own rails. I do not propose to ask this House to adopt the policy, the Government does not propose at this moment, regarding the increased railway development of the country as one of the vital essentials of progress and prosperity, to include in this arrangement what the United States has done, and done with such success, and that is to apply it to steel rails. We propose that they shall come in free as they have done in the past, because we consider that should be made an exception. I do not hesitate to say that the adoption of this policy will, in my judgment, place Canada in a position where she will be able to provide her own rails, and that at no distant period, at as reasonable a rate as any country in the world. Why should we not do so? Show me any country possessing as many miles of railway as Canada does that does not manufacture its own rails? It cannot be done. There is no country in the world with 12,000 miles of railway in operation that does not manufacture the rails used there. Why should we not at no distant day under the application of this protective policy for the iron industry of Canada, be in a position to manufacture our rails successfully and efficiently? Now, as to car axles. There are several places in this country where they are now made. As showing that there is no want of skill in Canada, that Canadians are equal, without any outside assistance, to deal with manufacturing matters, I can point to a foundry in Montreal where most excellent steel castings are turned out. Go to New Glasgow and you will find a steel industry built up by local capital of from \$300,000 to \$400,000 invested by Nova Scotians, or by Canadians, at all events, where they are turning out the very best articles that can be produced. All that is wanted is fostering protection in order to make the quantity as great as the quality is good. In those works there is not a man employed who is not a Canadian. The ready intelligence which Canadians possess enables them within a short time to master the most intricate processes in connection with any industry. In the county of Pictou, iron, coal and limestone are found in the closest proximity; within a radius of ten miles there is everything necessary to build up a great and successful industry; and this mineral wealth is found on the seaboard so that the products of the industry can be cheaply transported by water to the head of Lake Superior if required. All descriptions of iron ore are found in this county, so that when we are told by persons engaged in the iron founding industries that they require other iron to mix with Londonderry iron because it is too good, that they require to import Scotch pig iron, the answer is that we possess within our own borders every variety of iron ore, so that any mixture desired can be made. We have specular iron ore with 68.33 percentage metallic iron, compact limonite 57.71, fibrous limonite 59.50, red hematite, and also fossiliferous hematite 54.36, and spathic ore with 43.56. In New Brunswick there is hematite iron ore; in the county of Carleton ore and coal are to be found, also in different districts of that Province. Bog ore in Queen's, Sunbury, York, Charlotte, Restigouche and Northumberland counties, in close proximity to the Intercolonial Railway. It is specially applicable to the manufacture of charcoal iron. There are iron ores in Quebec. Magnetic iron ores are found more or less throughout the Laurentian range of mountains along the Ottawa River. At the Hull or Baldwin mines, west of the Gatineau River, the ore analyses 67 per cent. The quantity is estimated at 100,000,000 tons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The Haycock mine ore ranges from 64 to 68 per cent. metal, Bristol mine 58 per cent. iron. In Three Rivers and Drummondville there is both bog and iron ore in abundance, and unlimited timber for making charcoal. In the Eastern District of Ontario, back of Kingston, Belleville, Trenton and Cobourg, between Lake Ontario and the Ottawa River; in the townships of Marmora, Hastings, Tudor, Bedford, Madoc, Wollaston, Palmerston, Bagot, Belmont, Darling, Barrie, Galway, Snowdon and many others, there is magnetic iron in abundance. This district is served by the Ontario and Quebec, Kingston and Pembroke Railways, the Central Ontario, Cobourg and Peterboro', and Grand Trunk Railways, and by the Rideau and Trent Canals. There is plenty of timber all through this district. I had a conversation with a surveyor who had extended these lines for hundred of miles through these districts, and away up 130 miles further, to the intersection of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I was assured that not only was there an unlimited quantity of iron through that district, but that the forests along that line of communication could not be surpassed in any country in the world for the production of charcoal. Now, I have shown you that the Lake Superior ores of the United States are carried one thousand miles to the coal, for the purpose of manufacturing the pig iron. If that be the case, what is to prevent the policy of the ship that carries the ore from Weller's Bay, Kingston and Cobourg, across to the United States ports, bringing back a cargo of the anthracite coal which is within one hundred miles from the point of shipment? There is nothing to prevent it but one thing, and that is the duty upon the anthracite coal; and what I propose to ask this House to do, in adopting the policy of vitalizing this great industry for Canada, is to take the duty off anthracite coal and make it free. The moment that is done we shall have blast furnaces at Cobourg, Weller's Bay and Kingston, at all events, served by anthracite coal, making that description of anthracite iron which is so highly valued by gentlemen connected with foundries. The distance between Weller's Bay and Charlotte, in the United States, is about sixty miles, and from Rochester to the anthracite mines is 150 miles; and, I think, when I give those distances and give what is accomplished every day in the United States, where coal and iron are 1,000 miles apart, I shall have settled the problem that nothing will be easier than to establish blast furnaces in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, by which you can not only manufacture unlimited quantities of charcoal iron but manufacture the iron by the use of anthracite coal. Now, Sir, you may ask me what about the great North-West. Well, Sir, it is well known that you have in the North-West the most boundless supply of coal that is to be found in any part of this Dominion. One of the great advantages we have over the prairie country to the south of us, is the unlimited supply of fuel furnished by nature in the form of lignite and bituminous coal. And you have not only 50,000 square miles of this bituminous coal in the great North-West, to furnish enormous quantities of fuel for generations to come, but you have in Big Island, in Lake Winnipeg, a valuable deposit of iron ore, and any quantity of timber to make charcoal to convert it into iron. All it requires is the adoption of this policy in order to establish at an early day industries for the manufacture of iron in the North-West as well as in the other portions of the country. And what more? Across the Rocky Mountains, need I tell you that in British Columbia you have one of the most magnificent deposits of iron ore—on Texada Island (30 miles long and 5 miles wide)—that is to be found in any place in the world, rich in the highest degree in iron; and that you have the Nanaimo coal fields to furnish fuel to put blast furnaces in operation at an early day, lying within thirty miles of Texada Island. I say, that with the prospect of opening up trade with Australia, with China and Japan, although I am not a

prophet nor the son of prophet, I believe that at no distant day you will have in the Province of British Columbia an iron industry built up which will compare favorably with that of any other industry in this country. Now, Sir, you will ask me to give you a little more closely than in the general terms I have employed, what would be the result of Canada entering upon this national policy of manufacturing her own iron, and I will give you briefly my calculations on that point. And, though I base my estimate on our past consumption of iron, giving this industry the same protection that is given to others—I say that we need not base it on the past consumption of iron, for, with the development which is opening up before industries, a very feeble glance at what the real Canada, the past furnishes, in regard to all these result of adopting such a policy would be. We are making rapid strides, and if you take these diagrams, these graphic illustrations which I have placed before you, and look at what we have done in the last eighteen years, tell me if you can, the measure of what the progress of Canada will be in the next ten or twenty years. We are only opening up this great question of developing the industries of our country, and I have no hesitation in saying that a more moderate calculation could not be made than the one I shall now offer the House, basing my calculation on the present consumption of iron. Our present consumption is 250,000 tons of pig iron, leaving steel rails out of the question altogether. To make this quantity of pig iron, you require 750,000 tons of iron ore. You require 120,000 tons of limestone and 750,000 tons of coal to make it into iron in its first stage, pig iron; and the freight required for the means of intercommunication in bringing these materials together, amounts to not less than 1,625,000 tons. To manufacture it into puddled bars, merchant bars, and the various shapes and sizes into which it is made, it would require an additional quantity of 750,000 tons of coal, making a total consumption of 1,500,000 tons. It is on the ground that the development of the iron industry of Canada will tax the coal industry of this country to its utmost capacity, in order to furnish the additional output that will be required, and with all the advantages connected with that increased development, that I am enabled to say to the House that although making anthracite coal free will take \$497,000 away from the Government in revenue which it is now receiving, we would be perfectly justified in doing it, because the development of this iron industry would be giving to the coal-mining industry a greater advantage and boon than that which would be taken away by the removal of the duty. Now, Sir, what does this involve? Take the diagram of Sir Lowthian Bell—the highest authority in the world—the man who in England is considered head and shoulders above every authority on these questions. Taking his diagram, which I have sent to every hon. gentleman in the House, you will see the price of Scotch pig iron and the earnings of the colliers in Scotland in comparison with Westphalia, and it follows that just as the production of iron increases or decreases, so the production of coal increases or decreases. Now, Sir, the result is that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 to 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity. I say, Sir, that if there is anything in the National Policy, if we have not been all wrong from the very start, if the history of Canada shows that this National Policy has achieved for Canada what we said it would achieve—and I have given the most abundant and irrefragable evidence on that point—if there is any question on which there ought not to be any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman, it is that the application of the same sound policy which we have found so admirable and successful in relation to all other industries, will have the same result in regard to the great iron in-

dustry of this country. Now, this estimate of an increased population of 100,000 souls does not take into account the manufacture of castings and forgings, cutlery and edged tools, hardware, machinery and engines, or steel rails. Were we to manufacture these articles now imported—and there is no reason why we should not steadily progress to that point—the population I have mentioned of 100,000 souls would be no less than trebled. I may briefly give to the House the effect of the resolutions which I propose to lay upon the Table; and I may say that the Government have given the most careful attention to the proposals that have been made to us in reference to changes in the Tariff. We have found that in order to carry to its legitimate conclusion the policy we have applied to the various industries established in the country, it is desirable to make changes in the Tariff, which in all will involve an increase in round numbers of something under \$500,000 a year. In regard to iron, the increased revenue we expect to receive this year will not be over half a million from the changes proposed in these resolutions; and while we have no reason to doubt that they will be entirely effectual in bringing rapidly into this country all the capital that is necessary to vitalise this great industry and put it into a flourishing condition, all the increased taxation that will be involved over the whole of Canada, from sea to sea, will be something like half a million dollars a year. That increased taxation, however, will all be swept away and given back to the people by the one resolution which makes anthracite coal free; and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which largely pay that duty, will be greatly benefited instead of oppressed or burthened by the adoption of the policy that is now proposed. I do not think it necessary, Sir, to occupy the time of the House at greater length in making these explanations, and I am anxious to close at such an hour as will give an opportunity for the fullest criticism from the other side of the House. In this proposed tariff we have not followed exactly the American system. We have based it upon the principle of applying two-thirds of the American rate. There is at present provided by law a bounty of \$1.50 a ton until the 30th June, 1889, on every ton of pig iron manufactured in the country; and afterwards that bounty is a \$1.00 a ton, until it ends in June, 1892. We of course leave that as it is; and in the meantime, instead of adopting the American tariff of \$6 a ton upon pig iron, we propose to adopt two-thirds of that tariff by raising the duty from \$2 a ton, as it is at present, to \$4 in addition to the bounty. And then we have applied as a general principle—modified in certain cases according as we felt it desirable in the interest of the country, a little more or a little less—that two-thirds rate to all the branches of the iron industry throughout the country. We do not propose to increase the tariff on sheet iron, hoop iron, or the lower kinds of round iron, which are left at the old rate at present, because these I do not expect at an early day to be manufactured in the country. The duty on steel worth 4 cents per lb. and under is placed at 30 per cent, or on an equal footing with the iron duty. On steel worth over 4 cents per lb., we leave the revenue duty of 12½ per cent., because we do not expect that high class of steel at an early day to be manufactured in the country; so that miners and others using a high class of steel will not be affected adversely by the change. On wire rods, wire rope and wire fencing the duty is not proposed to be increased. The duty on boiler plate and locomotive tubes remains, for obvious reasons, unchanged, as we wish to do all we can to develop the manufacture of engines in our own country, and to furnish all the aid we can to railways. The highest *ad valorem* rate, therefore, on them, under the proposed tariff, would be about 35 per cent. The unenumerated articles, embracing hardware stores, edge tools, cutlery, &c., will come in at 30 per cent. duty. And now, Mr. Speaker, thanking the

House very much for the kind indulgence with which they have listened to my very lengthened statement, and my efforts at making these explanations, and regretting that the condition of my voice has not enabled me to do better justice to the subject, I will proceed to deal with the resolutions which it is proposed to offer for the consideration of the House. In blacking, shoe, and shoemakers' ink, the duty is 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. Harness and leather dressing, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What increase is that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid if I attempt to give the increase it will make it so late that we will not have the pleasure of hearing from the hon. gentleman. I would prefer reading the resolutions and then taking them up *seriatim* when we go into committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you got them printed for distribution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I ask the hon. gentleman to do is, as he is going on, to state in each case what the increase is. I do not propose to ask him for the reasons in detail.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I can do that by reading the resolutions from another paper. Blacking, 5 per cent. is added to the duty. Blueing, laundry blueing of all kinds, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, an addition of 5 per cent. We will be able of course to give the fullest information to the hon. gentleman when we come to take up these matters in committee. It would take too much time to do that at present. Advertising pictures, pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, tailors' and mantle-makers' fashion plates, a specific duty of 6 cents per lb., and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. The change makes no difference in duty; it merely adds certain words: "illustrated price lists, calendars and almanacs" to the resolution as it stood before, and would stand in the Customs' Act. Advertising pamphlets not illustrated, a specific duty of 1 cent each. The words "not illustrated" are added to make the item more specific; the duty is not changed. Braces and suspenders, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, an addition of 5 per cent. Buttons, vegetable ivory, horn or composition, a specific duty of 10 cents per gross, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Buttons, all other kinds not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Buggies of all kinds, farm waggons, farm rig or freight carts, pleasure carts or gigs, and similar vehicles, costing less than \$50, a specific duty of \$10 each; costing \$50 and less than \$100 a specific duty of \$15 each, and an addition thereto, in each case, of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. All such carriages costing \$100 each and over, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. The duty is based on legitimate prices and intended to check under-valuation. Cotton sewing thread or spools, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, an addition of 5 per cent. Jeans, cottilles, when imported by corset makers for use in their factories, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, an increase of 5 per cent. in favor of cotton factories. Before it was 20 per cent. when imported by corset-makers for use in their factories. Printed or dyed fabrics not elsewhere specified, 32½ per cent. *ad valorem*. This is an increase of 5 per cent. additional protection to cotton factories and print works. Earthenware, stoneware, namely, demijohns or jugs, churns and crocks, a specific duty of 3 cents per gallon of holding capacity, an increase of one cent per gallon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much do you compute that to be per cent.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not over 30 per cent. Earthenware and stoneware, brown or colored, Rockingham ware, &c., 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, 5 per cent. increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Flagstones, sawn or otherwise dressed, specific duty of \$2 per ton, being an increase of 50 cents per ton; glass carboys, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, same as before. Flasks, phials of four-ounce capacity and over, telegraph and lightning rod insulators, specific duty of 10 cents per dozen and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; that is an increase of 10 cents per dozen, in addition to the 30 per cent. charged before. Gold and silver leaf, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, an increase of 5 per cent. Sewing machines, or heads or parts of heads, of sewing machines, specific duty \$3 each and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, the duty now being 20 per cent. *ad valorem* and \$2 specific. Leather, sole, specific duty of 3 cents per lb. The present rate is 15 per cent., and we do not consider that is an increase. It is a change from the *ad valorem* to the specific duty without increasing the charge. Belting leather and all upper leather, including kid, lamb, sheep and calf, tanned or dressed, but not colored, waxed or glazed, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*; there is no change in the duty but a mere alteration in the arrangement. Japanned, patent or enamelled, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, now 20 per cent. Liquorice root, paste, extract of, a duty of 2 cents per lb., the present duty is 15 per cent. and 2 cents would be equal to 25 per cent. Oil cloth, floor, specific duty of 5 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. This is introducing a specific duty, but it is not expected to increase the amount. The hon. gentleman will understand that in many of these cases this is done to meet one of the great difficulties of the Customs Department, that of under-valuation, from which our revenues have suffered very much. In reference to oil cloth in the piece, cut or shaped, &c., there is an increase of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, the specific duty being as it was. On paper hangings, or wall paper in rolls, the new proposals are in place of the present duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that an increase?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not except on the first item of brown blanks. On papers of all kinds not elsewhere specified, we propose to levy a duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; the present duty is 22½ per cent. on calendered paper, and 20 per cent. on uncalendered. We now make it all 25 per cent. On tissue paper, the duty is the same, the only change consisting in striking out the words "of artificial flowers." In regard to pickles, sauces, &c., the present duty is 25 per cent., and we substitute a specific duty based upon 30 per cent. on the better classes of pickles. It will only increase the amount materially on the inferior kinds. In regard to plated cutlery, the present duty is 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. This is an increase on the cheaper kinds of plated knives, but will not materially increase the duty on the better class. The only difference in regard to plumbago is in regard to the manufactures of plumbago, on which the specific duty is increased from 20 to 25 per cent. On coarse salt we propose to charge 10 cents per 100 pounds, not including salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession. The same on fine salt in bulk, or on salt in bags or other packages, a specific duty of 15 cents per 100 pounds, the packages to bear the same duty as if imported empty. That is an increase of 3 cents per 100 pounds on the bags, barrels or other packages.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that exempt the salt from the sea?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, all salt imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries is free of duty. The duty on sand-paper, glass, flint and emery paper is to be 30 per cent. instead of 25. On school and writing slates there is to be a specific duty of 1 cent each, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Now, the duty is 25 per cent. without the specific duty. I now come to a very large and important change in regard to the duty on cigars and cigarettes, on which we propose a specific duty of \$2 per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad*

valorem, the weight of cigarettes to include the weight of paper covering. During the last fiscal year the number of cigars manufactured which were the product of imported raw leaf was 90,408,025. Assuming an increased production of 50 per cent. the output should be 135,612,037. The duty on 90,408,025, at \$6 a thousand would be \$542,448. The duty on 135,612,037 at \$6 would be \$813,672. We estimate an increased revenue from the duty on cigars of \$150,000. There is no change in the duty on trunks, but we propose to charge a duty of 10 cents each and 30 per cent *ad valorem* on valises, satchels, carpet bags, pocket books and purses. In that case the 10 cents specific duty is added. The change in regard to varnishes, &c., is from 20 cents per gallon specific and 20 per cent. to 25 per cent. and 20 cents a gallon. The duty on potatoes is raised from 10 cents a bushel to 15 cents. The duty on tomatoes is raised from 30 cents per bushel to 30 cents per bushel and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. Vegetables, not otherwise specified, are increased from 20 to 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. The duty on watch actions or movements is reduced from 20 per cent. to 10 per cent, that is in order to prevent smuggling and to foster the industry of making the cases in this country. On fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, &c., the duty is to be 7½ cents per lb. and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. The duty is now 7½ cents per lb, 20 per cent. on a part, and 22½ per cent. on another part *ad valorem*. On collars of cotton or linen, on which the present duty is 30 per cent, we have added 24 cents specific duty, as fostering protection to the seamstresses of the country. On newspapers partly printed and intended to be complete and published in Canada, 25 per cent *ad valorem*. That is to settle a disputed question in the Customs Department, and we give still greater protection to our own printers who furnish much more valuable matter within the country than that which is imported from outside. We have increased the duty on shirts of cotton or linen by \$1 per dozen. The resolution with reference to articles imported for the Government, for Parliament, and for the use of the army and navy, makes no alteration of the duty, but it is only explanatory of items 532 and 533. The resolution with regard to anthracite coal repeals item 101, which provided for a duty of 50 cents per ton, and occasions a loss to the revenue of about half a million, the amount collected last year having been \$49,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. How about bituminous coal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It remains as before. The effect of the removal of the duty on anthracite coal will be not only to give great relief to the public who use anthracite coal, but also to give a great relief to the manufacturers of iron, who will have to pay on their raw material a larger price than before; but they will receive a considerable portion of that back in the form of remitted duty, the amount remitted being equal to all we will receive the coming year from the increased duty on iron. Of course anthracite coal stands in a different position from bituminous as it is not produced in the country. In the resolution with respect to scrap iron and scrap steel, we draw a distinction between imported scrap and scrap that is the result of wrecks upon the coast. The former duty of \$2 per ton on imported scrap is restored, and I am afraid that is the principal blot on the policy as propounded, for to carry out the principle, it ought to be \$4 a ton, the same as iron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state how many changes there are altogether?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there are about one hundred and twenty. I now move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to repeal the following items in schedule "A" of the Act 49 Vic., chap. 33, intitled "An Act respecting the Duties of Customs"—Consolidated Statutes, 1886, viz:—

Numbers 7, 31, 32, 37, 39, 44, 51, 72, 83, 101, 125, 126, 133, 137, 138, 144, 145, 146, 147, 154, 161, 181, 192, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 234, 237, 238, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 248, 251, 252, 254, 255, 275, 278, 282, 317, 318, 319, 330, 331, 333, 339, 346, 353, 354, 355, 365, 366, 368, 383, 403, 404, 406, 409, 439, 447, 451, 455, 456, 458, 462, 473, and 475, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof as follows:—

1. Blacking, shoe, and shoemakers' ink, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
2. Harness and leather dressing, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. Blueing, laundry blueing of all kinds, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
4. Advertising pictures, pictorial show-cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price list, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, and tailors' and mantle-makers' fashion plates, a specific duty of six cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
5. Advertising pamphlets not illustrated, a specific duty of one cent each.
6. Braces or suspenders, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Buttons of vegetable ivory, horn or composition, a specific duty of ten cents per gross and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
8. Buggies of all kinds, farm waggons, farm, railway or freight carts, pleasure carts or gigs and similar vehicles, costing less than fifty dollars, a specific duty of ten dollars each; costing fifty dollars and less than one hundred dollars, a specific duty of fifteen dollars each, and in addition thereto in each case, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
9. All such carriages costing one hundred dollars each and over, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
10. Cotton sewing thread on spools, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
11. Jeans and coutilles, when imported by corset makers for use in their factory, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
12. Printed or dyed cotton fabrics, not elsewhere specified, thirty-two and a half per cent. *ad valorem*.
13. Earthenware and stoneware, namely, demijohns or jugs, churns and crocks, a specific duty of three cents per gallon of holding capacity.
14. Earthenware and stoneware, brown or colored, Rockingham ware; white granite or iron stoneware, O. C. or cream colored ware; decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware not elsewhere specified, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
15. Flag-stones, sawn or otherwise dressed, a specific duty of two dollars per ton.
16. Glass carboys and demijohns, bottles and decanters, flasks and phials, of less capacity than four ounces, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
17. Flasks and phials of four-ounce capacity and over, telegraph and lightning rod insulators, jars and glass balls, and out, pressed, or moulded tableware a specific duty of ten cents per dozen pieces, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
18. Gold and silver leaf, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
19. Sewing machines whole, or heads or parts of heads of sewing machines, a specific duty of three dollars each and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
20. Leather, sole, a specific duty of three cents per pound.
21. Leather, belting leather, and all upper leather, including kid, lamb, sheep and calf, tanned or dressed, but not colored, waxed, or glazed, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
22. Japanned, patent or enamelled, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
23. Licorice root, paste extract of, a specific duty of two cents per pound.
24. Oil cloth, floor, a specific duty of five cents per square yard, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
25. Oil cloth in the piece, cut or shaped, oiled, enamelled, stamped, painted or printed, india rubbered, flocked or coated, not otherwise provided for, a specific duty of five cents per square yard, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
26. Paper hangings, or wall paper in rolls, the following specific duties on each eight yards of the following descriptions, viz:—
 - a. Brown blanks, two cents.
 - b. White papers, grounded papers, and satins, three cents.
 - c. Single point bronzes, seven cents.
 - d. Colored bronzes, nine cents.
 - e. Embossed bronzes, eleven cents.
 - f. Colored borders, narrow, eight cents.
 - g. Colored borders, wide, ten cents.
 - h. Bronze borders, narrow, fifteen cents.
 - i. Bronze borders, wide, eighteen cents.
 - j. Embossed borders, twenty cents.
27. Paper of all kinds not elsewhere specified, twenty-two and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
28. Tissue paper, white or colored, when imported by manufacturers for use in their factory, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
29. Pickles in bottle, a specific duty of forty cents per gallon, sixteen half-pint, eight pint, or four quart bottles to be held to contain a gallon: In jars, bottles, or other vessels the quantity to be ascertained and the same rate of duty to be charged thereon, the duty to include the bottle and other packages.
30. Pickles in bulk, in vinegar, or vinegar and mustard, thirty-five cents per gallon, and in brine, twenty-five cents per gallon.
31. Sauces and catsups, in bottle, a specific duty of forty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*: sixteen half-pint, eight pint or four quart bottles to be held to contain a gallon.
32. Plated cutlery, namely, knives plated wholly or in part, costing under three dollars and fifty cents per dozen, a specific duty of fifty cents per dozen and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

27. All other plated ware, electro-plated or gilt of all kinds, whether plated wholly or in part, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
28. Plumbago, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
- 28a. Plumbago, all manufactures of not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
29. Salt, coarse, ten cents per one hundred pounds (not to include salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or salt imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries), which shall be free of duty.
- 29a. Salt, fine, in bulk, a specific duty of ten cents per one hundred pounds).
30. Salt, in bags, barrels or other packages, a specific duty of fifteen cents per hundred pound-, the bags, barrels or other packages to bear the same duty as if imported empty.
31. Sand paper, glass flint and emery paper, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*
32. Slates, school and writing slates, a specific duty of one cent each and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
33. Cigars and cigarettes, a specific duty of two dollars per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*. The weight of cigarettes to include the weight of the paper covering.
34. Trunks of all kinds, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
- 34a. Valises, satchels, carpet bags, pocket books and purses, a specific duty of ten cents each and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
35. Varnishes, lacquers, japans, japan driers, liquid driers, collodion and oil finish, not elsewhere specified, a specific duty of twenty cents per gallon and twenty-five cent. *ad valorem*.
36. Potatoes, a specific duty and fifteen cents per bushel.
37. Tomatoes, fresh, a specific duty of thirty cents per bushel and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
38. Vegetables not elsewhere specified, including sweet potatoes, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
39. Watch actions or movements, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
40. All fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca goat or other like animals, viz.:—Blankets, flannels, cloths, doeskins, cassimers, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, felt cloths, horse collar cloth, alpacas, Italian cloths, cobourgs, merinos, and all similar fabrics, not otherwise provided for, also manufactures composed of same materials, viz.:—Yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn, and knitted goods, viz.:—Shirts and drawers and hosiery, not elsewhere specified, a specific duty of seven and a-half cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
41. Barrels containing pork or other salted meats, a specific duty of twenty-five cents each.
42. British gum, dressing, sizing cream and enamel sizing, a specific duty of one cent per pound.
43. Collars of cotton or linen a specific duty of twenty-four cents per dozen, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
44. Cuffs of cotton or linen, a specific duty of four cents per pair and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
45. Gas meters, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
46. Glue, sheet, broken sheet and ground, a specific duty of three cents per pound.
47. Mucilage, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
48. Newspapers, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
49. Photographic dry plates, a specific duty of fifteen cents per square foot.
50. Shirts, of cotton or linen, a specific duty of one dollar per dozen and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
51. Veneers of wood, sawn only, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
52. Colored fabrics, woven or dyed or colored cotton yarn, or part jute and part cotton yarns, or other material, except silk, not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
53. Fertilizers, artificial, of all kinds, a specific duty of six dollars per ton.
54. Macaroni and vermicelli, a specific duty of two cents per pound.
55. Oranges and lemons, in boxes of capacity not exceeding two and one-half cubic feet, twenty-five cents per box; in one-half boxes capacity not exceeding one and one-fourth cubic feet, thirteen cents per half box; in cases and all other packages ten cents per cubic foot holding capacity; in bulk, one dollar and sixty cents per one thousand oranges or lemons; in barrels not exceeding in capacity that of the one hundred and ninety-six pounds flour barrel, fifty-five cents per barrel.
56. Paper, tarred, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound.
57. Spectacles and eye glasses, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
- 57a. Parts of spectacles and eye glasses, unfinished, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
58. Moss, Iceland, and other mosses, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
59. Axes—chopping axes, a specific duty of two dollars per dozen and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
70. Broad and ship axes, adzes, and hammers weighing ten pounds and over, a specific duty of three dollars per dozen and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
61. All other axes, hatchets, hammers, hay knives and 4 and 5 pronged forks of all kinds, a specific duty of two dollars per dozen and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
62. Hoes, garden rakes, 2 and 3 pronged forks of all kinds, picks and mattocks, a specific duty of one dollar per dozen and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
63. Shovels and spades, a specific duty of one dollar per dozen and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
64. Mowing machines, self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, binding attachments, reapers, sulky and walking ploughs, and all other agricultural machines and implements not otherwise provided for, thirty five per cent. *ad valorem*.
65. Grape vines costing twenty cents and less, five cents each.
66. Gooseberry bushes, two cents each.
67. Raspberry and blackberry bushes, one cent each.
68. Peach trees, four cents each.
69. Rosebushes, five cents per plant.
70. Seedling stock for grafting, viz.:—Plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
71. Manufactures of iron and steel, viz.:—Wrought iron, scrap iron and scrap steel being waste or refuse wrought iron or steel that has been in actual use and is fit only to be re-manufactured, two dollars per ton.
72. Ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, speigel, steel bloom ends, and crop ends of steel rails, for the manufacture of steel, two dollars per ton.
73. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge and cast scrap iron, four dollars per ton.
74. Iron in slabs, blooms, loops, puddle bars, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, nine dollars per ton.
75. (a) Bar iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than one inch wide, nor less than three-eighths of one inch thick, eleven dollars per ton.
76. (b) Comprising round iron not less than three-fourths of one inch in diameter, and square iron not less than three-fourths of one inch square, thirteen dollars per ton.
77. (c) Comprising flats less than one inch or less than three-eighths of one inch thick, round iron less than three-fourths of one inch, and not less than seven-sixteenths of one inch square, fifteen dollars per ton.
78. Rolled round iron in coils or rods less than seven-sixteenths of one inch in diameter, and bars and shapes of rolled iron, not elsewhere provided for, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
79. Iron or steel rolled round wire rods under half an inch in diameter when imported by wire manufacturers for use in their factories, five per cent. *ad valorem*.
80. Iron and steel wire, galvanized or not, smaller than number five gauge and not smaller than number fifteen gauge, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
81. Wire of spring steel, coppered or tinned, number nine gauge or smaller, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
82. (a) Boiler or other plate iron, sheared or unsheared, skelp iron, sheared or rolled in grooves, and sheet iron, common or black, not thinner than number twenty gauge, not elsewhere specified, ten dollars per ton.
83. (b) Sheet iron, common or black, smoothed or polished, and coated or galvanized, thinner than number twenty gauge Canada plates and boiler plate of iron or steel not less than thirty inches wide, and valued at not less than one and a-half cents per pound, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
84. (a) Hoop or band or scroll or other iron, eight inches or less in width and not thinner than number twenty gauge, thirteen dollars per ton.
85. (b) Hoop or band or scroll or other iron, eight inches or less in width and thinner than number twenty gauge, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
86. Iron railway bars, steel T rails weighing not over twenty-five pounds per lineal yard, iron or steel flat rails punched and iron or steel railway fish plates, nine dollars per ton.
87. Rolled channels and angle and T iron, and rolled eyebar blanks made by the Kloman process, when imported by manufacturers of bridges for use exclusively in their own manufactures, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
88. Iron bridges and structural iron work, twenty-five dollars per ton, provided that the duty shall not be less than thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
89. Forgings of iron and steel, or forged iron of whatever shape or in whatever stage of manufacture, not elsewhere specified, thirty dollars per ton, provided that the duty shall not be less than thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
90. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, by whatever process made, billets and bars, bands, hoops, strips and sheets of all gauges and widths, all of above classes of steel not elsewhere provided for valued at four cents or less per pound, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*, but not less than ten dollars per ton.
91. When of greater value than four cents per pound, twelve and a half per cent. *ad valorem*.
92. Steel not specially enumerated or provided for, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*
93. Provided that on all iron or steel bars, rods, strips or steel sheets, of whatever shape, and on all iron or steel bars of irregular shape or section, cold rolled, cold hammered or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-sixth of one cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the said materials.
94. Provided further, that all metal produced from iron or its ores, which is cast and malleable, of whatever description of form, without regard to the percentage of carbon contained therein, whether produced by cementation, or converted, cast, or made from iron or its ores by the crucible, Bessemer, pneumatic, Thomas Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin or open hearth process,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

or by the equivalent of either, or by the combination of two or more of the processes, or their equivalents, or by any fusion or other process which produces from iron or its ores, a metal either granulous or fibrous in structure, which is cast and malleable, except what is known as malleable iron castings, shall be classed and denominated as steel.

And provided further that all articles rated as iron or manufacture of iron, shall be chargeable with the same rate of duty if made of steel, or of steel and iron combined, unless otherwise specially provided for.

95. Malleable iron castings, and steel castings not elsewhere specified, twenty-five dollars per ton, provided the duty shall not be less than thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
96. Cast iron vessels, plates, stone plates and irons, sad irons, hatters' irons, tailors' iron and castings of iron not elsewhere specified, sixteen dollars per ton, provided the duty shall not be less than thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
97. Cast iron pipe of every description, twelve dollars per ton.
98. Iron or steel axles, parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks or forgings for axles without reference to the stage of manufacture, thirty dollars per ton, but not less than thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
99. Engines, boilers and machinery, viz:—
(a) Fire engines, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
(b) Locomotives and other steam engines, boilers and machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
101. Portable machines, portable steam engines, threshers and separators, horse powers, portable saw mills and planing mills and parts thereof in any stage of manufacture, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
102. Locomotive tires of Bessemer steel in the rough, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
103. (a) Boiler tubes or flues or stays of wrought iron or steel, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
104. (b) Wrought iron tubing, plain, not threaded, coupled or otherwise manufactured, over two inches in diameter, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
105. (c) Other wrought iron or steel tubes or pipes, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
106. Safes, doors for safes and vaults, scales, balances and weighing beams of iron or steel, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
107. Skates, twenty cents per pair and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
108. Wire rope of iron or steel, not otherwise provided for twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
109. Sledges, track tools, wedges and crowbars of iron or steel, one and one-quarter cent per pound and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
110. Hardware, viz.:—Builders', cabinet makers' and carriage hardware and locks, thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
111. Muskets, rifles and other firearms and surgical instruments, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
112. Nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, galvanized or not, and wrought iron or steel nuts and washers, and horse, mule or ox shoes, one and one-third cents per pound.
113. Horse shoe nails, hob nails and wire nails and all other wrought iron or steel nails, not elsewhere specified, two and one-half cents per pound.
114. Cut tacks, brads or sprigs not exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, two cents per thousand.
Exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, two cents per pound.
115. Iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without threads, or nuts or bolt blanks, and finished hinges or hinge blanks, one and two-third cents per pound.
116. Cut nails and spikes of iron or steel, one cent per pound.
117. Street railway bars or rails weighing not less than twenty-five pounds per lineal yard for purposes other than railway tracks, six dollars per ton.
118. Manufactures, articles or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
119. Labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionery and other goods, also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders, fifteen cents per pound and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
120. Printing presses of all kinds, folding machines and paper cutters ten per cent. *ad valorem*.

2. *Resolved*, That it is also expedient to repeal the following items in schedule "C" of the same Act, viz:—Nos. 532, 533, 549, 599, 639, 661, 691, 700, 767, 770, 797 and 803, and to enact as follows, viz.:—The undermentioned items shall be free of duty:—

1. Articles imported by and for the use of the Dominion Government or any of the Departments thereof or by and for the Senate or House of Commons, and the following articles when imported by and for the use of the army and navy, viz.:—Arms, military or naval clothing, musical instruments for bands, military stores and munitions of war.
2. Brick, fire.
3. Coal, anthracite.
4. Cotton yarns finer than No. 40, unbleached, bleached or dyed for use in the manufacture of Italian cloths, cotton, worsted or silk fabrics.
5. Gannister.
6. Gums, amber, arabic, Australian, copal, damar, mastic, sandarac, shellac and tragacanth.
7. Quills in their natural state or unflumed.
8. Steel rails, weighing not less than twenty-five pounds per lineal yard, for use in railway tracks.

9. Steel valued at two and one-half cents per pound and upwards for use in the manufacture of shates.

10. Scrap iron and scrap steel, old and fit only to be re-manufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Canada.

11. Steel bowls for cream separators. Steel for the manufacture of files, when imported by file manufacturers for use in their factories.

12. Veneers of ivory, sawn only.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal item No. 816 in schedule "E" of tariff of Customs duties, and to substitute the following in lieu thereof, viz:—

1. Shingle bolts of pine or cedar, and cedar logs capable of being made into shingle bolts, one dollar and fifty cents per cord of one hundred and twenty-eight cubic feet.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal section 8, chapter 33, 49 Victoria, Consolidated Statutes, and to enact the following in lieu thereof:—

Except in cases otherwise specially provided for in the schedule to the tariff, packages manufactured of glass, tin, iron, or other metals, crates, barrels or other packages containing earthenware, china, porcelain, crockery, glassware, glass or other brittle goods, cases containing bottled spirits, wines, malt liquors, or other bottled goods, together with all articles used as first receptacles or packages for goods of any kind in which such goods are packed for purposes of sale or not solely for exportation, except as hereinafter provided, shall be chargeable with the same rate of duty as the goods contained therein, if such duty be *ad valorem*; but if such duty be specific, or *ad valorem* and specific, or if when *ad valorem* alone, such named duty would be less than that to which such receptacles or packages would be liable under the tariff in force at the date of importation if they were imported empty, or if the goods therein be free of duty, then the duty shall be that to which such receptacles or packages would be liable if imported empty; but all other packages being the usual and ordinary ones in which goods are packed for exportation only, according to the general usage and customs of trade, shall be free of duty.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions, and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the 13th of May instant.

Sr RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman with great interest and attention. I am inclined to admit that, although there are one or two points to which I may have to take exception presently, the speech, and particularly the earlier part of it, was a judicious speech, and I rather admired the dexterity and rapidity with which the hon. gentleman glided over some very dangerous ground. Still, I must say that I experience a feeling of some considerable disappointment on this occasion. I know that the hon. gentleman is a man of capacity and of resolution, and I had hoped that, having been withdrawn from amongst us for a period of some years, and having had the opportunity of breathing a wholesomer and purer political atmosphere than has, perhaps, always prevailed in this Chamber—I say I had hoped that, when he returned to fill his present very responsible position, he would have recognised more clearly than he appears to have done the very dangerous position in which the finances of Canada now stand. Of course, I am aware that there is a certain amount of official optimism which it is incumbent on the Minister of Finance to observe; but I think those who have paid much attention to the financial position of Canada will agree with me that if you choose to read between the lines of the hon. gentleman's speech, you will see he is aware that there is a very considerable deal in our present position which might well awaken the most careless of us to serious apprehensions. The hon. gentleman on the present occasion appears to take, as might perhaps be expected, an exceedingly roseate view of the situation. In one place he states not merely that Canada is in an exceedingly prosperous position, but he goes on to say that the outlook for the future is all that we can desire. There is, it is true, one slight cloud which he perceives in the horizon, but even that has so decidedly a silver lining that I almost thought before the hon. gentleman had closed that he was about to propose that we should decree non-intercourse with the United States in order that thereby the cities of Montreal, Halifax, St. John and St. Andrew's—as to the exact whereabouts of which latter I am not as well informed as I might be—might astonish us by the rapid progress they would make if we could only get rid of

the necessity of carrying on trade with our American neighbors. Well, Sir, I cannot myself wholly agree with the hon. gentleman; nor can I quite agree with him in believing that a debt of something like \$270,000,000 gross, or \$225,000,000 net, is a bagatelle; or that two successive deficits, one of \$2,250,000 and another of \$5,835,000, are also the mere insignificant trifles that the hon. gentleman appears to consider them. Sir, I happen to be blessed, or cursed, as the case may be, with an exceedingly retentive memory, and I can very well remember how the hon. gentleman in days gone by, used to look on deficits, not of \$5,800,000, but of \$1,400,000, and even \$1,100,000. I am not going to go back over those old speeches which the hon. gentleman used to deliver from this side of the House, but I think his own conscience must tell him that in those days he did not regard the existence of a deficit of \$5,800,000 or even \$2,250,000, as at all a trifling thing. On the contrary, I recollect very well his informing this House from this very place that the existence of such deficits was an unanswerable proof of the utter incompetency of the Ministry of the day, and especially of the Finance Minister thereof. Sir, we on this side of the House know too well the flights of imagination in which the hon. gentleman was accustomed to indulge in in old days. He has been emphatically a Minister of great expectations; and if we are not able to-night to lend as ready a credence as we could desire to those rosy pictures which he has evolved from the depths of his inner consciousness, he must pardon us if we recall former feats which have left a little doubt upon our minds. His great zeal for the welfare of his country causes him to slightly exaggerate the benefits which he expects to flow from the measure he proposes. The House will recollect very well that not merely the hon. Minister of Finance, but the First Minister, declared again and again, in tones very much louder than the hon. gentleman has used in depicting the great wealth that is to flow from the new taxes he is about to put on—declared, not once, but a hundred, I might almost say a thousand times—that if there was one thing more than another that the people of Canada might rest assured of, it was that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not cost them one cent. I recollect, when the hon. gentleman brought down, as Minister of Railways, his project for granting very liberal subsidies and unheard of exemptions and privileges to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the leading argument the hon. gentleman then used was this, that it was infinitely better for us to be so generous and liberal, because thereby the bargain would be absolutely final, and we would never again have the Canadian Pacific Railway applying to us for one farthing. I recollect perfectly well, when the hon. gentleman was carrying that measure through the House, that he and his colleague beside him assured us, proved to us, and gave us minute details, to which I can refer, if necessary, that we were certain to realise, either in cash or in good mortgages, \$70,000,000 from land sales by the year 1891. I recollect at a latter day, when he saw fit to modify that statement, how he laid on the Table a report from a responsible officer in the Department, by which he showed conclusively that \$58,000,000 would be realised from these same sales by 1890. I can recollect—and it has certainly some pertinency on the present occasion—how the hon. gentleman, three or four years ago, showed us that we were certain to have very speedily an export of 640,000,000 bushels of wheat from Manitoba and the North-West Territories. I recollect his explaining to us how the National Policy was going to help our English trade and depress our trade with the United States; and I think he said something of the same kind to-night. Sir, I think it will aid us considerably in estimating the exact value of the promises we have just been listening to, to show how those statements, then made in so authoritative a fashion by the hon. gentleman, have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

corresponded with the facts. I have here a document to which I must pay profound respect, because it is the Public Accounts of the Dominion of Canada, laid on the Table of the House by the hon. gentleman himself; and I perceive that up to date the railway that was not to cost the people of Canada one dollar stands in our books for a little more than \$71,000,000, for which we have not received as yet, that I know of, one cent. I have not at the moment time to dwell on the remarkable calculation by which the hon. gentleman wishes to reduce this by \$10,000,000, alleging that we have got back land which we, on this side of the House, estimated as likely to bring \$2, \$3 or \$4 an acre. Sir, it would have been possible, I believe, that the land, under a wise railway policy, a wise system of settlement, and a wise administration of the North-West, might have been worth its \$2, \$3 or \$4 an acre; but I regret to say that the policy and administration of hon. gentlemen opposite have so injured and damaged the whole prospects of that country that I fear the six or seven million acres which we have received are, for all practical purposes, thanks not to any depreciation of the intrinsic value of land, but thanks to the manipulation of those gentlemen, of no present value to us whatever. I recollect when these hon. gentlemen assured us in 1881 that their bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway was absolutely final; I also recollect when the same hon. gentlemen in 1882 came down to us with an important modification which they declared was absolutely finally final, as my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) would say. I recollect in 1883 when there was another absolutely finally, finally, final settlement, and in 1884 when there was another absolutely finally, finally, finally, final settlement, and again in 1885 and in 1886 we had other absolutely finally final settlements; and I should like to know whether 1887 will pass by without another of those finally final settlements. But I do not want to ask too much from the hon. gentleman. I know that in regard to this matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are not altogether free agents. I know that their position with respect to that company is rather like that of the English Light Brigade at Balaclava:—

“ Their's not to reason why,
Their's but to do or die.”

I think there is an hon. gentleman in this House who might tell us whether this settlement in 1886 was really a finally final settlement—an hon. gentleman who knows, and has shown that he knows, a very great deal about the Finance Minister and about the First Minister too. If that hon. gentleman would only confirm the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, and advise us that the settlement of 1886 is to be really a finally final settlement, I and a great many ratepayers of Canada will receive his assurance with great satisfaction. Here are the hon. gentleman's statements recorded in *Hansard*, whereby first, the Premier, and then the Finance Minister, have shown us we are to receive \$53,000,000, at the lowest calculation, by the first of January, 1891, as receipts from the land sales to be made in the North-West. I turn again to this valuable volume of the Public Accounts, and I see that up to date, after deducting expenses, our receipts from the land sales in the North-West are stated to be just \$1,200,000 worse than nothing. The hon. the Finance Minister and the right hon. the First Minister will observe that there are 44 calendar months between the first of May, 1887, and the first of January, 1891, at which their promissory note becomes due; and therefore, although I stand corrected if I make an error in the calculation, if to the \$53,000,000 to be gained we are to add the \$1,200,000 which we are out of pocket now, we will require to net from the land sales in the North-West \$1,345,454 per month for each of these 44 months, or else the hon. gentlemen will stand convicted of having carried important measures through this House by means of promises which they are wholly unable

to redeem. I may remind the House that the hon. the Finance Minister, not content with promising us \$53,000,000 from sales of land in the North-West, also promised us a production in that country of 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or equal, at a rough calculation, to 20,000,000 tons; enough to load 2,000,000 cars of ordinary capacity, equal to 100,000 train loads; enough to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway drawing train loads of wheat at the rate of one every five minutes, day and night, during the whole 365 days in the year. I do not object to a little miscalculation; I admit these estimates may be regarded as a little roughly made; and if the Finance Minister was only, say 1,000 per cent. wrong, and if instead of 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, we got, say 64,000,000 from the North-West, I would say that was near enough for practical purposes in his case. But I fear extremely, although I wish with all my heart it was otherwise, that throughout Manitoba and the North-West the total production of wheat would hardly equal 5,000,000 bushels, and I submit that is a little too great a discount on 640,000,000. Added to which, I have my doubts, looking at the Governor General's warrants which were laid on the Table the other day, and in which I was sorry to see a grant of \$140,000 for seed grain for settlers in this very Territory, whether the hon. gentleman has fully considered the difficulties which attend the production of 640,000,000 bushels of wheat in Manitoba and the North-West. Now, the hon. gentleman thinks, and no doubt desires, that our National Policy should increase our trade with the Mother Country and diminish our trade with the United States, and here let me say that in the calculations which are submitted to us, and which I hold in my hand, the hon. gentleman appears to me to have overlooked the important fact, in speaking of our trade with the United States prior to 1879, that an immense proportion of what is put down as entered for consumption, is, really, simply goods *in transitu*, under the old system of keeping accounts. It needs merely to look at our Trade and Navigation Returns to see that no fair comparison can be made. But if you make proper allowance for this and then compare, on the basis the hon. gentleman has adopted, our trade with Great Britain during the last thirteen or fourteen years with our trade with the United States, you will see some rather remarkable proofs of how far this policy, be it good or bad, has increased our trade with Great Britain, and how far it has diminished our trade with the United States. In 1873 our imports from Great Britain were \$68,500,000; in 1886, thirteen years later, our imports from Great Britain were \$40,601,000. Thus, in thirteen years, our imports from Great Britain decreased no less than \$28,000,000. From the United States, we nominally imported \$47,500,000 in 1873, but at least \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 of that were goods *in transitu*, and our real imports from the United States thirteen years ago, exclusive of goods *in transitu*, were certainly not more than \$40,000,000. In 1886 our imports from the United States were \$41,853,000, so that while our imports from Great Britain in these thirteen years decreased \$28,000,000, our imports from the United States, if they are fairly estimated and due deduction made for goods *in transitu*, increased \$4,800,000. Now, that may be a proof of how much the National Policy is increasing our trade with Great Britain and diminishing it with the United States, but it is proof of a remarkable description. Similarly, we find that while we exported to Great Britain \$38,750,000 in 1873, we now export \$41,542,000, being an increase of \$3,000,000. In 1873 we exported to the United States \$42,000,000, and in 1886, \$36,500,000. So that we have improved our trade relations with the Mother Country by selling to them \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 more, and by selling to the United States about \$6,000,000 less, while we are buying \$28,000,000 less from England and \$5,000,000 more from the United States. Those are the figures taken from the hon. gentleman's own official return,

which he will hardly pretend to dispute, and they hardly appear to me to bear out the statement which he has made, that one of the results of his policy has been to increase our trade with the Mother Country. The hon. gentlemen opposite and their press have complained, and perhaps with reason, that I have not always exhibited that implicit credence in their statements—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman to inform the House in what part of my speech I referred to that subject at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I heard the hon. gentleman refer to the increase which has taken place. I took down the words, and I have heard him on several other occasions refer to the same thing, and, what is more, I observe that he referred to it in one of his speeches at St. John the other day. Of course, that was an election speech, and, perhaps, should not be brought in here. It is true that to-day the hon. gentleman did not say very much about it, because this has been up before. The hon. gentleman is not a novice in this matter; he has been for a round dozen of years engaging in debate on this subject on Budget nights, and he has probably had that subject threshed out of him, but, notwithstanding that, he alluded to the matter to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, he did not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, if the hon. gentleman says he did not, and if he says the result of his policy has not been to increase trade with Great Britain but rather with the United States—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that I did not refer to the question at all or make a single reference to it in my speech to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course I cannot expect the hon. gentleman to remember all that he said in a five-hour speech. However, we will put aside the question of the English trade. The facts are as I state them, and he cannot deny the facts as I state them. I call his attention, and I also call the attention of the House, to this circumstance. The hon. gentleman objects to that subject. We will give him the benefit of the objection. We will say no more of the manner in which the National Policy has helped the English trade. But, as to the other four predictions of his to which I alluded, the hon. gentleman has not ventured to contradict me at all. Now I think that the hon. gentleman, under these circumstances, cannot complain if I warn the House that his fervent zeal, his fervent desire to make the best of everything, for the interest of the country, no doubt, has occasionally in past times led him into miscalculations, and there is some considerable danger that those miscalculations may be repeated on the present occasion. With respect to the Budget the hon. gentleman has brought down, with reference to the Estimates the hon. gentleman has placed in our hands, allow me to recall to the hon. gentleman's mind this slightly significant fact that, ever since 1873, during all the time that the hon. gentleman and his friends have been in office, in 1873, in 1879, in 1880, and thence onward to the present moment, the hon. gentlemen have never once laid a Budget on the Table of this House, they never have once given an original estimate to the committee of this House which estimate has not been very largely exceeded by the actual expenditure. The hon. gentleman, or rather the hon. gentleman's predecessor, as I very well remember, in 1873, brought down an original estimate of \$20,000,000, and, when I came into office, I found he had taken authority in one way or another to expend \$23,685,000, and the actual expenditure was \$23,316,000. In 1879, those hon. gentlemen presented an original estimate of \$23,427,000; their actual

expenditure was \$24,850,000, or nearly one million and a half more than their original estimate. In 1881, they presented an original estimate of \$25,007,000; their actual expenditure was \$25,502,000. In 1882, their original estimate was \$26,189,000; their actual expenditure was \$27,067,000. In 1883, their original estimate was \$27,305,000; their actual expenditure was \$28,730,000, a million and a half more than their original estimate. In 1884, their original estimate was \$29,961,000; their actual expenditure was \$31,107,000, nearly a million and a quarter more than their original estimate. In 1885, their original estimate was \$29,811,000; their actual expenditure was \$35,037,000, which, deducting a million and three-quarters for war charges, leaves the amount by which they exceeded their original estimate three and a quarter millions. In 1886, they presented an original estimate of thirty-one and three-quarter millions; their actual expenditure was \$39,011,000, which, deducting three millions and a-quarter for war expenses, shows that they exceeded their original estimate by four millions and a-quarter. In this year of 1887 the original estimate appears to have been about thirty-three millions and a-quarter, and the hon. gentleman himself admitted in the statement I have before me that he expected the expenditure to go up to \$35,600,000, and that, after deducting and charging to capital account \$200,000 or \$300,000 for war expenses. I do not think under those circumstances, that the hon. gentleman or his friends can complain of me, when, during every year that they have been in office, from 1873 to the present time, their original estimates have been largely below the sums actually expended, if I express my doubts whether the thirty-five millions which the hon. gentleman says he expects to expend in the next year will not be very largely exceeded. There are one or two other points in connection with that matter to which I will call the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman brings down an estimate of \$35,041,000 charged to income, but when I turn to his expenditure on capital account, I find that \$330,500 is there charged to capital account for rolling stock and service ties, whatever they may be. I hold that we have most grossly abused the practice of charging to capital account a vast number of matters, of which these are part, which ought assuredly to go to ordinary expenditure, and I say that in that respect you ought undoubtedly to draw the line, you ought not on any account whatever to charge perishable articles like rolling stock, many years after the road has been completed, to capital account. It is bad enough to charge every coal shed and every trifling expenditure along the line of the Inter-colonial Railway to capital account, but the putting of this rolling stock and other matters of that kind to capital account is, I hold, a distinct abuse, and it is one to which I have not unfrequently called the attention of the House on previous occasions. I shall be very glad if the hon. gentleman can keep down the expenditure on Mounted Police and Indians to the figures he has given, but, when I turn to the Public Accounts and see that in a long series of years, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886, the expenditure for Indians has never been less than \$1,100,000, and when I look at the Governor General's warrants which were laid on the Table of this House a few days ago, and see that even while the House was sitting the Government thought themselves obliged to use this mode of obtaining \$189,000 above the whole vote of last year for the service of Indians, I, for one, entertain very grave doubts whether, if we live to meet again another year, we will not find, in one shape or another, a similar state of things, and further grants of a couple of hundred thousand dollars for this purpose. The hon. gentleman himself practically admitted that he expected a large addition on the score of public works, not, as I understood, so much because he was afraid of his colleague as he was afraid of the gentlemen who support his

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

colleagues, and who, I suspect, will not be willing to be put off with the very meagre allowance the hon. gentleman proposes to confine them to in the present Estimates. Then I doubt for my part whether the hon. gentleman will find, judging from past experience, judging from the details which are now given us, that \$200,000 are enough to operate the Franchise Bill; and as the hon. gentleman craves suggestions how to reduce the public expenditure and promote the public good, here are \$200,000 in these Estimates which are used for no earthly purpose under Heaven, except to do public mischief, and which may be saved with the greatest possible advantage. The hon. gentleman admitted that, over and above his estimates, about \$200,000, if I understood him aright, would be required for steamship subsidies in connection with the Pacific and in connection with the Atlantic routes, and perhaps a little more on account of some other route to the West Indies, as to which he did not give us particulars. We have on the Table of this House propositions involving a further expenditure of \$30,000 at least, one way or another, for the creation of certain new offices, new Ministers who are to be appointed. We know that the Government are obliged to grant a subsidy of \$20,000 to the Island of Prince Edward; so I think if the hon. gentleman will look carefully at the expenses which have been incurred in former years, and would revise the Estimates a little, he must estimate the expenditure at \$36,000,000; nay, I fear this is probably far less than he will expend for the service of the year which we are shortly to enter. Now, Sir, before we proceed seriously to consider this Budget, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he will venture to pledge himself that he will not be obliged to bring down Supplementary Estimates before we part on this occasion, to the tune of half a million or more, whether there are no considerable charges on capital account to be sprung upon us in the last days of the Session as they have been many times before, or whether, perchance, in spite of the hon. gentleman's protestations to the contrary—although I have no doubt but that he felt as I did, it was a scandalous abuse of power not intended to be made use of for such purposes—whether all these deficiencies are not to be covered up again by a couple of millions more of Governor General's warrants. Sir, I must call the attention of the House to the fact that according to declarations made in the press, according to declarations made on the floor of this House, there are a considerable number of obligations to which the hon. gentleman did not draw our attention on the present occasion, but which he and his colleagues will have to implement in one way or another before the House rises, in the shape of subsidies to various railway enterprises in Nova Scotia, Quebec and other parts of the Dominion, where it was thought that judicious expenditures of money might do good on a recent critical occasion. Anyhow, I will call the attention of the House to a certain statement made a few days ago by responsible heads of Departments. I was informed by the Minister of Railways that contracts had been entered into to the amount of \$3,268,000, forming a further charge on capital account. Whether they are to be all implemented within the current year, I do not know, but they undoubtedly will form an addition to our future liabilities. He also informed us that \$2,000,000 would be required for our canals, and about \$600,000 for further public works. We see that we are to spend a million or so besides on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal; we have resolutions on the Table of the House involving an expenditure of a million and a quarter, by way of first instalment on some of those Nova Scotian railways for which the hon. gentleman made himself responsible a few months ago. We have annual charges which I may capitalise at about \$4,000,000 roughly. So that, so to speak, over and above the present gross debt, here are nearly \$12,250,000 of admitted additional charges on capital account which are actually in sight, not to speak

of vast multitudes of others which hon. gentlemen will find themselves compelled to submit to if these are carried out as they propose. Sir, the hon. gentleman has prepared, at great pains and with great care, a most interesting series of diagrams in which he sets forth a number of valuable and interesting facts affecting the present condition of Canada, which diagrams are now, I believe, in the hands of all hon. gentlemen here present. But it appears to me that other diagrams are called for to make this as complete as it ought to be, and to serve as useful appendices to the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. I have looked through it as carefully as my time permitted, but I can see here no diagram of the increase of debt for the last twenty years. I see here no diagram of the increase of taxes. I miss the diagram of the increase of expenditure. I miss most of all the diagram of the increase of prices of farmers' produce which was to be one of the most permanent results of the blessed and beneficent National Policy announced by these hon. gentlemen some half dozen years ago. I miss that most interesting diagram which, I think, ought not to be omitted, showing the rapidity with which settlement has been going on in Manitoba and the North-West during the last half dozen years, as compared with the adjacent State of Dakota, and as compared with the statement of the First Minister and the hon. gentleman, and, thirdly, as compared with the official statements of our own Department of Immigration. Add these five diagrams and I think I may venture to say that the series of the hon. gentleman will be tolerably complete. Now, I am not disposed to take much exception to the statement which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us as to the estimated income of the present year. It is possible that may be attained, although I fear that, as has happened heretofore, the actual expenditure will outgo his calculations. But I do object to charging even a small sum, even two or three hundred thousand dollars of the war expenses to capital account. I think that is a very serious error on the hon. gentleman's part, and as his predecessor set him, in that respect, an excellent example by honestly charging the war expenditures to the ordinary Consolidated Fund outgoings, I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider his determination and will charge that matter, as it ought to be charged, to the ordinary expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has not the war expenditure all gone to capital account?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, not according to the Public Accounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do not deficits go to capital account? I ask the hon. gentleman where all his deficits are? They are all in capital account, they are all in the increased debt of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, but you have no right to charge them to capital account as an asset of this Dominion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you have not a surplus, you have a deficit, and where does it go? There is no revenue to meet it, and it goes to capital account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have got to borrow money, it may be, to pay it, to pay for your deficit of two millions and a quarter of two years ago, to pay your deficit of six millions last year and your probable deficit of a million dollars this year. But that does not entitle you to consider it an asset, and that is the point at issue when you put it to capital account. Here is the hon. gentleman's statement, here are the comparative statements of expenditures charged to Consolidated Fund, and in these statements charged to Consolidated Fund he will find the whole of these war expenditures. There are his own Public Accounts laid by himself on the Table. If he disputes their authority I have no

more to say, except that those accounts were most properly kept by his predecessor, and that the amount now in question should again be charged to the Consolidated Fund as were the five or six millions previously. But, as I have said, I am not going to dispute with him as to his probable estimate, I think it not unlikely that the sums mentioned may be received. I hope, at any rate, it may prove to be the case, and that the hon. gentleman may receive, in 1888, an equal sum; and to that I take no exception. I noticed, however, that the hon. gentleman took credit for himself for the reduced immigration vote, and he hoped he would produce a better result with that smaller sum than by the expenditure of the larger amount. And I will make him a suggestion: if he wiped out that amount altogether, a better result, in my judgment, would be produced than by the immigration expenditure for many years, because it has been most disastrous to this country. I know no greater abuse than the way in which the taxation of the people has been misused for bringing persons into the country, who if they obtained a living here at all, did so by driving out honest Canadians of much longer standing than themselves, who are compelled to seek their fortunes in a foreign land. And, therefore, I make the hon. gentleman a second suggestion, if he wishes it, that would enable him to save half a million by wiping out the atrocious vote for the Franchise Act, and the almost equally atrocious vote for immigration expenses, as that service is at present conducted. The hon. gentleman, I observed, in explaining to us the great advantage we had received from the reduction of our claim on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from thirty millions to twenty millions, was good enough to tell us that the company had a yet further claim upon us because they had to borrow money at five per cent. to pay us money for which they were only obliged to pay us four per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. I made no such intimation that they had any claim, it was a distinct bargain between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government. I recognise the fact that although they had paid one dollar and fifty cents per acre they had not received it, and I explained why. They had no claim, and I deny they have a claim for a further dollar.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the hon. gentleman will keep in that mind. The hon. gentleman stated, however, that we should keep under consideration the fact that they have to float loans at five per cent, while all we required was four per cent. Those who recollect the original transaction, will recollect that the hon. gentleman and his predecessor insisted on the excellence of the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company because the original contract called for the payment of five per cent. which the Government afterwards reduced to four per cent. I agree with the hon. gentleman on one point: I think we were very lucky to get the twenty millions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But I do not think the hon. gentleman was altogether wise in dwelling so very much upon that matter, because I observe that the hon. gentleman when acting as the principal instrument in negotiating the thirty million loan was good enough to state:

"I say there is no intelligent man who will say, in the first place, that there is a shadow of ground for supposing that every dollar of this principal or this interest will not be returned and repaid into the coffers of Canada."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So it was, and better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can say that if the hon. gentleman remains Minister of Finance very long,

and does not return to that sumptuous residence in London to which he casts a longing eye, he will be very glad to exchange the six millions of acres for ten millions of dollars in hard cash. The hon. gentleman also told us, and that is a point on which I shall have to enlarge later on, that he was always glad to see the Minister of Railways making an additional charge to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway; and, as between them, he and his colleague have added ten millions to the capital account of the Intercolonial since my friend Mr. Mackenzie presided over it, their cause for gladness must be great. And when the hon. gentleman boasts that the business of the road has doubled since 1876, I have to say that I should be glad to hear it were I not aware that the annual loss has trebled since 1876, if you take into account the interest on the money we have expended since that time and add it to the present deficit on the working of that road. It is a most remarkable proof of progress and shows, I must say, very creditable management indeed that as fast as the business increases, or in an even more rapid ratio, the deficit on the working of the road increases. If that be a proof of progress, all I can is that in the interest of the rest of the Dominion, I should have been very glad if it had remained where it stood. Now, with respect to one important question which the hon. gentleman raised. With respect to the proof the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table of the advancement in material wealth of the people of this country, I am not disposed, and never have been disposed, either to say or to believe that four millions and a-half of intelligent Canadians, inhabiting a country which possesses very considerable resources as yet but very partially developed, would continue to toil from year to year without accumulating some wealth, at all events in the hands of some portion of them. But I can tell the hon. gentleman this, that if you consider carefully what those tables show, you will find that to a very great extent they represent rather a displacement of wealth than an increase of it, taking the whole population through. The hon. gentleman made a great point of the increase of the accumulations in the savings banks. But the hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House that there has been an enormous fall in the rate of interest; that the Government to-day are paying at least 33 per cent. for the deposits they receive in the savings banks more than depositors could obtain in any bank of decent standing in the Dominion. If I had granted a proportionately increased interest in 1876-77, if when the Canadian banks were paying 4 and 5 per cent. on deposits, I had gone one better and offered 6 per cent., I could have had as many millions as I could have desired. The hon. gentleman is aware that the banks are only offering 3 per cent., and that he is able to bring in considerable deposits only by offering 4 per cent., at least 33 per cent. more than the current rate on the open market. I do not object, and I was careful to guard myself against the allegation that I did, to any reasonable encouragement being afforded to the poorer portion of those depositors. But the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman's colleagues know right well the bulk of the deposits as to quantity are not held by persons for whom the rest of the community ought to be taxed, but that the bulk is held in large sums by persons as well able as the hon. gentleman or any member of this House to dispense with more than a fair interest on their money. We had all those accounts brought down to us a few years ago, and we found that in the case of one of the Departments—I forget whether it was the Post Office or the Government Savings Banks—one-half was held in sums of, I believe, over \$2,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that I am correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I mean that I object to that system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All we object to was the abuse of the system for that purpose. We are quite as willing as the hon. gentleman that moderate sums of money which may be fairly considered to represent the earnings of the poor, may receive a little extra interest; and I agree to it for this reason, that I hold that the present system of taxation presses exceedingly heavily on those persons, and therefore I am willing to go a little out of the way to indemnify them in some small degree. But what I objected to then, what I object to now, and what I am glad the hon. gentleman agrees with me in objecting to, is the gross abuse of having large sums of money put in the hands of the Government at rates largely exceeding the current value of the day. I was glad to hear—I had noticed it myself—that the price of our securities at three and a half per cent. had come up to par. That is a very fortunate circumstance for us, particularly looking at our present enormous indebtedness. But I would remark to the House, without in the smallest degree designing to discredit any operations which may have been recently conducted in London, that all that is proved by that is simply the well known fact, that in the last few years there has been a very great fall in the interest of money all over the world. I recollect perfectly well—and I think the hon. gentleman if he chooses to look back can verify the fact—that on the occasion of the very last loan I made myself in London in 1876, I was able to obtain as good a price for our Canadian 4 per cents as the Americans were able to obtain for their four and a half per cents, that same day and hour, on the London market, and I do not think that the credit of Canada, relatively to those securities, has advanced in any material degree since then.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is not the hon. gentleman aware, if he is in the habit of looking at the *Economist* or any of these other papers that give the prices of stock in London, that a few years ago New South Wales was leading our four and a half per cents while we are leading them to-day?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware of that, but I think the United States is a better comparison for us than New South Wales. I say that if you want to compare the value of North American securities, you had better take the North American States, and not travel to the other side of the world for that purpose. Sir, I was rather astonished to hear the hon. gentleman, in alluding to the enormous value of the Canadian Pacific Railway, spoke of the value which it was to us in the late insurrection, and tell us we could have afforded to give thirty millions of dollars as a free gift to it, by reason of the service it was to us in putting down that insurrection. Sir, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman and his colleagues that it would have been better never to have so administered the North-West as to have had an insurrection, and that I cannot admit that it is much proof of the wisdom of their policy that, by their misconduct, they should first provoke these unfortunate Matis to rebel, and that then they should turn around and say that it is a proof of their great foresight, that foreseeing this rebellion and foreseeing their own misconduct—and they might easily foresee that it would have produced a rebellion—they constructed the railway in time to aid in suppressing the rebellion which they themselves produced.

Mr. MILLS. Would it not be well to adjourn the debate, as we are not likely to close it to-night?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) desires it we will adjourn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be better, as it would not be courteous to the Minister o

Finance to answer a five hours' speech of his in an hour and a-half, and it would be cruel to members on both sides of the House to inflict three financial speeches on them in one day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will adjourn the debate then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And take it up to-morrow?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to go into committee and pass the resolutions, with the understanding that the discussion takes place precisely as if the Speaker were in the Chair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well, then, the first thing to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I willingly accept the suggestion. I suppose that any criticism on the resolutions had better be deferred. We can pass them *en bloc* now and reserve the discussion on details.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will they be printed in the Votes and Proceedings?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No human being can understand them merely by hearing them read.

House resolved itself into Committee on the resolutions,

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved:

That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs on the articles therein mentioned shall take effect on and after the 13th May, instant.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions adopted and ordered to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved:

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended until Monday, 30th May instant, and the time for presenting Private Bills until Monday, 6th June next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McNEILL. I beg leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will have to give notice of that, as it is a public Bill.

Mr. McNEILL. I give notice now that I will move for leave to introduce this Bill.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Londonderry Iron Company.—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 85) to authorise and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 86) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 87) to revise and amend the charter of the Quebec and James' Bay Railway Company, and to extend the time for commencing and completing the railway of the said company.—(Mr. Grandbois.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Canadian Horse Insurance Company.—(Mr. Small.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means (May 12th) were reported and read the first time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved second reading of resolutions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is passed I desire to say a few words on the subject. When the House rose last night, I was occupied in pointing out that, much as I admired the Minister of Finance, I thought, bearing in mind certain predictions which he had made on former occasions in this House, and bearing in mind also the facts which the reports before us disclose as to the results of those predictions, I thought that the House would do well on the whole to receive the hon. gentleman's statements with some degree of caution. I pointed out, also, that as regards the Estimates which were recently laid on the Table of this House, it would be scarcely prudent for us to expect that the Government could keep strictly within the bounds of their original Estimates, taking into consideration the fact to which I also called attention, that during the last eight or nine years I could find no single instance in which the original Estimates of the Government had not been exceeded in many cases by several million dollars; also, that with respect to the diagrams, interesting as they are, which the hon. gentleman had submitted to us, I feared that on examination it would be found that they contained several important omissions, and that without those omissions being supplied, it would be very difficult for us to acquiesce in the consequences which the hon. gentleman had deduced from them; also, I thought, Mr. Speaker, that some of the declarations made by the hon. gentleman were rather rash. I feared that, owing, no doubt, to his absence from this country, he had somewhat exaggerated the situation, when he spoke of Canada, as a whole, being at present in a condition of exceeding prosperity, and when he assured us that the future was all we could desire. The hon. gentleman in his speech saw one single cloud on our horizon, but he intimated that even that cloud had such a silver lining that on the whole he was rather inclined to think it would be to the advantage of the people of Canada if the American Government were to carry out their threats and non-intercourse was established between us and our greatest customer and neighbor. Also, Sir, although I recognise the patriotic sentiment which inspired the state

ment, I felt it was, perhaps, premature on the part of the Finance Minister to state positively in his place that our half of the continent was as good as that possessed by the Americans. And, as he has invited suggestions, and as it is clear from divers statements in the hon. gentleman's speech, that he was a brilliant success, as he mentioned several times, in his capacity of Lord High Commissioner to England, I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the Premier, that if he concurs in the view expressed by the Minister of Finance, it might be greatly for the advantage of Canada that the hon. gentleman should be sent as High Commissioner to Washington with full powers to negotiate a swop. I think that if the hon. gentleman be correct, that our half of this continent is as good as the American half, here is a fine opportunity, particularly bearing in mind that our territory is much the newer and more virgin of the two, of terminating some of the difficulties which have arisen between us and our American neighbors. But I doubt if I can agree with the statement which the hon. gentleman made, that the depression in the United States (I took down his words, and if I am wrong I shall be glad to be corrected) was as great in the years 1886 and 1885 as it was in the period between 1873 and 1878. As for the other statement which the hon. gentleman has volunteered, that the results of protection are to lead to a fall in prices, that we will obtain our goods as cheap as if we had no taxes on them at all; and also that he had no idea of the approaching elections till he landed in New York—they are, I must say, of a somewhat surprising character. It is due, no doubt, to the Minister of Finance to state that he advanced one very excellent reason indeed for his disbelief that a general election was about to take place. That hon. gentleman, who is known to have been always deep in the confidence of the Government and the First Minister, was perfectly well aware of the extraordinary exertions which had been put forward by the First Minister and his colleagues to defeat Mr. Mowat, and knowing, as he did know, that those exertions had wholly failed, that Mr. Mowat had been returned by an enormous majority, it was natural that so astute a politician as he is would have concluded that the probabilities were greatly against the right hon. gentleman's success. But, however astute the Minister of Finance undoubtedly is, he had forgotten one important factor in the situation, the revising barrister, and the fact that the list on which Mr. Mowat was elected was a very different, and, I may add, a very much fairer and honest list than that on which the hon. gentleman was elected. Sir, I also took occasion to intimate to the Finance Minister that I feared he was rather exaggerating the blessings likely to flow from the introduction of the multifarious taxes he proposed; that I feared in this, as on many other occasions, it would be found, if we relied too implicitly on his calculations, that we were following a will-o-the-wisp which might ultimately land us in a financial quagmire; and, briefly, I told him I could not agree with the statements he had made, more particularly as to the present position of this country. As I have already said, I am not disposed to dispute the fact that with four millions and a half of intelligent people, possessing a country with very considerable resources, it would be probable that from year to year, and much more over a long term of years, that there would be considerable progress in various directions. I am quite willing to agree with the Minister of Finance that there has been considerable progress, although much of it, in my judgment, has been partial and one-sided, and rather, as I intimated last night, in the nature of the displacement of wealth than of a general acquisition of wealth. I also pointed out that the evidences on which he relied were misleading and insufficient; that he had ignored very material and cardinal facts; that he had not shown that the rate of population was increasing as fast as we would wish; that the condition of the great producing classes was as prosperous as could be desired; that the

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

prices of our great staples were advancing or even holding their own; nor had he touched, except in the slightest possible way, upon our success in the settlement and development of the North-West Territories, which have cost Canada so much to acquire. And here allow me to say a few words as to one matter on which the hon. gentleman dwelt at very considerable length during the latter part of the evening, that is, the proposal for developing a great iron industry in the Dominion. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to tell us that the iron industry was necessary for the progress of all and every industry. Well, Sir, I think he is pretty correct, although I would probably attach a different meaning to that fact than he seems to attach to it; and I say that, being a prime necessary to a great many industries, it is not quite so statesmanlike, wise, or prudent, as he would have us believe, to provide for making that article more costly which is the raw material of a great many industries. Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the midst of all his enthusiasm, permits some important omissions, for I notice that he does not propose to tax the largest consumers of iron at all, the wealthy and powerful corporations which monopolise the railways of the country. They are to go scot free. My own wish is that, had it been consistent with his policy, he should have shown equal consideration to the host of minor industries, to the small and poor men throughout the country, on whom, as well as on the rural population, this tax will press, in my opinion, with extreme severity. However, I agree with the Minister of Finance that it would be better, on the whole, that we discuss this subject in committee, in ordinary fashion, when we will be able to obtain fuller information, on various matters of detail, from the hon. gentleman, and in particular, when we can learn how he expects to promote, as, if I understood him rightly, he does expect, a great export of charcoal iron from this country. To my mind, if we can produce charcoal iron for export at all, we could do it just as well in the past as we are likely to do by reason of anything the hon. gentleman proposes to do in that direction. But, Sir, I think it is time for us to examine our position as regards our financial future. I think that as this is a new House, as this is the twentieth year of our young Confederation, as many things which in former Sessions were matters of speculation have been proved clearly and conclusively from the public records to be facts now beyond doubt, it will serve an excellent purpose to consider calmly and deliberately where we have arrived, and what are the real prospects of this country in a financial point of view. I want to call attention, in the first place, to the amount of debt as stated by the Minister of Finance, and to the amount of deficits he has admitted. I want to call attention to our total expenditure, and the proportion which our fixed charges bear thereto, and also to the obligations admitted to have been incurred, and the consequences which are involved in those obligations. I want to call attention particularly to the state of our population; to the state of our exports; to the fall in the prices of a great many of our productions; to the success or non-success which has attended our efforts for the settlement of the North-West, and, lastly, to the claims which are now being made on the Dominion Treasury by the various Provinces, and by sections of the various Provinces, from one end of this Dominion to the other. And, in connection with all these, I may take occasion to observe how the results agree with some of the former assertions made by the hon. gentleman as to the importance of maintaining an exact balance of trade, as to the importance of diminishing the drain of gold which the hon. gentleman used in former years to speak of as a source of great injury to this country; how he has succeeded in promoting an influx of immigrants who have remained in this country, and how also he and his colleagues have succeeded in carrying out

those declarations of economy of which they used to be so profuse when they sat on this side of the House. In the first place I call attention to the present amount of our debt and the results we have to show for it. That is a point to which the hon. gentleman also called attention last night and it is a point on which I am afraid there will be some very considerable difference of opinion between himself and me. First of all, Sir, I call attention to the statement made in the Public Accounts, under date of the 1st of July, 1886, as to the exact net debt of this Dominion, which is there placed at a little more than \$223,000,000. Now, Sir, I think that if any one thing could show better than another the imperative necessity for complying with the recommendation of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and publishing these statements weekly or monthly, we will find it in the fact that although it must have been perfectly well known to the Minister of Finance and his Department as long ago as the 1st of July, 1886, that the net debt of Canada was \$223,000,000, it is, nevertheless, a most singular fact to which I call the attention of the House, that although this was known on the 1st of July last, during the eight months or thereabouts which intervened between the 1st of July and the 22nd of February, several important members of the Ministry did not appear to know that the net debt exceeded \$196,000,000. I respect official etiquette; I know that one Minister should not pry into another's Department; but just consider the position in which the hon. gentleman's return shows that these Ministers were placed by the unhappy reticence of his Department as to the amount of the debt. Here we have them stating all over the country, as appears in the published reports of their speeches, that the public debt was \$196,000,000, when, in point of fact it was \$223,000,000 on the 1st of July, or a difference of about \$28,000,000. It is very hard that those hon. gentlemen should not have been corrected in time to prevent their exposing such extreme ignorance of the real financial position of the country, as to go before the people, on the eve of a general election, and understate the public debt by nearly \$30,000,000. Now, Sir, we have got to see what that debt is and what we have got to show for it. As to the amount there is no dispute. But, Sir, when we come to consider what sort of properties we have, and what those properties are worth to us at the present moment, then I am afraid that the conclusions I am about to draw will hardly conform to those which were drawn by the hon. gentleman. He stated last night, if I understood him correctly, that the total cost of our canals and our Intercolonial Railway, with the sum we had expended for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for these buildings, was about \$163,000,000—in fact, I am not sure but I am understating it. However, Sir, I think we are both agreed in saying that after you deduct the Canadian Pacific Railway, the cost of the public works which the people of Canada now possess is about \$103,000,000. I need not tell the House that at this present moment we are not in the receipt of one cent of interest on the amount which those works have cost us. But it may interest the House to know what is the annual charge, as taken from the Public Accounts, of administering those works from year to year. I take last year, Sir, and I find it to be as follows: For public works under the head of railways and canals, charged to income, we expended \$81,450; under collection of revenues, \$191,000; and for operating railways and canals, \$3,339,000; and the two Departments of Railways and Canals and of Public Works cost us, with the Minister's salaries, \$110,000. So that our public works cost us, as by statement, \$3,728,000, and our total receipts amounted to \$3,082,000, being an annual deficiency of \$646,000. Now, Sir, I am bound to admit that I think that these results have partly arisen from unavoidable causes. I am not going to condemn the hon. gentleman because our canals,

for instance, have turned out less profitably than they were expected to turn out, because it is now necessary to work them at a loss, whereas, I think, in my hon. friend's (Mr. Mackenzie's) time, they were worked at a small, but still a steady profit. I call attention to this, however: not merely is there an annual deficit of \$646,000, as verified from the Public Accounts, but I find that over and above that there are charged in 1886 to capital account items like these: for rolling stock, \$58,000; for air brakes, \$378; for sleeping cars, \$161,000; for coal cars, \$4,460—in all, \$223,000, which, according to the principle I laid down the other evening, ought, I think, at any rate, in dealing with Government works, to be added to the annual deficit chargeable to income, and which, if so added, would represent an annual deficit of about \$870,000. Now, Sir, that is not all. Since my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) went out of office, we find that on the Intercolonial Railway alone, \$10,000,000 have been added to the capital account. We find that in public works of all kinds since 1878, there have been added, without taking into account the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$18,000,000 up to the present time. Now, Sir, for interest and sinking fund on that amount there is a further yearly charge of \$810,000, as compared with our charge for the cost of these works in 1878. So, at this present moment, if you add those two sums together, you will find an annual deficit of \$870,000, and a further annual charge for interest and sinking fund of \$810,000, making \$1,680,000 annual loss, incurred in the working of our public works, being about \$1,200,000 more than existed in 1878. Now, Sir, in the time of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) it is true there was a deficit. The road was just completed; it was new; it had not had an opportunity of developing traffic; and, moreover, it was my hon. friend's practice to charge to income a very considerable number of items which are now charged to capital. At any rate we get this broad result, that taking into account the additional charge for capital sunk, we find that whereas there was under those peculiar circumstances, a deficit of \$500,000 on the working of our public works in my hon. friend's time, there is now a deficit of nearly \$1,700,000. As I said, I think that is partly our misfortune, and not altogether the fault of the hon. gentlemen; but I must say I am rather at a loss to see by what mental process the hon. gentleman convinces himself that these properties, which not only do not return one farthing of interest on their cost, but which involve a large and steady annual loss, can be treated as a particularly valuable or profitable asset, and how it is that he can tell us we need not mind our debt, because we have so valuable a property to show for it. And, I may add, that if I understand aright the effects of the policy which the hon. gentlemen are inaugurating, the carrying out of two or three of their railway schemes is likely to add very largely, indeed, to the deficits of the Intercolonial Railway. I am afraid that, bad as this showing is, it is nothing to the showing we may expect to face at the expiration of a few years. Now, Sir, with respect to the deficits which have occurred, there is no dispute. The hon. gentleman admits frankly and candidly that even after the whole expenditure on war account in 1886, there remains a deficit of about \$2,750,000. Sir, I can imagine, as I remarked last night, how the hon. gentleman, when he sat on this side of the House, would have regarded such a deficiency had it occurred under the administration of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie). Now, I suppose such a deficiency is a mere matter of account, and following the excellent doctrine which the hon. gentleman expounded last night, you may charge it as an asset to the credit of capital account, and wipe it out at the same time. But there is this very material difference, to which I call the attention of the House. There were deficits, it is true, in the time of my hon. friend, but those deficits were incurred because

of the reluctance of himself and myself and our colleagues to add to the burdens of the people in a time of distress, and our desire to save the public as much as we could from large charges. The deficits which have now occurred, and which are vastly larger than those which existed in our time, have occurred after an enormous increase of the public burdens, after practically doubling the incidence of taxation on the people. As the hon. gentleman admitted frankly enough that a deficit of a larger or smaller amount was inevitable this year, I shall not pursue that subject except to say that I for one will be heartily relieved if it turns out that the deficit the hon. gentleman expects will not be materially exceeded. At the same time I must observe that the statement of receipts and expenditures, which he has laid on the Table, appear to me to threaten that the deficit will assume considerably larger proportions than he now anticipates. But, Sir, a matter which well deserves our consideration is the enormous proportion that exists between our total expenditure and our fixed charges. I do not think enough attention has been paid to this in times past. Now, I will just state to the House the actual fixed charges which were paid in 1886, and contrast them with the actual income, and then the House can judge for itself whether or not I at all exaggerate the situation. I find that the actual sums paid in 1886 were: for interest and charges of management, \$10,483,000; for sinking fund, \$1,606,000; for what are known as "collection of revenue," which we cannot practically diminish, \$7,807,000; for subsidies, \$4,182,000; so that out of an actual revenue of a little over \$33,000,000 in 1886 the fixed charges amount to \$24,081,000, very nearly 75 per cent of the whole receipts in that year. And if to these you add the payments for superannuation and the payments made under Indian treaties, which together amount to about \$1,200,000, you will find that we left ourselves in 1886 something like \$8,000,000 for carrying on all the affairs of this country. Now, I do not find that there is any improvement under present circumstances, though I do not blame the hon. gentleman himself therefor. I find that the proportion of fixed charges continues to increase. I find that the proportion of fixed charges is in some respects larger in the present Estimates than they were in former ones; and, as I said before, it is quite clear that a very considerable number of those charges which were put down under the head of controllable expenditure have ceased to be controllable. They are treaty obligations which it is no longer within our powers substantially to reduce. This increase has taken place in spite of two things—in the first place, in spite of the fall of the rate of interest all over the world, which ought to have considerably diminished the burdens of the people, and, in the next place, in spite of the fact that a very considerable proportion of our expenditure is concealed by the practice, which has now apparently become habitual, of charging a number of items to capital account which ought, in all reason, to be charged to ordinary expenditure. Then, I come to consider the question of our future obligations. I pointed out last night that, according to the statements made by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, and according to the Estimates and resolutions laid on the Table of the House, over and above our present net debt of \$225,000,000, we had incurred obligations amounting to about \$12,250,000 which we know of. I also called attention to the prospect that, as in former Sessions, within a few hours before this House separates, we may be called on to consider grants of many millions of dollars for various purposes, as to which the Minister of Finance and his colleagues have as yet vouchsafed no hint. But I desire to point out, what is of yet more importance, that if these obligations, which are in the nature of gifts and grants, are discharged, you may lay to your account a huge mass of other obligations amounting to more millions than I would

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

at this moment dare to mention. Why, Sir, it is but a very few days since we were informed—and publicly was given to it in the newspapers, and in fact the document has been since laid before the House—that a further subsidy was to be made to Prince Edward Island of \$20,000 a year, representing, practically, a grant of \$500,000 to that island. Now, I have this to say: If Prince Edward Island, with its population of 110,000 or so, is intitled to half a million on the grounds which are laid down in that Minute of Council, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that the 4,400,000 people who inhabit the rest of this Dominion will put in their claims, before he is very much older, for 44 half millions more; and the hon. gentleman will find that, in this grant of \$20,000 a year to Prince Edward Island, he has tied his own hands, and the hands of his colleagues, in such a way that he may just as well at once admit that he will have to provide some \$22,000,000 more to meet the demands which will assuredly be made upon him from the other Provinces. The whole of this system of special grants, and of special railway subsidies to this or that little railway, here or there, is a direct violation of the very essence of the Federal compact, and the hon. gentlemen, having done what they have done, having begun this system, having made these grants to outlying sections in this or that Province, for what reasons, political or other, I am not going to stop to discuss, have made it the duty of members of Parliament from the other Provinces (the hon. gentleman must admit it, although I regret the conclusion) and from every section of those Provinces, to insist that equal rights be granted to their constituencies. We are members of a limited partnership, and if one member is allowed to draw funds for its private advantage from the general partnership, you cannot, in reason or justice, hesitate to grant proportional sums to all the other portions of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman should have thought of this before he and his colleagues introduced this system—this system which we opposed at the time because we foresaw the result. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, in estimating our future liabilities, he or his successor—if he is not to be here long—will do well to bear in mind that, just so surely as you make special grants, either to a particular locality or Province, sooner or later, probably sooner rather than later, will you be compelled to make similar grants to every other Province, in proportion to its population and resources. There is another very important matter which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and myself have discussed and disputed over before. I am sorry to say that all the information which I have been able to obtain leads me to the conclusion that while we are increasing our debt, and our expenditure, and our taxes, out of all proportion to our resources, the population of Canada, as a whole, has become almost, if not altogether, stationary, at any rate over a great area. I am sorry, Sir, indeed, it should be so; but I cannot shut my eyes to the facts which are making themselves apparent every day and hour to every man who chooses to consider this subject with any degree of care. On the present occasion I shall say nothing about the condition of the Maritime Provinces or the Province of Quebec. There are gentlemen here better qualified to speak on that subject than I, and if they tell me that their personal information tends to make them believe the population of the Maritime Provinces and Quebec is increasing in a greater ratio than that of Ontario, all that I can say is that I shall be sincerely rejoiced; but I do not believe an hon. gentleman will be found on either side of the House, coming from the Maritime Provinces or from Quebec, to rise and state that, in his judgment, the population of those Provinces shows signs of rapid growth. With respect to Ontario, we possess means of information not given us in other quarters, and I find that in Ontario certain very remarkable results exhibit themselves, as evidenced by the returns laid before the

Ontario Legislature by its Bureau for the collection of Statistics. I find that in a period of five years, going back to 1881, the total population of the Province of Ontario, according to their municipal statistics, has increased just 128,000. Now, I am aware that some hon. gentlemen opposite have disputed the correctness of those statistics, and I will call their attention and the attention of the House to this important fact. Those statistics may not be absolutely correct, but they are, most assuredly, relatively correct in the matter of the increase of population, so far, at any rate, as we can deduce anything from our own census returns. If hon. gentlemen will choose to look at the Ontario statistics, they will see that, as a matter of fact, the Ontario statistics show a larger increase in the years from 1872 to 1881 than do our census returns. Consequently, I contend, if there be any error on the part of the Ontario returns, they are rather likely to err in exaggerating than diminishing the number. More than that, our assessors of late years have taken much greater pains than usual to obtain correct returns, and I may also refer to a very important circumstance, which is, that the returns of the number of registered pupils attending school in Ontario during the last five or six years show a positive decrease. I am unwilling to believe that those returns, though valuable in their way, are to be taken as showing a positive decrease on the part of the people of Ontario, but it is a very remarkable fact, and numerous theories have been advanced to account for this extraordinary state of things. We were told, on the other side of the House, I think, that one reason for the diminution of the number of pupils was that more children were earning their own living, and consequently could not attend school. We have been told, in other quarters, that our people have become poorer, and unable to send their children to school, and some persons have insinuated that at present the increase of families has been checked by artificial means, which last I hope sincerely is not the case. Be that as it may, the Ontario statistics show most clearly that the increase of our population, during the last five or six years, has not exceeded 128,000 souls, and what is more important, in my opinion, these same statistics show that the rural population of Ontario has become almost absolutely stationary. Sir, I find that in a period of seven years, from 1879 to 1886, the rural population of Ontario has increased a bare 15,000 souls; and I recommend to the careful consideration of the Minister of Finance this fact, that those same statistics show in the period from 1872 to 1879 the rural population increased by 87,000, as against 15,000 from 1879 to 1886. In other words, they show that, prior to 1879, the rural population increased at something like sixfold the rate it has since attained. I am not going to inflict on the House a detailed statement of the increase of the rural population in every county, but I give the general results, and those results are very remarkable. In Ontario we find that the counties which exceed 1 per cent. per annum number five; we find that counties which are increasing at the rate of less than 1 per cent. per annum number ten, and that there are twenty-nine counties in Ontario in which the rural population is either stationary or is retrograding. I hardly think that any hon. gentleman, in view of those facts, will be disposed to contend that I am wrong in intimating that I cannot see my way to allow an increase larger than 50,000 a year in the population of this Dominion, and that, deducting Indians, I do not think the white population of the Dominion can possibly be put to day at more than 4,500,000. I would call the attention of the House in this connection to certain significant facts to which the hon. gentleman alluded last night. As I have shown, our own municipal statistics only show a total increase in Ontario of 128,000 during the past five years. I think every hon. gentleman here is perfectly well aware that there is no great immigration to the Maritime Provinces, that there is no great immigration to the Province

of Quebec; and we know perfectly well, from the hon. gentleman's own returns, the total immigration which has gone to Manitoba and the North-West, and we know what has gone to British Columbia. Therefore it is clear that, if the immigration statistics of the present Government are to be relied on, a very large proportion of the total number of immigrants must have gone to Ontario. We are informed on the authority of the public returns that, in 1881, 48,000 immigrants settled in Canada; that, in 1882, 112,000 immigrants settled in Canada; that, in 1883, 133,000 immigrants settled in Canada; that, in 1884, 103,000 immigrants settled in Canada; and that, in 1885, 79,000 immigrants settled in Canada; making in those five years a total of 477,000 immigrants who are alleged to have settled in Canada. We know that Manitoba and the North-West, according to these gentlemen's own census returns, have not absorbed at the outside more than 44,000; we know that British Columbia has not absorbed more than 33,000; we know that only a very small number go to the Maritime Provinces, or to Quebec; and, consequently, if the hon. gentleman's statements be correct, we are forced to this conclusion, that, whereas the total population of Ontario has only increased 129,000, nevertheless 300,000 immigrants, at the least, throwing off 100,000 for fear of accidents, according to these hon. gentlemen, must have settled in Ontario. Why, if that statement be correct, those immigrants must have driven out at least that number of native Ontarians, to seek their fortune elsewhere. For myself, I must say that I view those statistics with the greatest possible suspicion, that I do not believe that that number ever settled in Canada, that I believe they were either birds of passage, or that they came here for a very short time, and then made their way to other countries; but there is the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, and from that statement we learn that 477,000 immigrants have settled in Canada in five years; we have the evidence of our own municipal statistics, of our own school returns, that in the Province which, if they came and stayed here at all, must perforce have absorbed the great proportion of them, the increase is not more than half the natural annual increase, without counting immigrants at all. That, I think, will be enough to satisfy any candid and unprejudiced mind that there is something very gravely astray in the returns which are yearly laid on our Table purporting to be made by the Department of Immigration, and, if those are all the results we are likely to obtain for the \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year which the Department of Immigration costs us, I again repeat my recommendation to the hon. gentleman to save the public money by wiping out that Department altogether. Now, not merely is it clear and plain that our population is practically reduced to a stationary condition, notably among the rural population of the Province of Ontario, and what is true of Ontario is true, I take it, in perhaps a greater degree of the rural population of the other Provinces—but it is likewise a rather remarkable fact that, at the same time, not merely is our volume of trade diminishing, but the actual exports from this country are diminishing in a very considerable ratio, that is to say, in proportion to our population. I am taking now not the exports which the hon. gentleman gave us last night, which are composed to a great extent of goods *in transitu*, but I am taking the exports of Canadian products only. I take two points, 1873 and 1886. I find that in 1873, Canada, with a population of 3,750,000, exported of our own produce \$30,384,000 worth, or at the rate of \$21.70 per head. I find that, in 1886, we exported \$77,813,000 worth of our own produce, which, taking my calculation of a population of 4,500,000, is at the rate of \$17.50 per head against \$21.70 in 1873; and if you take the hon. gentleman's calculation of a population of 5,000,000, as given by him last night, it is clear that the reduction would be very much larger. So in regard to the total volume of

trade. I find that the total volume of trade was \$217,000,000 in 1873, which, on a population of 3,750,000, is \$67.50 per head. I find that in 1886, with a population of 4,500,000, it was \$189,000,000, being at the rate of \$42 per head; and, as before, if you take the hon. gentleman's calculation of 5,000,000, the reduction would be greater still. And here is a curious and interesting fact. In 1873, our export of manufactures was \$2,921,000 worth; in 1878, our export of manufactures was \$4,127,000 worth; in 1886, our export of manufactures is given at \$2,824,000 worth. In thirteen years, we have not only not advanced in the export of our manufactures, but have gone back about \$100,000, after having attained to the amount of \$4,127,000 in 1878. I am quite well aware that this reduction is very considerably due, not so much to a positive diminution of the quantity of our exports, as to a fall in prices, but the conclusion which I draw from that is very different from the conclusion drawn by the hon. gentleman. It appears to me that a time when prices are falling, when very large classes of our people are less able to buy than they were before, is not the time to go on enormously increasing the taxation and the burthens of this country. Now, I come to a point which I hope will be of considerable interest to some hon. gentlemen in this House, at any rate, and which does undoubtedly bear, and bear to a very considerable degree, on the wisdom of the policy of which the hon. gentleman boasts so much. It is only too well known to every hon. gentleman here, on either side of the House, who represents a rural population, that for many years back there has been a steady and grievous fall in the prices of all agricultural productions, but I doubt whether the public at large entirely appreciate the extent to which our farmers' incomes and profits have been reduced in consequence. Now, Sir, although I am not sure that hon. gentlemen on that side will admit the *Mail* to be quite as infallible an authority as they used to do, still, I think they will admit that at the date to which I propose to refer, it was in good standing, and was an accepted member of the Conservative league and alliance. From the *Toronto Mail* I take the extracts of prices I am about to read. I find that on the first day of October, 1873, the price of fall wheat in the Toronto market ranged from \$1.25 to \$1.30; of spring wheat from \$1.17 to \$1.19. I find that on the same date in 1878 it had fallen from \$1.25 and \$1.30 to 90 cents and \$1.02, for fall wheat; and for spring wheat to from 80 to 97 cents. I find that on the 1st of October, last past, it had fallen to 76 cents for fall wheat, and 76 or 77 cents for spring. I find that a similar fall prevailed in the case of our next largest cereal, barley. I find that whereas barley in 1873 was \$1.05 to \$1.11, in 1878 it had fallen to 60 cents to \$1; on the 1st of October last it was 48 to 63 cents. I am aware of my own personal knowledge that in the great barley growing districts of Canada the gap was much wider; I am aware that in 1878 barley was sold in those districts, and in October last, it was difficult to obtain from 45 to 50 cents. I find that in 1873 beef cattle were sold at \$6 per hundred; in 1878, at \$4.60; and in 1886, at \$4 per hundred. Now, Sir, here is to be seen the fact, plain and clear, that prices paid to the farmers of Canada for their chief productions are very much less than they were eight years, vastly less than they were thirteen years ago. But the House would do well to remember this most important fact, that according to the best information I have been able to obtain, there has been no considerable reduction in the cost of growing a bushel of wheat or a bushel of barley since those dates to the present time. On the contrary, I am inclined to think that, as a rule, and bearing in mind that the soil was much less exhausted thirteen years ago than it is to-day, I believe that it was, probably—although I will not insist on that point—cheaper to grow a

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

bushel of wheat or barley in a great many sections of this country, thirteen years ago, than it is to-day. Now, Sir, I have consulted authorities on this point—it is one on which I speak under correction—and I find that the cost of growing a bushel of wheat to-day is put down at 60 to 65 cents.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am merely stating the information I have got; it varies considerably. But none of these estimates furnished to me state the cost at less than 50 cents a bushel for the growth of wheat—of course I am speaking of an ordinary crop, say about twenty bushels to the acre; where the growth is larger, there would be a proportionate reduction. In short I find, from all the authorities I am able to obtain—though there are gentlemen here who can speak with much greater personal knowledge than I can—that the cost of growing a bushel of wheat has not been materially reduced in the last dozen years, and that the minimum cost of growing wheat is 50 cents per bushel. Now, if you choose to apply that test, I think the House will arrive at some remarkable results. They will see, in the first place, that supposing the *Mail's* prices to be correct, a farmer's profits in 1873 must have amounted to something like 60 or 75 cents per bushel on the growth of wheat, which I think is a convenient standard. In 1878, they ranged from 40 to 50 cents per bushel; and to-day, according as you take 50, 55 or 60 cents as the cost of growing, the net profits are reduced to 20 or 25 cents per bushel. I am afraid that when that matter comes to be discussed and examined we will find these figures to be substantially correct, and that the profits of the farmers in Ontario, and I suppose of the farmers of Canada in general, have been enormously reduced in the interval of thirteen, or in the interval of eight, years, to which I have alluded. Now, Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to that point. If, as I am informed, the profits of the farmers of Canada have been reduced in this proportion, or in anything like this proportion, in the last thirteen, or the last eight, years, then I say he will do well to consider this important fact, that, in almost all the changes which he proposed last night, in almost all the new taxes which he proposes, he will lay still further burdens on the backs of the farmers of Canada, and will still further diminish their narrow margin of profits, all too narrow as it is to-day. Sir, it would hardly be possible, without very careful and minute research, to estimate what is the loss of income that the farmers have sustained, and if I venture any calculation I do it, I repeat again, under correction. Still, after looking into the matter, after considering the amount of the exports of agricultural produce which we have had returned from year to year, after considering the prices that the farmers obtain from their home customers (after retaining enough to feed themselves), I am inclined to believe that within the last ten or dozen years, the net income of the farmers of Canada is something like \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 less, by reason of the enormous fall in prices to which I have referred. However, be that as it may, there is unfortunately no possibility of denying, no possibility of contradicting, the main facts to which I have alluded, namely, that the profits of the farmers of Ontario in particular have been enormously reduced within the last few years, and that being so, that it is a matter of most questionable policy, that it is a very imprudent thing, in my mind, to go on and load these men down with further taxes, while you know from the facts I have shown, that over the great majority of the counties of Ontario, at any rate, the rural population is absolutely stationary or retrograde. Sir, remember I have shown clearly and plainly an enormous reduction on the profits which the farmer can make by honest industry in Ontario; we have the proof that for seven long years the rural population of Ontario

bardly increased, altogether, one per cent. in that interval. I do not comment further, but I commend these facts to the most serious consideration of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I come to another point on which I greatly regret to have to dwell. I have to consider the success which has attended the efforts of the Government to settle the great territory we have acquired in the North-West. I have always admitted, I admit frankly now, that if hon. gentlemen, in return for all their huge expenditure, for all the vast burdens they have laid upon us, were able to-day to point to a populous and compact settlement in Manitoba or the North-West, let us say, of six or seven hundred thousand people, I would be willing to admit that they have something to show for the enormous sums they have made away with. But, Sir, what are the lamentable facts in this matter? Last year we took the census of that vast territory which extends from the western boundary of Manitoba to the borders of British Columbia, and what did that show? Why, it showed that in five years we had added 15,000 souls, about 3,000 families, to the population of that huge region. This Session we have seen, for the first time, what have been the results of the hon. gentleman's policy as regards the Province of Manitoba. The House will remember that in reply to a question from myself the Minister of Agriculture stated there were to-day 5,495 whites in Manitoba. I want to call the attention of the House to a few statistical facts. In 1881 there were by our own census 66,000 whites in Manitoba and the North-West put together. The natural increase in five years would amount to about 8,400 souls. There are to-day, according to the hon. gentleman's own census report, in all 118,495, putting Manitoba and the North-West together; so, after making allowance for the natural increase, we have added 44,095 souls to the population of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, or say nearly 9,000 families in five years. I take the Immigration reports, and I find that in 1881, 22,001 souls were reported by the Immigration Department to have settled in Manitoba and the North-West. In 1882, 58,751; 1883, 42,772; 1884, 24,240; 1885, 7,240; in all, in five years, according to our most trustworthy reports, 155,204 in Manitoba and the North-West; and now shall I say our lying census returns, or would that be unparliamentary Mr. Speaker?—at all events, our census returns show that, starting with 66,000, and adding thereto 155,000 emigrants and 8,400 for natural increases, we have got 118,000. So, Sir we find that according to the hon. gentleman's statistics, that if you include the last year, for which the number was 11,593—and I observe in the foot note it is said they underestimated the number—we have at a huge cost to this country settled in Manitoba and the North-West Territories 166,303, of whom 44,095 remain, and 120,000 odd formerly settled in that country are now scattered over the United States, England and Ontario, and Canada at large, acting only too vigorously as anti-immigration agents to prevent the settlement of Manitoba and the North-West. I should like to know what we are to say of the statements of the Department of Immigration? Here are returns brought down to us year after year, here are statements made by responsible Ministers declaring, in spite of our protest and the comments from this side of the House, that 150,000 people, as the hon. gentleman's chief colleague stated, had gone into Manitoba and the North-West in two or three years; and yet when we come to take the census returns we find that, at the outside, the number is 44,000 instead of 166,000. I say that these reports are not only misleading, but they are fraudulent, and they deserve to be expunged from the archives of this country. It may be interesting to know at what cost to the people of Canada this noble result was brought about. In 1881 we paid \$250,812; in 1882, \$253,000; 1883, \$437,000; 1884, \$575,000; 1885, \$506,000; 1886, \$347,000, and in the six years for the headquarters' department at Ottawa, \$400,000. No less than \$2,770,916

was the cost of the Department of Immigration and the head office at Ottawa for settling 44,000 souls in Manitoba and the North-West and of sending 120,000 out of it to prevent other people from going there. Now, there is another side to this question which may interest the people of this Dominion—I know it will interest the people of the older Provinces—and it is as to what Manitoba and the North-West have cost, and what are our annual charges thereon. Within the last five or six years, if you choose to add together the money spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the interest thereon, and all the innumerable side charges, we have paid out very nearly \$100,000,000 of the public money in endeavoring to settle that country. As to the amount of private money, it is difficult to form a correct estimate. I thought, a few years ago, it was a smaller amount than that I have now reason to consider it; but after travelling through Ontario, from one end to another, and making minute enquiries in Winnipeg and Manitoba from parties entrusted with the investment of money by people of the older Provinces, I have been forced to the conclusion that, in estimating the total extent of our outlay, the amount of private funds to be added to the public funds I have alluded to, amounts to a very great many millions of dollars. I will put that, for the moment, on one side. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that up to date, within the last five or six years, the cost has been very nearly \$100,000,000 of the public funds in all. I next direct attention to the annual charges to which this country is put, over and above the charge of about \$4,500,000 for interest and sinking fund on that sum. I find at present that our annual outlay is stated as follows in the Public Accounts: Manitoba subsidy, \$143,000; Post Office charges for Manitoba and the North-West, \$266,000; the North-West Territories for Council, and so on, \$100,000; Dominion Lands chargeable to income, \$161,000; cost of maintaining the Department of the Interior and Mounted Police, which are kept up for the purpose of preserving order in those Territories, \$182,000. And let the House remember that those are actual expenditures. Public Works chargeable to income, \$30,000; annual charge of maintaining the Indians in Manitoba and North-West, about \$1,000,000; annual charge for North-West Mounted Police, about \$780,000; in all we are now spending per annum (over and above the interest and sinking fund charged on prime cost) \$2,962,000, or say about \$7,500,000 a year for the purpose of developing and maintaining our settlement in Manitoba and the North-West. We have certain receipts. We received \$500,000 or \$600,000 in Excise and Customs; and, lest I should be accused of omitting to credit this, I beg to inform the House that we find these are fully balanced by other expenditures in other directions. Customs in Manitoba and the North-West cost us \$40,000 a year; the penitentiary, \$52,000; Militia, \$75,000; Public Works, \$90,000; telegraph lines, \$20,000; hospitals, \$16,000. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that the bulk of our expenditure for immigration is undertaken on account of Manitoba and the North-West, and so that expenditure may be fairly credited to the North-West, to the extent of say \$200,000. I find the legislative expenses and Governor's salaries in those Provinces sweep away \$30,000, and the judiciary \$45,000. So that in all, Sir, although I do not in the least blame the people of Manitoba for it, we find, over and above the three millions a year to which I have alluded, over and above the four and a-half millions of interest and sinking fund, we spent practically every farthing we got in certain local expenditures, many of them proper and necessary expenditures, for the direct benefit of Manitoba. Now, Sir, I say that those are results which no intelligent man in this House, or out of this House can for one moment overlook. I say that when you find one hundred millions of the money of the people of Canada sunk in the attempt to develop Manitoba and the North-West;

when you find, over and above the charge for interest for that amount, annual charges to the tune of three million dollars a year, amounting in all to seven and one-half millions per annum, and when you find in five years, as a result of this expenditure, that you have added nine thousand families to the population of that vast region, I think that somebody is very seriously to blame. Mr. Speaker, I present to the Government, and to the hon. the Finance Minister this alternative. Either this country is unfit for settlement; either, owing to climatic disadvantages or what you will, it is impossible for us to place a large population there—and in that case the conduct of the Government in rashly rushing into these profuse expenditures, and tying these millstones round the necks of the older Provinces, is utterly inexcusable; or it is, as I believe, a good country, a country capable of sustaining a large population, a country that only lacks fair play and good government in order to make it a prosperous country and one of very great value to the people of the Dominion. That is the other alternative. And, if that country be a good country, capable of sustaining hundreds of thousands of prosperous yeomen, even if they don't produce the 640,000,000 of bushels of wheat which my hon. friend saw as in a vision—if that be the case, no language can be too strong to condemn the imbecility, the perversity, the mismanagement and the gross corruption which must have combined together to produce such results, after such a huge expenditure as this. Again I forbear to comment further. I do not think those facts require much comment. But when the hon. gentleman tells us that Canada is in a condition of exceeding prosperity; when he tells us that her future is all he can desire, then, Mr. Speaker, although I have been charged with being far too disposed to take a gloomy view of the situation, I have to say that my views of what Canada might become, and what the North-West might become, enormously exceed all that it seems to have entered into the minds of hon. gentlemen to conceive. Let us look at it. Here we have mortgaged our whole future. There is not a man on either side of this House that does not know that the whole existence of this Dominion is staked on our success in developing Manitoba and the North-West. And these are the pitiable, the humiliating I was almost going to say the ridiculous results, only the thing is far too grave for ridicule or jest—these are the results which the hon. gentleman has to show after eight years of uncontrolled power and uncontrolled expenditure, caused by them and produced by them, and justified by the Government by reason of the urgent necessity that lay upon them to develop, settle and improve the great inheritance we have become possessed of. There is another point, and one of great moment, to which I alluded a little while ago, and it is this: here we find ourselves committed to an annual expenditure of about thirty-six millions of dollars, because, as I have already observed, I fear that the results of the future year will show, as the results of the past years have shown, that the Government have seriously underestimated the annual expenditure of this country. Here we are a population of four and a half millions of whites, with an annual expenditure of thirty-six millions, and a taxation which the hon. gentleman himself estimated at twenty-nine millions. And, Sir, we find in spite of all that, in spite of the enormous proportion of fixed charges that I have alluded to—which makes our real income very small, after all said and done—I find in every direction that claims are being made—many of them just claims, I am bound to say—claims are being brought forward, on behalf of various Provinces and various localities of this Dominion, under this policy which the Government has maintained and fostered. I alluded to the fact that, when the hon. gentleman chose to give a grant of half a million to Prince Edward Island, with its population of 110,000, he had by that act rendered it inevitable, in my

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

judgment, that in a short time he would be obliged to grant proportionate sums, involving an additional charge of at least \$22,000,000, for the remaining 4,400,000 people of this Dominion. And, Sir, what is the condition of the other Provinces? Does not the hon. gentleman know full well that to-day, according to the statements laid before the Legislature of Quebec, by the Finance Minister of that Province, that the resources of that Province are strained to the very uttermost? And here let me remind the House that, but a few months ago, when I had occasion to discuss this subject, I was told that Quebec was in a flourishing financial position, and that there was no fear of a deficit. Since that time there have been some very grave facts brought to light in the Province of Quebec; and I find now that, whereas these gentlemen would face me down last session that Quebec was in a flourishing financial condition, there was a deficit, if I recollect aright, of nearly a quarter of a million on the transactions of the past year. The hon. gentleman knows himself that within the last few days or weeks deputations from his own Province, from the sister Province of New Brunswick—deputations, I fancy, from almost every other Province, except, perhaps, the Province of Ontario, have been coming here seeking for further grants, further subsidies, further assistance from the Dominion Government. Sir, I say that this state of things, which augurs ill for the future of the Dominion, is the direct result of the conduct of the Government themselves. It is the direct result of their folly in opening the door by all these grants I have alluded to for every demand that every Province, aye that every section of a Province, may choose to make. It involves grave results, there can be no doubt. It is a most unwholesome relation to maintain between the Dominion and the Provinces that this Government and Parliament should be called upon to find the money, to impose the taxation, and that the others should be called upon to spend it. I can conceive nothing more calculated to offer a premium to extravagance and folly than such a state of things; and almost any alteration in our federal constitution would be hailed, and ought to be hailed, by us with satisfaction, if it would bring about a different result. Now, I know, and so probably did the hon. gentleman, from the very hour that Confederation was formed, that the granting of subsidies to the Provinces was a weakness and a danger; but the hon. gentleman and those who with him were entrusted with the task of bringing about the Confederation, although they saw and admitted the danger, contended, and perhaps contended rightly, that on any other terms Confederation was impossible. But I say that the knowledge of the danger ought to have been their warning, ought to have kept them from allowing the door to be opened as it has now been opened; and I can tell them that, thanks to their most mischievous impolicy and as the inevitable consequence of what has already been done, many millions will be added to our liabilities before there is any effectual settlement of these innumerable claims. Now, the hon. gentleman, differing again very widely from me, appears to treat the burden of taxation on the people of this country as a matter of very small moment. Here again I would be glad to hear from my friends from the Maritime Provinces, my friends from Quebec, and my friends from Manitoba and British Columbia, too, as to how the burden of taxation presses upon their constituents. Meantime I propose, for the sake of illustration mainly, to take my own Province, the Province of Ontario, and consider how the burden of taxation falls upon it, and notably upon the rural population of that Province. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us last night that there have been great changes and developments in political economy, although, if I recollect aright, he will find that the germs of all those ideas he alluded to are contained in the writings of the old economists, if he will take the trouble to study

them. But I believe there is a school of economists who have great influence on the public mind, and to whose views I myself am somewhat disposed to adhere, who contend, with a considerable show of reason, that in the last result the whole burden of taxation rests on the cultivated land of any particular country. Now, I am not going to lay down any particular proposition, nor am I going to say that that is the case always or absolutely; but in the Province of Ontario I believe it is substantially true that in the long run the burden of taxation does rest in the end on the great producing farming classes. I would like to call the attention of the House to the extent of the burdens, which, on this assumption, now rest on the rural population of Ontario. I believe it will be admitted, even by the hon. gentleman, that I am not much out of the way in saying that Ontario is obliged to defray about three fifths of the whole taxation of this country. The taxation is, or was, about \$27,500,000 before to-night; and if you admit that proportion you will find that \$17,000,000 of nominal taxation falls on Ontario. Now, Sir, it is equally well known to anybody who has bestowed a second thought on the subject, that under our present system, by which, good or bad, a very large amount is taken out of the pockets of the people in taxation, beyond that which goes into the Treasury, the real taxation is vastly in excess of the nominal taxation. That excess cannot be estimated at less than 50 per cent. I believe myself that it is very much more, and I allege that the real burden of taxation, not measured by the amount that goes into the Treasury, but, as it ought to be by the amount that comes out of the pockets of the people, amounts to fully \$25,000,000 as regards the people of Ontario. And I am taking this estimate on a lower scale of taxation than that laid down by the hon. gentleman. Our returns show that we had in the Province of Ontario, when the last municipal census was taken in 1886, 10,912,000 acres of cleared land, not all, I am afraid, perfectly good land; and I will call the attention of the House to this fact, that if they admit that the burden of taxation in the last result falls on the agricultural population, these \$25,000,000 would represent a real tax of \$2.40 an acre, though the nominal taxation would be \$1.60 an acre. Capitalise that sum at 5 per cent, and it equals a mortgage of \$50 on every acre of cleared land from one end of Ontario to the other, from Rat Portage to the Province line; and it is perfectly well known that the farmers of Ontario, as well as the people in other parts of the country, have other burdens to bear—that they have a considerable amount of local taxation, and that their farms are mortgaged to a considerable extent, how heavily I cannot say. I know that the loan companies of Ontario have about \$77,000,000 invested in mortgage, very largely on farms. I am told that the mortgages on farms in Ontario to day amount to \$120,000,000 or \$150,000,000, the interest on which is payable largely abroad. Therefore, if you admit that in the long result the taxation rests on the land, we have matters brought to this state, that, apart from local rates and ordinary mortgages, you have in fact imposed a mortgage of \$50 on every acre of cleared land in Ontario, equal to a net rent of \$2.40 an acre to meet our Federal taxation alone. Now, I say the Ontario farmer, between this atrocious taxation and the intense competition to which he is exposed from foreign competitors, has a very poor chance of it. Within the last few years the profits of the Ontario farmers have been largely diminished. Their wheat which sold for \$1 or \$1.25 per bushel eight or ten years ago, they are obliged now to accept 75 cents or 76 cents for, which represents a net reduction of one-third in the profits on that article, and in some cases as much as two-thirds. You will see from this whether the evidences before us do not point as much to a great displacement of wealth as to a great accumulation of wealth—whether the great consuming class, the farmers of

Ontario particularly, are not, as regards their means of making profits out of their farms, in a very much worse position than they were some few years ago. Thirteen years ago the profits on one bushel of wheat to the acre would nearly pay all the taxation that rested on the farmers' land. To-day, if the whole of the cleared land of Ontario were covered with a good crop of wheat, yielding 20 bushels to the acre, it would take, at the present reduced price at which wheat is selling, the profits of one-half of the wheat that could be grown on every acre of cleared land in Ontario to defray the burden of Federal taxation that now rests on the people of Ontario. Sir, is it any wonder that the rural population of Ontario keeps stationary? Is it any wonder that in seven years, on a rural population of over a million strong, the municipal returns show an increase of only 15,000 souls? Is it any wonder that in twenty-nine counties out of forty-four the rural population is absolutely stationary or retrograde? When the hon. gentleman talks of the exceeding prosperity of Canada, when he tells us that there is nothing in our future that need cause apprehension, I fear that he is speaking from the standpoint of a well fed and well paid practical politician, not from that of a hard working farmer of the Province of Ontario. Sir, if this state of things had been produced by real urgent necessity, if these enormous charges had been laid upon our people for objects which we could point to as involving the life of the nation, if as a set off to these huge burdens you could show me to-day a populous Province of a million or three-quarters of a million strong in the North-West, I would say that there was something to represent the sacrifice. But I find that, not only is that not the case, not only has there been an absolute failure to promote the settlement of that vast region, but I find that this scandalous state of things has been aggravated by the grossest and most intolerable waste. I take these Public Accounts, to which I have alluded, for a single year, and what do I find? I find that in this state of things the people of Canada, the farmers of Ontario in particular—aye, and the farmers of all the other Provinces, because, remember, I have taken Ontario only as an illustration, and I think my hon. friends beside me can duplicate everything I have said, from their knowledge of the position of their own constituents in their own Provinces—I find the people of Canada have to pay a charge of \$352,000 for the Franchise Bill; I find for superannuation account (and a very considerable number of the men who are drawing this fund are as well able to do a good day's work as ever) a charge of \$200,000 a year; I find a charge of \$347,000 paid for immigration, which produces the result I have just told you. I find for experimental legislation—either on the part of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) or the First Minister, I do not know which—an item, and only one of many such in other years, of \$152,000 for money lost in operating the Liquor License Act. I find an annual deficit of \$1,000,000 on the Post Office. Now I am willing to see a reasonable amount above the receipts spent on the Post Office, and would not object to a moderate deficit, but I say that this reckless expenditure, this reckless running up of deficits, this spending of a million dollars more than we receive, is not a good policy, is not a wise policy, is not justified in the present state of the country. I find an annual expenditure of \$1,195,000 on Indians. Well, if that went to the benefit of the Indians there would be something to be said in its favor, but my hon. friend from Brant, if he chooses to speak, can explain how a great part of that is spent. In one case, the case of the Province of British Columbia—I speak from memory, but am substantially correct—out of a grant of \$50,000, \$3,000 went to the Indians and \$47,000 to white men to look after them, and to white men who, I fear, in a great many cases, were greater savages than the savages themselves. Then I find—and I think some of my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces, at least, will

agree with me that it is time we should rein up here—I find the repairs, the new furniture, the heating, the lighting, and the keeping of the grounds in order, of these identical public buildings, cost us last year \$327,000, very nearly as much as the annual allowance of the Province of Nova Scotia or the Province of New Brunswick. Why, our furniture and repairs, counting of course Rideau Hall, the expenditure on which was not much this year, cost us \$191,800; heating, \$63,000; gas, \$32,800; water, \$15,000; telephones, \$4,000; and \$15,000 for grounds—in all \$327,000 for the repairs and furniture, and heating and lighting of the Ottawa buildings. Well, I say, under such circumstances, when the people of this country are suffering under a great burden of taxation, when our population over a large area is stationary, when we find ourselves unable to grant reasonable assistance to various deserving objects, expenditures like these are utterly indefensible. Hon. gentlemen object exceedingly, I have observed, to any comparison being made between the way in which our Confederation has been managed and that in which the Confederation of the United States has been managed; but with every desire to gratify these hon. gentlemen, I cannot forbear, on this occasion, from calling the attention of the House and country to the way in which our expenditure compares with that of the great people beside us, who present on the whole the best possible example of the successful working of the Federal system. Sir, the hon. gentlemen, when it suits their purpose, are ready to copy and to quote American example. The hon. the Minister of Finance did it last night; he held it up to our eyes as a thing which deserved to be copied and imitated, and therefore he, at any rate, cannot take exception to the facts I am now about to call your attention to. In the early part of their history, the population of the United States was almost exactly equal to our own. When, in 1792, the Americans began the work of building a great nation on this continent, their population was about 3,900,000; their debt, and a curious coincidence it is, was exactly \$75,000,000, almost the same figure to a dot as our own was in 1867; and their annual expenditure was \$8,250,000. Twenty years elapsed, and the American population had grown, without any assistance from immigrants, from 3,900,000 to 7,250,000; that is, they had added 3,300,000 by their natural increase in those twenty years, to their population. Their debt, which was \$75,000,000, had been reduced to \$53,000,000, and their expenditure per year, which was \$8,250,000, had grown to \$8,500,000. The hon. gentleman last night gave us a series of statements, in which, however, he omitted to show the increase of our debt and expenditure. But let us compare the results of the twenty years in each country. Our country began twenty years ago with a population of 3,375,000 and a debt of \$75,000,000; and our expenditure, including subsidies to Provinces, was \$13,500,000. To-day our debt is \$225,000,000; our expenditure last year was \$39,000,000, or call it \$36,000,000, deducting war expenditure. Our population, as I have shown, is not to-day more than 4,500,000, although we are alleged to have had an enormous immigration, which did not exist in the case of the United States. The comparison is worth noting. The Americans had difficulties to contend with; they had to purchase large territories, they had to endure the cost of very expensive Indian wars, but with all that, at the end of twenty years, their population had nearly doubled, their debt had decreased one-third, and their expenditure had hardly increased a single quarter of a million. Now, Sir, some hon. gentlemen object to any comparison, because they say we have expenditures the Americans have not. That is true, and Heaven knows they have expenditures which we have not been called upon to bear in anything like the same proportion. But on purpose to oblige these hon. gentlemen, instead of going back to 1810, I will go

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

back to the middle of this century, 1845. I will strike off our subsidies, railway expenditures, militia and mounted police, post office, and the rest of them—everything as to which a question can possibly arise—and will compare the expenditure of the Americans in 1844 with our own, less all these items. I shall deduct in the case of the United States, the cost of their army and navy and war pensions, while I will give the hon. gentleman the benefit of our army and navy expenditure and pensions, with the greatest possible good will. In 1845 the American people had a population of 20,000,000 strong, and the gross expenditure was \$22,900,000, of which \$15,000,000 were for army, navy, and pension expenditure. The Americans conducted the whole of the expenditure under their Federal system, with a population of 20,000,000 in 1845 for a sum scarcely \$8,000,000, without making these deductions. We in Canada, after deducting subsidies to Provinces, after deducting railway expenses and post office expenses, after deducting, in short, everything the hon. gentleman can wish, absolutely required about \$24,000,000, with a population of 4,500,000 people, to discharge the identical functions which the Americans in 1845 were able to defray for a total sum of \$8,000,000. And remember that we started under circumstances of enormous advantage as compared with the people of the United States, and remember also that we have deliberately destroyed those advantages, and, to a great extent, thrown away our chances. If the House wants to know the reason of the monstrous difference to which I have just alluded, the House, I think, will find it in this: that the Americans, during the time when they were laying broad and deep the foundations of their national greatness, had the extreme good fortune to be governed by wise, far-seeing and patriotic statesmen, while Canada, during the vast proportion of the time I have referred to, I regret to say, has not enjoyed similar advantages, to say the least of it. And now, is there any hope, is there anything in the propositions the hon. gentleman brought forward last night to lead us to hope—as, to say the truth, I had almost hoped—that he, being, as I have already said, a man of capacity and intelligence, had come to the conclusion that the time had arrived to call a halt, that the time had arrived to reform, that the situation was perilous. I dare say that the Minister of Finance may honestly and sincerely desire to reduce his expenditure. I dare say that the Minister of Finance in his secret heart knows perfectly well, as I know perfectly well, that this state of things is perilous in a high degree to the best interests of this country, but, like many another man, he finds himself now powerless to control the forces which he set to work long ago; he finds himself borne on irresistibly on the tide; he cannot make any effective reduction in the expenditure. He may try to carry out (and I am willing to co-operate with him and to the best of my ability to help in carrying out his proposed economies) some reductions in public works here, or in one or two little matters there, but he finds himself compelled, against his will perhaps, while making these little economies, to bring down to the House propositions which will result in an enormous increase of the taxation and the burdens of this people, which will result in entanglements, and very serious entanglements, and in more violations of the Federal pact, by strict adherence to which alone we can hope on our part to build up a nation on this continent. With respect to the hon. gentleman's tariff changes, as I said, I cannot propose to discuss them in detail, but I will say that, looking over the 120 changes which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce, I am very much struck by this fact, which I commend to the attention of all hon. gentlemen. I do not know that they are going to bring in a great deal of revenue ultimately, though I think the immediate result will be to produce a good deal more than the hon. gentleman stated he expected to get; but I see this,

that every solitary one almost of these changes means an additional charge, an additional tax on the rural population and on the bulk of the ratepayers of this Dominion; I see that a great many of these, by the introduction of specific duties, which may be convenient, which may serve the purpose of the Customs, practically involve what the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman's predecessor used to denounce so strongly in this House, an unjust charge against the poorer consumer in favor of the rich; I see, and it is rather interesting, that, whereas we were supposed to start with a moderately perfect tariff, the changes which the hon. gentlemen from time to time have introduced are almost innumerable. I have taken the trouble to look over the number of tariff changes which have been made within the last seven or eight years, and to my mind at any rate, they are something extremely startling. I find that, after the enormous revolution in our fiscal policy which took place in 1879, we made no less than 73 tariff changes in 1880, 59 in 1881, 79 in 1882, 64 in 1883, 42 in 1884, 73 in 1885, 74 in 1886, and now 120 at the very least in 1887, making in all since 1879, 584 known tariff changes, not to speak of innumerable arbitrary regulations introduced by the Customs Department.

Mr. BOWELL. Not one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As far as I can judge, though I say it is impossible to make a minute estimate of the effect of the proposals laid before us last night, the practical result of this will be, in the long run, to add but a very moderate sum to the revenue, but to add very largely indeed to the burthen to the consumers, and that as to one large section of the consumers of Canada. It is the undoubted fact, as I have pointed out, that the rural population and the farmers of this country, and those who depend on them are in greatly reduced circumstances, are making much less profits than they made a few years ago, and, I assure the Finance Minister, are very ill able to bear the additional burthen which he proposes to place upon them. I noticed, although the hon. gentleman did not allude to it, that one of his colleagues introduced a resolution to provide for certain subsidies to be paid to the Province of Nova Scotia, or to a portion of the Province of Nova Scotia. Well I would not have wondered if the hon. gentleman had indulged in a little triumph, and I must say a little pardonable triumph, for the victory which he achieved in Nova Scotia at the last election. Speaking candidly, I must say that that victory was in my opinion wholly and entirely due to the hon. gentleman, even if he only did arrive in New York to find the general elections on his hands. Perhaps, however, it was as well that the hon. gentleman should have been wisely silent on that subject, and as to the means by which the pacification of Nova Scotia was effected. There are some things which I suppose must be done, but which it is not very well to talk about, and it does appear to me looking at the whole situation, that the hon. gentleman may be said to have achieved on that occasion a veritable Byzantine victory. We know that in the later days of the Lower Empire, many victories were achieved by the Greek troops over the barbarians, and the *modus operandi* was this;

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask if he means to say that my victory was over the barbarians?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am going to explain, if the hon. gentleman will allow me. I did not say that his victory was over the barbarians. I compared it, as to the mode, with that in which, in former days, victories were obtained over barbarians by the Greek troops. Far be it from me to suggest that the people of Nova Scotia are barbarians. On the contrary, I think the people of Nova Scotia are very exceptionally wide-awake gentlemen. However,

before I was interrupted, I was going to say that the mode adopted was this: The troops marched out with great parade and pomp, and with much clash and clamor of brazen cyrnals, but a few mules went before them heavily laden with gold to the camp of the barbarians, and that was found to be the easiest and cheapest way in which to obtain a victory. The barbarians allowed the Greeks to occupy their camp, and they themselves retired until the time of the next general election. I think the hon. gentleman might well have quoted the famous saying of Cæsar, with a slight difference *veni, vidi, emi*—he came, he comprehended the situation at a glance, and he bought the fellows straight out. Almost at the moment the hon. gentleman was achieving his victory in Nova Scotia, we were informed of what the hon. gentleman was about. I would like to call the attention of the House to a certain letter which was written by a certain eminent member of this House, in reply to certain proposals which were made to him about the time that hon. gentleman was achieving—what shall I call it—the pacification, the subjugation, or, perhaps, the purchase, of recalcitrant Nova Scotians. We were informed, as I have said, of the way in which this serious disaffection in Nova Scotia was being dealt with, and we were asked if we would see the hon. gentleman and “go one better”—if the House will excuse the phrase. This is the reply which was made to the proposal:

“MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 8th. You inform me that Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. McLellan are promising the people of Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou, that if they sustain the Government, a new policy, not as yet communicated to, or passed on, by Parliament will be adopted as to the railway you mention, and that it will be constructed as a Government work. You add that the people, while unwilling to trust Messrs. Tupper and McLellan wish from me an assurance that I will do as much for them as these gentlemen offer, and you tell me that such an assurance will materially help our prospects in the three counties.”

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the date of that letter?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The date of the letter was apparently about the 15th of February. It was written in reply to a letter of the 8th February—

“It is plain that, if the course now put forward were to be adopted, it should have been laid before Parliament and discussed and decided on its merits. Instead of this, it has been kept back till the elections, and is now put forward in the locality as a bribe, a wholesale bribe, to three counties. I cannot take part in an auction of the votes of Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou. I never give a promise unless I am satisfied that it is right, and that I can redeem my word. It is possible that the course proposed to be taken as to this railway is justifiable, and if that be shown, I will support it on whichever side of the House I sit or whichever way the people of the counties may vote. But I have not before me at this time sufficient information as to the condition of the road, the cost of completion and the other important points involved, to enable me to form an opinion on the question, and therefore I cannot conscientiously make the pledge which you tell is so important to the interest of the Liberal cause.

“God help poor Canada.

“Yours truly,
“EDWARD BLAKE.”

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when that letter was made public?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Several days before the election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to state the date?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The date is not given here. It was made public, to the best of my recollection, on the 17th or 18th February.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Too late to reach the Province of Nova Scotia before the election.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Too late? I regret to say that the reply was exceedingly well known in the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, as was also the Minute of Council passed by the Government, I fear for the

purpose of influencing the elections in the counties of Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou. Now, Sir, I say that these grants are practically being made at the cost of the whole future of this Confederation. Perhaps it is a just Nemesis. I recollect quite well how unfortunate I thought it at the time that Nova Scotia should have been dragged into the Confederation against the known and avowed will of the people, and I feared that we would later have to pay the bitter penalty of that piece of folly that brought Nova Scotia in against her will. But there is a more serious charge. I fear that the results of the efforts the hon. gentleman may think himself justified in making for the purpose of satisfying Nova Scotia, may, before all is done, rend this Confederation asunder.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman when he came to that conclusion, that it was very unfortunate that Nova Scotia was brought into the Confederation, and may I ask him how long he sustained the gentlemen who had been engaged in doing it, and co-operated with them in this House?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I came to this conclusion within a very few weeks after I had the pleasure of meeting the late Hon. Joseph Howe and my hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Jones) in the Parliament of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When did the hon. gentleman give expression to that view?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I gave expression to it somewhere about the year 1869, or about eighteen years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Two years afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but the hon. gentleman will recollect that I was not then responsible in any shape or way, other than as a private member of Parliament, for what had been done in Nova Scotia, that I had no influence and no control whatever over him or over the means which he thought fit to adopt for bringing Nova Scotia in. As soon as I had any right to express an opinion about it, I did so; and I tell the hon. gentleman further, I have not very often gone contrary to my own instinct and convictions in the votes I have given in this House; but I did once, and that was on the occasion when I consented, with very great reluctance, to vote for granting better terms to Nova Scotia, because I felt it was the only reparation we could make them, seeing that the people of Nova Scotia had been vilely treated in being brought into the Confederation as they had been. Now, Sir, I say that this is not finance in any proper sense of the term. I say that it is in fact simply a piece of desperate political gambling. The dice have been well loaded down with Gerrymander Acts, Franchise Acts, returning officers and revising barristers; they have gone in favor of the present Government and have gone against Canada, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that I think, if he remains here for any length of time as Finance Minister, he will find that the warning I now give him is only too well founded—if, indeed, the point of safety be not already passed—that it will be very unfortunate indeed if he or his successors do not rein up and rein up very soon; that even at the best, making all the allowances we can for possible fortunate accidents, I fear that the hon. gentleman has gone so far that he and his friends have opened the door to such innovations of our Federal compact, to such violations of the first principles of our Confederation, that it is a matter of great doubt indeed whether we will be able, at any rate on the present terms, to hold together for many years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, I shall be glad to hear hon. gentlemen, if they can do so at a later date, show that the facts I have stated are incorrect, but if the facts I have stated are correct, then I say that ample grounds have been given for me or any man who cares one straw for the future of Canada, giving formal warning of the dangers to which we are exposed. Sir, I am sorry to say that what I have drawn is only too faithful a picture of the result of the maladministration which has disgraced Canada for the greater part of the last 20 years. I say that those hon. gentlemen stand convicted of having failed utterly and totally to create any honorable national sentiment in this country to which a patriot or a statesman can appeal. Why, Sir, they do not even comprehend the necessity of it. Have we not heard the First Minister, who ought to know better, who has ability enough to know better—have we not heard him say and repeat in this place here, that he and his party in this House prefer annexation to independence? Sir, are we to go in leading strings forever? Does not the hon. gentleman know that such a statement, made by a man in such a place, is about as enervating, about as degrading, about as debasing, as any statement can be. Why, it is of the very essence of funkism in the highest possible degree, that a Canadian Premier could give utterance to such a word, though it is so far well founded that the policy of the Premier has been such for many a long day as to have gone very far to ensure annexation. Sir, I say that in point of fact the policy of the hon. gentleman has been such that our various Provinces are to-day further apart in essentials, in spite of the connecting iron link, than they were in 1867. I say that hon. gentlemen, all through, have shown from first to last, that they wholly and utterly disregard the very spirit of the Federal compact. I say their policy is one consisting largely of the invasion of local rights. What course did hon. gentlemen opposite adopt? How did they propose to consolidate Confederation? By seeking to secure control of Provincial rights, by their outrageous action in the matter of disallowance, by which they have driven the Province of Manitoba into downright disaffection, by choosing to interfere with the plainest Provincial rights in the Liquor License Act, by refusing to carry out the award which gave that additional territory to the Province of Ontario which it has now secured, by resorting to every petty device and trick to diminish the importance of the Provincial Legislatures, while on the other hand by granting better terms to Nova Scotia in 1868, and afterwards being obliged to make innumerable concessions under some shape or form to the smaller Provinces, and by their most misguided railway policy of subsidising little enterprises which had no proper claims on the Dominion Treasury, gentlemen opposite have gone far to utterly undermine the spirit of independence in the Local Legislatures which every statesman should have known, and ought to have known, it was of the highest moment to encourage as the best guaranty for preserving and perpetuating our Federal system. Sir, I have shown the House, and the Minister of Finance, with his own Public Accounts in his hands, cannot deny the facts, the enormous amount of debt and taxes inflicted upon us, and I have shown that, independently of that, he and his colleagues have failed to a very great extent to show any value for our outlay; that those public works to which the hon. gentleman points, and which long ago, no doubt, had some considerable indirect value, have, by the progress of events, become of very little use, that they are in point of fact the means of incurring a very heavy annual charge to the country. I have shown also that the hon. gentlemen's attempt to settle the North-West has resulted, so far, in a most disastrous failure, not from any fault on the part of the country or of the people, but because of the gross and continuous misgovernment on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, or if he does not know he can easily satisfy himself,

that at the present moment Canada has become an exceedingly expensive country to live in. I have taken the pains, and the hon. gentleman might have been at the pains while he was in England, to examine into this question, and I think in the case of persons having moderate fixed incomes it is possible to live to-day cheaper in England than in Canada. I do not think this is the case to the same extent as regards the laboring class, or as regards artisans, because food is still very much cheaper with us than in England, and food forms a very large proportion of the cost of living in their case. But I take it upon myself to say that, on a fair comparison, the hon. gentleman will find that a person of moderate fixed income can live better in England than in Canada, and I can tell him that it is not a very creditable showing for us. I am very sorry indeed to say that, in the course of my recent peregrinations through the country, I have found that the question which is agitating the minds of thoughtful men has changed considerably. Formerly the question used to be: Is it possible for us, in the face of the difficulties with which we have to contend, to preserve Confederation? Sir, I am exceedingly sorry to have to tell hon. gentlemen opposite, and this House, that in many men's minds to-day the question is not as to the possibility of preserving Confederation, but it is this: Is Confederation such a blessing as to be worth a struggle to preserve? Sir, I say that under the existing conditions of affairs the position of Canada is growing worse and worse morally, financially and politically; that taking the country as a whole, we are growing poorer and more dishonest and more debased, and we will continue to do so unless a change takes place in the course and conduct of our Government. Our people and even members of this House are losing the commonest instincts of free men, and are allowing themselves to be trampled on under color of legal technicalities, until we have had here the wonderful spectacle of men sitting in this House as members who were openly and avowedly not returned by a majority of the votes of their own constituents, but by the whim of a returning officer. It might have been vastly otherwise; it ought to have been vastly otherwise. I say we had a great opportunity and a good country, and we should have proved ourselves worthy of the country and have made the best use of the advantages we have inherited. But the fact remains that, as matters stand, neither is the Minister of Finance nor are his colleagues helping this country forward; on the contrary, they are oppressing the people and practically driving them out of the Dominion. It may be that some remedy may be found. I trust it may—I trust that a remedy may yet be found. But I know that even when the people do wish to emancipate themselves they will be apt to find in the future as in the past that they are meshed in the results of their own folly, and that it is both dangerous and difficult to retrace their steps, even when they are aware of their danger. I have on former occasions pointed out that there were three great tasks which at the time of Confederation were placed before Canadian statesmen. If the hon. gentleman and his colleagues claim the title of real statesmen they must be judged by their success in accomplishing those tasks. It was our singular good fortune in 1867 to commence our career of national existence under circumstances which gave us a great advantage over the United States. Let us see how those hon. gentlemen have preserved that advantage. It was their duty, and notably and particularly the duty of the Finance Minister and his present chief colleague, to have educated the people of this country to a right comprehension of the Federal relations as between the Provinces and the Dominion; and it was, as they have oftentimes admitted, their special duty to help forward the settlement of the great country we acquired in the North-West Territory. I say that the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite to the title of statesmen depends wholly and entirely on the answer to the question as to how they have

accomplished these tasks. How stand the facts? Twenty years ago the taxes of the people of Canada were exactly one-third of the taxes of the United States. Twenty years ago the debt of the people of Canada per head was exactly one-third of the debt per head of the people of the United States. Twenty years ago the expenditure of the people of Canada bore about the same proportion to the expenditure of the people of the United States. How stands the record to-day? Why, if the Finance Minister will take the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, he will see that the position is almost exactly reversed, to our great detriment. Whereas our debt twenty years ago was one-third of the United States per head, to-day the net debt of the people of Canada is very nearly twice and a half times as great as the net debt of the people of the United States. We owe \$225,000,000, with a white population of 4,500,000. The American people, deducting the Pacific bonds, owe \$1,290,000,000, with a population of 60,000,000, so that our debt per head is almost exactly twice and a half that of the United States. What is the taxation? Whereas twenty years ago we started in the race with a net taxation per head of just one third that of the people of the United States; to-day, if you take the necessary taxes of the American people, deducting the taxes which they choose to impose on themselves for the purpose of paying off one hundred million dollars a year of national debt, it will be found that our necessary taxes, taking the hon. gentleman's own statement of last night, amount per head to just about double the necessary taxes of the United States per head. How hon. gentlemen have educated the people of this country to a right comprehension of the Federal relations as between the Provinces and the Dominion, let the shoals of deputations which have been waiting on the Finance Minister of late, let the innumerable concessions made during these twenty years to the various Provinces, testify. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that it is not possible, with any regard to the future of Confederation, to go on with this system much longer. While as for the way in which the hon. gentleman and his friends have carried out the settlement of the North-West, this House will remember that after expending one hundred millions of public money and many millions of private funds, after having to undergo an annual charge of \$7,500,000 for the purpose of paying interest on our outlay and of keeping in order and maintaining our territory in the North-West, we have in five years added 9,000 families to the total population of that region. Sir, although there are many other matters to which I might allude, I do not propose to detain the House any longer; but I say this: that if ever men stood in their places self-condemned they are the men who come to us to-day and exhibit to us this result—that, after twenty years of what they are pleased to call careful, prudent administration, the national debt of Canada has been trebled, the taxation has been trebled, the expenditure been nearly trebled, and in all that time the total population of Canada has been increased by about 30 per cent. Our taxes have been increased 200 per cent., our expenditure 200 per cent., our debt 200 per cent., and our total population about 30 per cent. In one word, we have increased six times as fast in taxes, in debt and expenditure as we have in the matter of population; and I say to any hon. gentleman here who thinks that this can go on, or that for the next twenty years we can venture to indulge in such follies as have marked our course for the last twenty years, that far less than twenty years will suffice to put a period to the monstrous extravagance which has brought about this result. I apologise to the House for the length of time I have occupied, and I thank them for the courtesy and attention with which they have listened to the long array of, perhaps, rather tedious figures I have given them. I advise my hon. friends on this side, and I advise hon. gentlemen opposite, if they will take the advice, to do a little more than to listen to the respective

speeches of the hon. gentleman and myself. I advise them to take the Public Accounts and to judge and learn for themselves whether or not the statements I have made can be verified; and I think that, if they will do that, they will agree with me that, whoever may be in blame for all this, there is ample ground for any thoughtful man to feel very grave alarm—as I confess I do myself—as to the result which will await the people of Canada, unless they put a stop to the measureless extravagance which has so long disgraced the administration of our affairs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the discussion, or replying to the House, but of suggesting that, if agreeable to both sides, we should take the second reading of the resolution, and then continue the discussion as fully as any hon. gentleman on either side may desire, when the resolutions are taken up *seriatim*. I do not know whether that will be agreeable to hon. gentlemen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have always thought that it was a great mistake to delay the discussion on the Budget; I think it should go on *de die in diem*. I would suggest that we should agree to go on with the debate to-night and, if need be, on Monday, until we get through. If that be the case, I suppose the suggestion of the hon. gentleman might be acceded to. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Mills), however, points out, what of course is true, that Monday is, in a special sense, a private members' day. Still it would be a great convenience to have the debate go on, and I suppose there would be no difficulty in making an exchange of days.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I don't see any difficulty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be a great convenience in that case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman to agree that we should take the second reading of the resolutions now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the understanding that there is the fullest possible discussion, without confining it to any particular item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

Resolutions read the second time, and agreed to.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Ontario Sault Ste Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means.

Blacking, shoe and shoe makers' ink, 30 per cent, *ad valorem*.
Harness and leather dressing, 25 per cent, *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Five per cent. is added to the duty on blacking. There is no change in the duty on harness and leather dressing. That is the reason the items are separated here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this change made for protective purposes, or does the hon. gentleman expect revenue from it, and if he does how much?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is done with the double object of giving a little greater protection, and of deriving revenue. It is expected that we shall receive an increased revenue of about \$1,000 from that item.

Blueing, laundry blueing of all kinds, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an addition of 5 per cent. on that. It is not a very large item, and this small increase of duty is intended to give increased protection to the industry in this country. We suppose we may derive about \$300 revenue from that item. The amount entered for consumption last year was \$8,350.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would point out that this is a tax which will be felt undoubtedly by a very hard-working and deserving class of the community, the class of washerwomen, and it is also, to a certain extent, a tax on cleanliness. On these two points it is therefore objectionable. It is a small tax, but really it appears to me we are running this thing to the ground. These unlucky washerwomen will have to pay a little extra, and the interest of cleanliness and domestic economy will suffer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope not. It is not expected to increase the price materially.

Advertising pictures, pictorial show-cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars, advertising almanacs, and tailors and mantle-makers' fashion plates, a specific duty of six cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no increase of duty in this item. The clause is reconstructed for the purpose of adding "illustrated price lists, advertising calendars and advertising almanacs" to the articles already mentioned in the clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does the hon. gentleman suppose this will be on the lowest grade of article? In these specific rates of duties, it is a matter of great difficulty to ascertain what the duty is, because some of these articles may be worth three or four times as much as the others, and this duty may be, as regards certain classes of articles, utterly prohibitory and comparatively little as regards superior quality. What is the maximum and minimum duty this would give?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has not been specially investigated, for the reason that the item remains precisely what it was before, with the exception of adding these three or four articles I have named to the previous list, and I think there will be found no objection to that. The imports of last year were \$24,405, and the duty received \$9,308. We estimate the same amount of duty this year, because the tariff remains unchanged. The hon. gentleman would himself, I imagine, make the calculation more readily than I could as to the rates of duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the facilities for doing it as the hon. gentleman has. I would ask him to make a note, and let us know at a more convenient time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will do so. You want the *ad valorem* rate as nearly as can be judged.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want what this 6 cents would represent. I would suggest in all these cases the hon. gentleman should cause enquiries to be made, as I have had numerous complaints made to me, as no doubt the hon. gentleman has had in many cases, of a specific duty being imposed in such a fashion as to be absolutely prohibitory, when possibly the Government did not intend that, and would certainly lose revenue by it.

Advertising pamphlets not illustrated, a specific duty of one cent each

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in the tariff on this item, but the words "not illustrated" are put in to make the item more explicit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you call a pamphlet. Is there any limitation to the number of pages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; provided it is not illustrated. If illustrated, it will go under the former class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. Minister can tell me what income he will get under this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The imports of last year were \$8,000, and the duty was the same as it is now. The duty received was \$3,039, and we expect the same amount this year.

Braces or suspenders, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an addition on that article of 5 per cent. The amount imported last year was \$92,360, and the duty received, at 30 per cent., \$27,705. We estimate the duty this year will be \$32,306.

Buttons of vegetable ivory, horn or composition, a specific duty of 10 cents per gross and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Buttons, all other, not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object of this is to give a little increased protection, but it is not expected that any revenue will be derived from that source. The imports in 1886 were \$305,863. The present duty on buttons of all classes is 25 per cent., and the change made adds 10 cents a gross to vegetable, horn and composition buttons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman suppose to be the range of value and the maximum *ad valorem* duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is rather a wide range, and it would be very difficult to get at the duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It occurs to me that although this 10 cents per gross covers a large amount of buttons, you will make the duty pretty heavy on the inferior kinds of buttons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We estimate that the proposed change will increase the duty from \$76,466 to \$78,000; only \$2,000 in all. It will increase the manufacture and limit the import.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think this was done by the hon. gentleman's predecessors. But might I enquire whether he is causing a note to be taken and records to be kept as to the results of these changes? In our Trade and Navigation Returns, a great many of these matters are lumped together in such a fashion that it is quite impossible, without special motion, to obtain the information we would like to have, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be advisable to have some sort of record kept, either in the Finance Department or the Customs, of the operation of a good many of these small duties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the suggestion. It think it is a valuable one, and I will take a note of it.

Buggies of all kinds, farm waggons, farm, railway or freight carts, pleasure carts or gigs and similar vehicles, costing less than \$50, a specific duty of \$10 each; costing \$50 and less than \$100 a specific duty of \$15 each, and in addition thereto in each case, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. All such carriages costing \$100 each and over, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object of this change is really to reach the question of under-valuation, and it will mainly apply and have a tendency to prevent very inferior articles being brought into the country that are really of very little value. The present duty on all kinds of these carriages is 35 per cent., and that will be very little changed by the present proposal. In fact, we estimate a very small increase, if any, to the revenue in consequence, but we believe that it will prevent under-valuation, and thus

be fairer than the *ad valorem* duty was without the specific. On carriages costing over \$100, the duty will remain what it is present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the duty you get at present?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty received last year was \$13,294, and we only expect \$14,300 under the new proposition, so it is not for the purpose of obtaining revenue, but to check under-valuation, and to prevent the inferior description being brought into the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that is true enough, but I recollect that that doctrine was a good deal objected to in ancient times.

Mr. BOWELL. The increase to 35 per cent. was objected to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mean the doctrine that the increase would prevent an inferior article coming in, but there is, no doubt, some truth in it.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the free trade doctrine, however.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs state roughly what the quantity of these articles of a less value than \$50 is which have been imported?

Mr. BOWELL. They are not kept separately in our books, but the total number imported last year was 467.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Value, \$41,475.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of all kinds named here?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, of all kinds.

Cotton sewing thread on spools, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is an increase from 20 to 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What increase is expected on this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount received last year was \$83,670. Under proposed rate it would give \$104,587.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you expect as much as \$21,000 increase?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, if imports not checked.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, again, I point out in regard to this sewing thread, that, though it seems a small item in one sense, if I am correctly informed, the seamstresses and persons employed in making up clothing are obliged in many cases to provide their own thread, and this comes very heavily on an extremely ill-paid class of the community. I am afraid that the case is with us, as it is in England and in many other communities, that the unfortunate sewing girl, or seamstress, or tailoress, or whatever they may call her is about the worst paid, and approaches nearer to the condition of a white slave than any other wage-earner in the community, so, as those people supply their own thread, every additional cent of tax that you put comes on a very ill-paid and deserving class.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite sympathise with everything the hon. gentleman has said in regard to the seamstress. As he will find in regard to cuffs, and collars, and shirts, we have specially taken that into consideration, but in this matter it was believed there would be no material increase in the price owing to this increased duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it anticipated that sewing thread may be manufactured in Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is brought in hanks, and spooled here. It will encourage the industry of spooling in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman will see that, if he is correct in expecting an increased revenue of \$21,000, the price must be raised in proportion. You will not get the money without the price of the article being raised.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say that we will receive \$104,000, but that the rate of 25 per cent. on the same amount would give that. It is not expected that there will be so much imported. I find the estimate is that we will receive only \$8,000 additional, owing to a larger quantity being spooled in Canada, and not imported in spools but in hanks.

Jeans and coutilles, imported by corset makers for use in their factory, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In that case, there is an increase of 5 per cent. in favor of cotton factories, but we do not expect to derive any increase of revenue on that account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present revenue?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$8,363.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may mark that as a purely protective tax?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you not expect to lose a little revenue on that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is quite possible that we may, but at any rate we do not expect to get any additional.

Printed or dyed cotton fabrics not elsewhere specified, 32½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is also an increase of 5 per cent. to cotton factories and print works. The duty collected in 1886 was \$524,854. The addition would give us \$95,000 if the imports continued the same, but they will probably decrease, and we may possibly expect \$75,000 additional.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is in my humble opinion a most unfortunate increase. The poorer classes of this country were called upon some years back to pay an increased duty from 25 to 27½ per cent. on printed cottons. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to raise that to 32½ per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must call your attention to the disorder which prevails, and I am sure that the Minister of Finance will agree with me—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That nothing can be more ill-judged than to interrupt discussions of this kind. There is no desire to do anything but to obtain reasonable information about this motion, and it is very much to be deplored that hon. gentlemen should delay our proceedings. They know perfectly well if they do, that no progress can be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope there will be no repetition of the slightest interruption when any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, or on this side, is addressing the Chair. I do not think anything could possibly be more objectionable or more calculated to delay the public business which the Government has brought before the House, from making progress.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was proceeding to say that I think that this is a very unfortunate increase. The hon. gentleman

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

man could not lay his finger upon anything that is imported into this country that is used more generally by the poorer classes than printed goods. They cannot do without them, and I think that before asking us to increase an item of this kind, that is largely used by the poorer classes, and on which a very heavy duty has already been placed for the purpose of protecting a factory established in this country some years ago, I think he should have hesitated, and possibly have added to something rather than this. I am quite prepared to say that when luxuries are imported and revenue is necessary, duties should be put upon these things; but upon goods that are of absolute necessity, in the case of settlers, poor and rich, and particularly the poor, I think it is the most unfortunate increase the hon. gentleman could have made. We know perfectly well that common print is a thing that is manufactured in this country to a very limited extent. When the law was changed for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture, the argument was used that it was for the sole purpose of giving the company an opportunity of producing these articles in Canada. At that time the most positive assurance was given to the House that if we would consent to make the duty 27½ per cent. the company that was being formed for the purpose of producing prints would be able to operate within that limit, and operate successfully; that they did not think it would be at all necessary in the interest of that company to ask for some protection. Now, in place of carrying out that agreement, in place of carrying out the understanding that was then entered into between this House and the company, they now come to a new Parliament and ask an increase of 5 per cent., which is a direct levy upon the resources of the poorer classes. I think it is the most unfortunate thing the Government could have done. If it was necessary to keep that establishment alive, it would have been better, in the interest of the poor in this country, that the Government should not have consented to that increase, but should have said to the company, if you cannot possibly manage to manufacture within the limits we granted you, we will have to decline to give you a further increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite appreciate the argument the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House, and I feel its force to the fullest extent. But I may be allowed to remind him that when it was proposed to make the manufacture of cotton practicable in this country, and to establish these industries, exactly the same line of argument was adopted, namely, that the effect of putting on such a protective tariff for the manufacture of cotton in Canada as would enable it to be successfully manufactured, would cause great hardship to the mass of the people who were obliged to purchase that cotton. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that that has not proved to be the case, although it might have been so in the first instance. But it has resulted in such an amount of capital being brought into the country as to make cotton cheaper, perhaps, than it ever was before in Canada, and of a better quality, and that the only persons who are in a position really to demand the sympathy of the House are the unfortunate manufacturers who have invested their capital in the industry. Now, this industry does not stand under precisely the same footing as it did. It is perfectly well known that great populations, such as England and the United States, have an enormous advantage in the manufacture of prints. There is a great desire, of course, to have a great variety, and there is a considerable amount of expense, and I confess that I had some misgivings as to whether we had a sufficiently large population in Canada to carry out successfully the application of the principle to prints. However, Parliament did adopt that policy, and it is found that owing to the keen competition between countries which have a great population to provide for, and the enormous quantity they are able to

manufacture of the same pattern, it is extremely difficult for Canada to compete with them. Under these circumstances the question arose as to whether this industry should be still further sustained by giving them a certain amount of protection. I may say that at the recent Colonial and Indian Exhibition in England, we had a wonderful display of those printed cottons, and I took means to inform myself as to whether the prices at which they were marked, and the prices at which parties sending them at that exhibition were willing to sell for, how they compared with prices in England and America, and I was greatly surprised to find that while these prints were of a very good quality indeed, the prices charged for them was not greater than that for which they could be purchased in London. I fully appreciate the argument the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House, but I am afraid it will be found necessary to give this slightly increased protection for the purpose of enabling the large amount of capital that has been invested in this industry to be made successful, and if it is made successful, I am quite sure that the competition is such that no material increase in the price will issue to the purchasers in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many factories are engaged in its manufacture here?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only one. The competition is with foreign prints coming into the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is one of the matters which cannot be justified even on the theory of protection. It is well known that in England, where cottons are printed, that hundreds of pieces are printed of the same pattern from the same rollers. After the rollers are worn by the large quantity printed upon them, they are planed off and engraved the second time and used for printing another season. This process is continued as long as it is possible for them to be used. Now, in this country there is not a hundredth part of the print required to justify the expense necessary in order to engrave upon these rollers a new pattern. The hon. gentleman knows right well that the same machinery used for the purpose of printing a pattern of goods could be used for twenty years in succession here, and not then be worn to any greater extent than the rollers would be in England in a single season. Now, the expense necessary to make the changes and to meet the wants and tastes of the population, are such as those engaged in the printing of cotton cannot incur in this country, nor can they afford to carry on the business in the same way that it is carried on in England or in France. The hon. gentleman proposes to give an enormous protection to certain parties to enable them to carry on a business which the population of this country forbids them profitably to undertake, unless, indeed, they do what I understand is done, that those very gentlemen on whose behalf it is proposed to increase the burden upon the people of this country, go to England and buy the rollers that have already been planed off and engraved, and reengraved, until they have become too small to be used any longer, and then, after being used there for the last time, they are sold at a mere trifle to these gentlemen to be used in this country. And so, to compel people in this country to wear prints of the same pattern for a series of years, it is necessary that this increased tax should be imposed. Now, if the facts are as I understand them to be, that these men engaged in printing calicoes in this country purchase the worn-out rollers in England, then they do not need protection. If they undertake to engrave new rollers, and to furnish for themselves new appliances, they propose to engage in a business for which the country is not at all suited. The hon. gentleman might just as well undertake to give an enormous protection in order to encourage the orange industry here, as to propose to establish a system of duties to enable parties to engage in a business which would require at the very least a population of fifty millions,

instead of five millions, to make it profitable. This is one of those industries for which, even upon the theory put forward by the hon. gentleman and those who have controlled the tariff for the past ten years, they can find no justification whatever on any principle, and the only effect is to add millions of dollars to the expenses of the people without any corresponding advantage to those who may be engaged in the business. Let the hon. gentleman take the quantity of calicoes imported and consumed in this country. Let him look at the prices and add the amount of taxes he proposes to levy, and he will see what a burden he is imposing on the people. And to what purpose? To enable half-a-dozen men who have formed themselves into a company to buy the worn-out machinery of a calico mill in England, and bring here obsolete patterns, and the Government imposes such a tax as will compel the women to wear goods printed in this particular mill. It is a monstrous proposition; and barons of old, who built their castles by the side of cross roads in order to pillage travellers and thus supplement their incomes, did not act in a way more objectionable or unjust than the Government propose to act in this matter. What advantage do they confer upon the people to justify them, or to afford a pretext even for what they propose to do? There is no justification whatever. If twenty men are employed in an establishment with worn-out machinery with which to produce calicoes for the Canadian markets, only those interested will receive advantage.

Mr. BOWELL. To what machinery do you refer?

Mr. MILLS. I refer to the rollers employed in printing calico, and I say that the Canadian manufacturer cannot afford to buy new machinery, but he will go to England and buy worn-out machinery from the mills there; and now the Government propose to charge this enormous sum in addition to the legitimate price, in order that those parties may put money into their pockets.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement of the hon. member for Bothwell that this proposal will add millions to the taxation of the country is not quite true. The value of prints imported was \$1,907,000, and the additional duty proposed will amount on that sum to \$95,000; so that it will not add millions to the taxation of the country as represented by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has also told the House that the quantity used is so exceedingly small that the mills cannot be profitably occupied and a very small quantity will be sold. It appears that 23,839,000 yards of printed cotton are used in this country, which would cover more than 16,000 miles in length, and that quantity would give profitable employment to a good many print mills. The addition of 5 per cent. will tend to promote the printing of those cotton goods with advantage to the people, because we know from experience that cotton manufactured here is much superior to cotton of English manufacture, and prints from this Canadian print mill are also much superior in quality to those we obtain from England. The additional taxation allowing for the best quality of prints, will be three cents per eight yards, sufficient to make a dress; and while it is not a serious tax, it will permit print manufacturers in this country to supply this quantity of upwards of 28,000,000 yards at present imported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the conclusion at which I arrived was this: that this proposition would not ultimately enhance the price, and for this reason. Evidence, which proved to be conclusive, was given that those parties who manufacture prints in England on such a gigantic scale, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), were ready to place their prints on the market of this country greatly below their value for the purpose of crushing out this industry, and being thus enabled to charge much higher prices. I had an opportunity to compare, and I did compare, the quality

and the price of Canadian prints with those that could be obtained in London, and I am quite satisfied that no great, no material hardship will occur in the shape of an increase of price over that which our people would be compelled to pay if this industry were crushed out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the factory?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At Magog.

Mr. COLBY. In regard to the industry referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I may say that the hon. gentleman is quite misinformed as to the character of the machinery used and the methods adopted at that establishment. An investment of some \$450,000 has been made at that place for the purpose of carrying on this industry. The machinery is the most modern and the best that could be procured in England, regardless of cost. The company is doing its own engraving. It is printing patterns of great variety and giving most excellent satisfaction to the Canadian trade, and it is, moreover, under-selling goods of equal quality produced in foreign markets. It is laboring under the disadvantage which all new enterprises started in Canada have had to encounter, that is the disposition of the mercantile community and of importers to deal in foreign rather than in domestic goods. The woollen manufacturers had to encounter it, and it formed one of the chief obstacles in the establishment of that industry. The cotton manufacturers also found it one of the great obstacles in their way. The importers, the wholesale merchants, the dealers, can make more money on imported than on domestic goods. The public do not know the cost of the imported articles, but they ultimately come to know in some way or other the cost of the domestic article, and consequently—it is one of the secrets of the trade, an open secret but one of the methods followed—the merchants prefer to deal in foreign rather than in domestic goods. The establishment at Magog produces one-fourth of the prints consumed in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the production?

Mr. COLBY. I think about 6,000,000 of yards; I am not precisely certain upon that point, but I think 6,000,000 or more was the production last year. The Canadian manufacturers are laboring under those disadvantages which are incident to the establishment of new industries. It is not their expectation that an increase in the duty will be attended with any corresponding increase in the price to the consumer in Canada. They expect to be obliged to under-sell the similar article produced abroad in order to get the market. It is necessary to do it, but it is freely admitted by the trade of Montreal, and, I think, by the trade in Ottawa, Toronto and the lower Provinces, that better value is given in the cotton, and equal value in the subsequent process which are put upon it by the Canadian prints than by the foreign prints. My hon. friend shakes his head. His information may have been received at the time this institution was in its infancy. It is a young institution now, but during the last year or eighteen months it has made remarkable improvements. Of course, in the establishment of an industry which requires skilled labor it is necessary to have the best skill and the best labor. No company is absolutely sure, in the first instance, that it is going to be able to obtain the best skill and produce the best article within the first few months of its existence. Difficulties have to be overcome, losses have to be encountered, and experience has to be gained; but I may say to hon. members that the gentlemen connected with that industry are gentlemen of the highest financial standing in this country—business men who are seeking to carry forward a business enterprise strictly on business principles, and who are doing, and intend to do, everything in their power to supply the trade of Canada with an article which is adapted to the wants of our people,

Mr. COLBY.

and which is required to meet the necessities of the country. And if it is necessary at all to ask the Government to give an increase from 27½ per cent. to 32½ per cent., it is not to enable them to add 5 per cent. to their price; it is simply that they find themselves handicapped by the disposition of the wholesale traders to give the preference to the foreign article, and not to encourage the domestic article. Consequently they are obliged to under-sell, they do under-sell, and they expect for some time to come to under-sell the foreign article. It is actually the case that merchants acknowledge the superiority of the goods produced in the mill, and yet, such is the prejudice against the foreign article, that the manufacturers of this superior article are not permitted to put their own trade mark upon it. The merchant insists that he shall put his own trade mark upon the goods, and many of those goods which are better than the foreign goods, are sold as foreign manufactured articles to-day. These things are incidental to the starting of a new enterprise; prejudices have to be overcome, and it is not in this line of cotton goods alone. I think the Government have done wisely to encourage and strengthen an enterprise which is well conceived and which will no doubt, under proper protection, become a success, and a credit and a useful industry to this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know if the weaving is all done here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is not; they are preparing to do it.

Mr. COLBY. I may say that the print mill was started almost at the identical time that the depression in cotton goods commenced, and that, while a building was constructed for weaving, it was impossible during that period of depression—and it has been impossible from that time to the present—to obtain capital—in fact, capital was not solicited; it would have been useless to solicit capital—to put in the spinning and weaving machinery. But in the meantime during this glut in the cotton market it has taken up, appropriated and distributed \$300,000 of cotton goods which otherwise would not have had a market. I may say to the hon. gentleman that capital is now being raised for the spinning and weaving. The mill is prepared and everything is in operation for the reception of the machinery. Some \$200,000 I think are required for putting in the necessary machinery for the manufacture of cloth. It is important to do so, because there is no machinery in Canada to-day which is precisely adapted to the manufacture of the finer qualities by the best and most economical methods; and in all probability within a very few months, should any hon. gentleman have an opportunity of visiting that establishment, he will find it one of which he will agree that the country may be proud.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), I think, admits that the goods that are printed in these mills are not manufactured in the mills where they are printed. One hon. gentleman has spoken of the superior quality of the Canadian cotton.

Mr. COLBY. They are manufactured in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They may be manufactured in Canada, but they must be specially manufactured for this business, for I think every hon. gentleman knows that the kind of goods manufactured for the purpose of being printed and made into calicoes are somewhat different from those which are intended to remain as bleached cotton. I do not understand how the cotton goods of Canada, which are of a different width from those which are converted into calicoes, are being converted into calicoes at this moment. One hon. gentleman says that the English calicoes are not of as good a quality as these goods. English unbleached cottons and some of the English bleached cottons, are also-

gether inferior to those manufactured in Canada and generally to some of those manufactured in the United States. The reason is that by the process of separating the superior fibre from the refuse matter they manufacture goods of different grades and qualities, and it is from the very best fibres that the best class of calico goods are woven. So that the hon. gentleman who made that statement has made a statement altogether at variance with the fact, when he says that the goods manufactured in Canada are of a superior quality to those of this class which are manufactured in England. On the contrary, they are necessarily of an inferior quality, because the refuse fibre is not separated from the better fibre to the same extent that it is in England. Then the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) says that the calicoes manufactured at this mill are printed from rollers engraved at the establishment.

Mr. COLBY. They are now engraving.

Mr. MILLS. That was not the case when the establishment was first formed. I think the hon. gentleman then informed the House—and my information from other sources was exactly the same—that the owners of those mills expected to buy their rollers in England—the rollers which were no longer required for use there—and to get them cheap, to be enabled to produce printed calico goods for something like the same price as they are produced in England. The hon. gentleman now tells us they have abandoned that notion. My information is that it costs about \$2,000 to engrave a set of rollers. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but that is my information—that to engrave a set of superior steel rollers will cost at least \$2,000. Now, it is perfectly obvious that in a cotton mill where 800 or 1,000 million yards are printed in a season when this cost is added to the price of the goods, it is possible to produce those goods at a much cheaper rate than in a mill where five or six million yards are printed. The hon. gentleman says that they print six million yards, and that they have a great variety of patterns. What does that mean? It means that a great expense is incurred for appliances to print six million yards that would be sufficient to print six hundred million yards. It is to turn capital from profitable investments to unprofitable investments. It is a curious thing that in this country, where we have immense resources to the development of which capital could be directed, it is proposed to put an enormous tax on the people for such a purpose as this. It does seem to me that the Government are taking a false step. The hon. gentleman proposes to make a large addition to the taxation of the country, and even with that it is extremely doubtful whether the Government will be able to raise sufficient money to meet their obligations. It is extremely doubtful whether we shall not have, at the end of another season, another deficit, as we are likely to have one at the end of this year. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? He proposes to close every avenue from which revenue may be obtained for this country. We are obtaining from the calico prints imported into this country a considerable amount of revenue, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes, by imposing an enormous burden on the country, to encourage the printing of cottons within the country. I think it is greatly to be regretted that Ministers should have formed this sort of combination with capitalists, and used their position for the purpose of levying a tribute on the people of this country. The farming population to-day have not by 30 or 35 per cent, as large an income as they had ten years ago. I know myself that the value of real estate has fallen 25 or 30 per cent. over a great portion of Ontario; and the hon. gentleman, with these facts before him, proposes to still further burden the people by levying a tribute upon them for the benefit of those who are quite capable of taking care of themselves. I am willing that the Government should put their hands

into the pockets of the people and take whatever is required for public purposes; but I am not willing that they shall persist in taking from those who by their industry earn their scanty incomes and give to those who are better able to provide for their own wants. The Government, I suppose, are acting on the scriptural theory that "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

Mr. WALDIE. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who say that cotton prints imported from England are better than those printed at Magog. My impression is that they print on an excellent cloth at Magog; but that cloth is manufactured in this country. There is machinery enough in this country at present to produce all the goods we require, and I should be sorry if this increased duty should be the means of adding new spindles to the unused cotton machinery already set up. I see no reason why the gentlemen who have the print works at Magog should not purchase their cloth from the other mills in which machinery is standing idle for want of work. I think it would be for the best interest of the country that that should be done; and as there is only the one print mill with numerous cotton mills, I do not see that it is necessary to give this increased protection to this one mill. I think the proprietors of that mill are doing reasonably well. They are supplying the market pretty extensively, and I think with the protection they already enjoy they will soon pay a better dividend than any other cotton mill in the country. There is, I know, in the wholesale trade an unwillingness to take the manufactures of this country and place them in the hands of retailers, for the reason that the wholesale people themselves desire to make a profit; and as the character of the goods is known to the consumer, the retailer cannot so easily obtain a profit on the goods manufactured in this country as he can on imported goods, and therefore there is opposition to overcome, as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) correctly stated. But I think that the merit of the goods is telling upon the market, and that the Magog company will be able to make a reasonable profit without this increased tariff. With regard to the character of the goods that come from England, the second year's run is frequently sent to this country, and these goods are sold in the English market at a lower price than the first year's produce. A limited quantity of the first year's print comes to this country to the first-class retail traders in the larger cities; but the general retail trade of the country only import the second year's run. The third year's production, I am informed, goes to India and other markets where it is sold at an even lower price than the second year's print in this country. I am very anxious that the industries of the country shall have reasonable protection and shall prosper; but I think that, as those gentlemen have the only mill in the country that we are likely to have, the Government should not give them all they ask, because people are inclined to ask too much. I have no doubt that the gentlemen connected with that mill are most respectable men, are good business men, and are very anxious to increase their dividend. They have pressed their case on the Government, but I think the Government have yielded a little too far, and I hope they will see proper to modify their proposition.

Mr. COLBY. I hope my hon. friend from Bothwell will be satisfied with the statement of facts given by his friend who sits behind him, although he would hardly admit them when they were thrown across the House from me. It is positively true, as the hon. gentleman who has last spoken has stated, that the Magog goods are superior in quality to the similar class of foreign goods, and that the cotton cloth upon which they are manufactured is better than what is used in the manufacture of that class of foreign goods, the

fine spun theories of the member for Bothwell to the contrary. I would say, in reply to the suggestion which fell from the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, that there is no increase of duty asked upon the cloth which is manufactured for the purpose of being printed upon; consequently, the tariff will remain, so far as that is concerned, precisely as it was. While it is true that the mills have been able to supply the Magog factory with a good quality of cloth, they have not been able to do so advantageously, for this reason: that their looms are not specially adapted for that purpose. They do not work with that degree of rapidity which is susceptible of being attained in the manufacture of this special line of goods, and, consequently, a very considerable economy in the manufacture can be effected if the looms and the whole weaving and spinning machinery be adapted to this specially, and that is one reason why it has become necessary to put that machinery into the mill. There is one other point I will refer to which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell. It is quite true that I stated, when the proposition was originally submitted to the House to impose an increase of duty upon print cloths, that it was the intention of the company to purchase rollers from England, and the company did purchase rollers from England; and I will explain to the hon. gentleman the reason, and he will see that even that was not an unwise course to have taken. I am told there are certain lines of cotton printed cloths that do not vary from one year to another. I am sure that the gentleman who has just spoken will confirm my statement, for he seems to be familiar with the trade, when I say there are certain staple patterns and colors, which constitute a large portion of the consumption of the people of Canada, that do not materially change from year to year. Now, it was copper rollers, susceptible of printing that particular class of standard and suitable patterns, that were purchased by the company, but the company has been emboldened to go one step further. It has been emboldened to go beyond these ordinary common staple patterns, which are mostly used by the farming class of the community, and to attempt a more tasteful variety of goods, and in doing that, they are now obtaining from abroad, before they were ever reproduced at all upon rollers, the very best patterns that can be obtained in England and Paris, before they come upon the market, and are reproducing those patterns by their own engravers in their own mills here. That has been a very marked success, and during the last year very great satisfaction was expressed by the merchants, with the superior taste and superior quality and fine selection of patterns which this mill has been enabled to produce. I mention this point simply to correct the misapprehension that seems to exist in reference to it.

Mr. WALDIE I would wish to bring out this additional fact, that in England everything is done by printing companies, and they buy their cloths, and I do not see why the Magog Printing Company should not continue to purchase their cloths from the cotton mills as they do at present. This is done in the United States also. By giving this additional protection you will create a monopoly, and the printing company will no longer buy its cotton cloth from the cotton mills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a large business, about one-third of our whole revenue from cotton appears to come from this. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, has taken stock of that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total exports were a little under \$2,000,000 on this item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That makes one-third of the revenue from cotton goods derived from this article. The hon. gentleman, noticing how large an item it is, had

Mr. COLBY.

better consider whether the revenue may be more diminished than he expects, as is possible if the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) is correct. We are now manufacturing one quarter of a million, and one additional quarter would make a serious inroad in the hon. gentleman's calculations.

Mr. COLBY. We will not do that this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But if you go ahead in your monopoly you will.

Earthenware and stoneware, namely, demijohns or jugs, churns and crocks, a specific duty of three cents per gallon of holding capacity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say there is an increase of one cent per gallon. The duty before was two cents. This will produce a very small increase of revenue, perhaps \$500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then to attain \$500 you add 50 per cent. to the tax on an article which most undoubtedly comes into general household use. I might mention to the hon. gentleman that I have received telegrams from parties whom I do not know, but who are in that trade, in which they protest strongly against the increase of duty on this particular kind of crockery, as it is likely to injure their trade very much. In this kind of ware, being of comparatively small value, the additional tax may be heavily felt. Does the hon. gentleman expect to increase the manufacture?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Considerably. Only \$1,630 duty was paid in last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to how much is consumed in the country?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There were 7,829 gallons for one month, when the duty of two cents a gallon was in operation. There will be little difference as far as revenue is concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted the hon. gentleman has no particular objection to state the fact that this is one of the duties he has been requested to impose by the manufacturers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman made enquiry as to the amount manufactured in Canada, and the number of establishments and hands employed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is manufactured in New Brunswick and in London and in St. John's, Quebec. It is thought this will give a very considerable stimulus to the industry, without sensibly affecting the revenue. I am not quite certain how many factories there are. There is the British Porcelain Works, white granite, at St. John's, P. Q., which is one of the principal places. There is the Davisville Pottery in Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is that?

Mr. BOWELL. In East York.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then there is a manufactory at Pottersburg in Ontario, also. I think that is in Middlesex. There is the London Crockery Manufacturing Co.

Mr. MILLS. There is one in Brantford.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, there is one in Brantford and one in Belleville.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a considerable number, and this will cause more to be established in this country; it will lead to the extension of works, to the investment of more capital and to the employment of more labor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the total exportation is only what the hon. gentleman led me to understand, there does not seem to be much margin for the employment of additional labor,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is only one item. There are other items in regard to this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that three cents per gallon mean, translated into *ad valorem*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 30 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would it not be a good deal more on the inferior articles?

Mr. BOWELL. Not on the average.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but the average is generally very misleading. A duty of 30 per cent. on the average might be 60 or 70 per cent. on the inferior article, and much less than 30 per cent. on the better article. I would suggest to the Finance Minister that it would be well if he would ascertain the maximum and minimum. Those are points that we should be advised upon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will take a note of that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the earthenware should have been separated from the stoneware. Earthenware is very much in use by the farming class for milk pans, and the cost of these will be very much increased by this change, while the amount added to the stoneware, which is much more expensive, will not be so great in proportion. I think it is a pity that a division should not have been made. I have a friend who is now a partner in one of those establishments, and has been for two years. I know from him, personally, that the profits during the past year were very satisfactory, that he was quite satisfied with the two years that he was in the business, and that he had found nothing in which he has been engaged in Canada so lucrative, and he made that statement to me before the three cents per gallon was put on. I think this proves most positively that for the Finance Minister to be able to judge as between the consumer and the manufacturer, he should be thoroughly posted as to the cost of producing these manufactures. The Minister of Finance is quite in the dark as to the profits which are derived from the manufacture. The result is that a combination is formed by the manufacturers, they come to him as others do who are engaged in other industries, he yields to their appeals, and an additional tax is put on the consumer, especially on the poorer classes, because earthenware should not be put in the same category with stoneware. I think, if there had been a duty of 1½ cents a gallon on earthenware and 3 cents on stoneware, it might be reasonable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is only an increase of 1 cent, not 3 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is an increase of 50 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is an increase from 2 cents to 3 cents.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the duty on earthenware and stoneware should be put together, because the stoneware imported from the United States enters into direct competition with the earthenware manufactured in this country. The retail price for earthenware is about 20 cents a gallon; so 3 cents a gallon duty is not very large. There are hundreds of these manufacturers in this country, principally of earthenware, but the stoneware comes into competition with them, and an inferior class of stoneware is made very cheaply in the United States, and is brought in at low rates, and is driving out of the business our manufacturers of earthenware.

Earthenware and stoneware, &c., not elsewhere specified, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty on this was 30 per cent. There is an increase of 5 per cent. It covers items 145, 146 and 147 in the present tariff, which are grouped together. The imports in 1886 amounted to

\$454,893; 5 per cent. of that would add \$22,744 to the revenue, but we estimate that at the outside there will not be an increase of more than \$15,000, because it will lead to a great deal more being manufactured in the country.

Flag-stones, sawn or otherwise dressed, \$2 per ton, specific

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What does that cover?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It covers item 161 in the present tariff. The present tariff is \$1.50, and it is proposed to add 50 cents a ton to that, the result being that the sawing, instead of being done out of the country, will be done in the country.

Mr. ELLIS. Does that mean marble?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not necessarily marble, but any kind of sawn stone.

Mr. ELLIS. The tax will be very objectionable in the Maritime Provinces. This stone, as I understand it, is brought in in the rough and sawn in Toronto or Montreal, and the expense of carrying it over the Intercolonial is so great that the manufacturers in the Maritime Provinces find it cheaper to import it from the United States. There is not enough used in the Maritime Provinces to make it worth while to saw it there, so you are compelling those who use a small quantity to pay the additional cost of carrying it over the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There were only 1,602 tons imported, and I am sure that, if there is anything that they do not require to import in the Maritime Provinces, it is stone. The Province of New Brunswick, which the hon. gentleman is so competent to speak for, abounds in the finest stone of every description and quality, and the Province of Nova Scotia, for which I am qualified to speak to some extent, possesses free stone of every description, of the finest quality. Why we want to import stone, either sawn or unsawn, I do not understand.

Mr. ELLIS. I asked if this covered marble.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, this is flag-stones. The \$2 per ton, I may say, is equal to a rate as nearly as we can calculate, of about 33¼ per cent. The value of the imports last year was \$9,413.

Glass carboys and demijohns, bottles and decanters, flasks and phials of less capacity than four ounces, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the same as at present. It is separating the articles; they were grouped together with the next item; consequently we had to make two separate resolutions.

Flasks and phials of four ounce capacity and over, telegraph and lightning rod insulators, jars and glass balls, and cut, pressed, or moulded tableware, a specific duty of 10 cents per dozen pieces, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty is 30 per cent., and the addition of 10 cents per dozen will materially assist glass blowers in competition with the very low prices at which these articles are sent from Germany, where labor is so much cheaper than it is in this country. The imports of these articles last year amounted to \$371,840, and we may expect an increase of perhaps \$10,000 in revenue, while it will lead to a large increased manufacture in the country.

Mr. MALLORY. Why should there be such a difference between bottles under four ounces and those over four?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The reason is that this is a specific duty by the dozen; and you would make it a very high specific duty if you put it upon ounce bottles; consequently four ounces is taken in order to limit the application of that specific duty which would be so heavy upon small phials.

Mr. MALLORY. There are particular uses to which the four, six and eight ounce bottles are applied, namely, for

purposes of prescription. The six and eight ounce bottles, particularly, are the ones that are used more often than smaller ones. I have always understood there was considerable profit in their manufacture in this country, and I cannot understand why there should be such a distinction between the two ounce bottles, and the four, six and eight ounce. These are sizes generally used in prescriptions, and nothing else.

Gold and silver leaf, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is an increase from 20 to 30 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it for revenue or protection? You will not get both.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will give about \$15,000 more revenue if you apply it to the imports of last year; but it is expected that it will not give more than a \$1,000, for the reason that there will not be so much imported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it because the extra duty will diminish consumption?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose it will be made here.

Sewing machines, whole, or heads, or parts of heads of sewing machines, a specific duty of \$3 each, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty is now 20 per cent. and \$2 specific. It is proposed to make that \$2 specific instead of \$2. There was \$6,801 paid in duty in 1886. The addition of a dollar each would give \$6,801 increase. But probably the imports will be greatly decreased. We estimate, therefore, the increase at only half that sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see you put a duty of \$3 on each. Is that on every single item of a sewing machine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Suppose some small part of a sewing machine was imported, would that be taxed \$3?—for purposes of repair, for instance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think what they call the head of a sewing machine covers the bulk of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not the head of the sewing machine cover the great bulk of the machine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and it is to prevent bringing them in in parts.

Leather, sole, 3 cents per lb., specific.
Leather, belting leather, and all upper leather, including kid, lamb, sheep and calf, tanned or dressed, but not colored, waxed or glazed, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present rate is 15 per cent. and the average value is 20 cents., per pound, which makes 3 cents per lb., practically the same. It is done for the purpose of separating that portion of the clause from the next clause that follows.

Japanned, patent or enamelled, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an increase of 5 per cent. The value of the imports of japanned, patent or enamelled, was \$15,000. The enamelling, &c., will be more largely done in Canada, and we cannot expect any increase of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any factory for enamelling in existence at all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is largely done in the country, in Montreal.

Liquorice root, paste, extracts of, 2 cents per lb., specific.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 15 per cent., an average value of 8 cents per pound would be 2 cents per pound duty, equal to 25 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue expected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This should give about \$10,000 more revenue. The imports were 1,072,685 pounds.

Oil cloth, floor, a specific duty of 5 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I move to reduce that to 15 per cent. *ad valorem* and 5 cents a yard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the two together supposed to amount to?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 20 per cent., average value 50 cents. Five cents and 20 per cent. will be equal to 30 per cent. It is not intended to increase it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you expect no increased revenue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. The present duty is five cents and 10 per cent. The change is to an *ad valorem* duty of five per cent., which will yield an increased revenue of \$2,500, and augment our Canadian manufacture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there not a great variety in the qualities of this article and a very wide range of value?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The reason a specific duty is applied is to check under-valuation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It makes it a very heavy duty on the low grades, which are very largely used by many classes of the community.

Mr. McMULLEN. The duty on some classes will be raised to about 45 per cent. This applies to lower grades, which can be purchased wholesale at 20 cents per yard, upon which a specific duty of 5 cents per yard and 20 per cent. will raise it to the amount I have stated. On the higher qualities used by people who are well able to pay, the rate of duty will be much less. The effect of a specific duty of this kind is to increase largely the cost of goods used by the poor classes. This also applies to table oil cloths, some of which can be bought at from 10 to 20 cents per yard wholesale, and a specific duty of 5 cents and an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. make a very heavy duty; on the poorer grades the duty may range up to 45 per cent., while on the higher qualities it will not exceed 30 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will perceive that the change can make very little difference, because, although the import last year was 6,517,000 yards, of the value of \$138,609, all we estimate as an increase of duty is \$2,500. So it is scarcely a perceptible increase.

Paper hangings. (See Item 22, p. 405.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 30 per cent. This is a reconstructed table altogether for the purpose of applying specific duties, and the specific duties have been arranged upon value, as nearly as we can ascertain the value of the different kinds, so as to keep the duty practically the same as at present. It will slightly increase the duty on the first item, brown blank; but it will practically leave all the balance at the same rate as before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not expect any increase of revenue?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed that although the hon. gentleman only intends to make the duty the same as before, yet that on some of the poorer qualities it will be very much increased, and as some qualities are sold wholesale at very low rates, the duty will be as high as 50, 60 or 70 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is done to avoid disputes about value. This change to specific duty will simply increase the first item, but not the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The statements made to me are to a different effect. What revenue does the hon. gentleman expect to obtain from paper hangings?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The imports of last year were of the value of \$225,116 and the revenue \$85,579.

Paper, of all kinds not elsewhere specified, 22½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty on calendered paper is 22½ per cent. while that on uncalendered is 20 per cent. It is proposed to increase the duty on uncalendered paper. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to allow this item to stand.

Pickles in bottles, 40 cents per gallon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a considerable change. It is based upon a 30 per cent. tariff, as it now is upon Crosse and Blackwell's pickles, but increases the duty upon those of not so good a quality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What revenue does the hon. gentleman expect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the head of pickles we expect to obtain an increased revenue of \$5,000.

Plated cutlery, 50 cents per dozen and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the importation and what increased revenue is expected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 30 per cent. This is a large increase in the cheaper kind of plated knives, but the duty on the best class will not be materially increased. We do not expect an increased revenue from it, and the duty is put on to shut out the worthless and inferior articles.

Plumbago, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Plumbago, all manufactures of, not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This leaves plumbago the same as before, and gives a protection of 5 per cent. on the manufacture. We do not expect any increase of revenue.

Salt, coarse, 10 cents per 100 lbs. (not to include salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or salt imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty).

Salt, fine, in bulk, a specific duty of 10 cents per 100 lbs.

Salt in bags, barrels or other packages, a specific duty of 15 cents per 100 lbs., the bags, barrels or other packages to bear the same duty as if imported empty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The effect of this will be to give an increase of 2 cents per 100 lbs., on the first two items and 3 cents per 100 lbs. on salt in bags or barrels. It is expected to give some small increase, about \$3,000 only, because it will lead to more being manufactured in the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be well that some provision should be made that refuse salt, imported in bulk for agricultural purposes, should be allowed to come in at a low rate. I admit that it is not brought in, but there is a large quantity of salt used for agricultural purposes, and if a provision of that kind were made it would keep down the price of the home article and encourage its use.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that all salt imported from Great Britain or the British possessions comes in free.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why not make it free from any place for agricultural purposes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because we have abundance of salt in the salt wells of Ontario, and all it requires is an increase of the industry to enable it to furnish, at a reasonable price, all the salt that can be needed for any purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit the hon. gentleman's argument, but I contend that if you permit it to be imported from the United States in bulk free—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would certainly destroy the industry altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It would have the effect simply of keeping down the price of the Canadian article and permitting those who want to buy it by the car load to do so at a less price than at present.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, get out.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an important matter which deserves the attention of the House, and no jeers from hon. gentlemen opposite will deter me from doing my duty with regard to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government are greatly indebted to the hon. gentlemen opposite for their assistance in carrying through these items, and I certainly hope there will be no interruptions to gentlemen discussing them, and I do not think there was any intended.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the item were altered to permit the importation from the United States, it would tend to reduce the value of the bulk salt at the well, simply because they would have to compete with imported articles—not that I think that it would be imported—but it would have the effect of lowering the price.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am told that the competition is now so sharp that it is almost impossible to produce at the present price, and allow it to come in free would simply shut up the industry, and nothing would be gained by that.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. gentleman has been misinformed as to the extreme competition with American salt. I live near the salt district and I know that a great deal is used in my neighborhood, but I am not aware of any American salt being brought in for use on land. I agree with my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that, as to this particular kind of salt, the increased duty will give too much protection. It is a cheap, refuse salt, used for putting on the land, and I think it should be allowed to come in at a low rate for the benefit of our farmers. I quite agree that it would not be brought in, but it would simply compel the manufacturers here to sell this lower grade salt at a little lower price. The effect of the changes in the tariff is not only to give an increased protection on the higher grades, but a disproportionate protection on the cheaper grades which the farmers use. That is one point. Another is that I think some consideration should be extended to those who import salt for dairy purposes. The dairy industry is one of the most promising in Canada. It is an agricultural industry which does show signs of some improvement at the present time. Cheese and butter are going to be staples, and salt is an important item in their production. A good deal of that salt comes from England, but some fine grades are now made in the United States, and I think that salt imported for dairy purposes should have the same consideration which is extended to salt for packing fish. The dairy industry is quite as important as the fish industry, and the farmers who have so long been asked to stand aside and allow the manufacturers to have the benefit of protection should have some consideration now.

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy of the Government is a protective policy, and this impost is undoubtedly in that line. It is certainly true that salt can be produced in the American salt districts cheaper than in Canada, and for this reason: In the Michigan salt districts the manufacture is carried on in connection with steam lumbering mills, the wells being in connection with the mills and the brine being pumped up by the mill power. The refuse of the

mills is used for fuel for the evaporation of the salt, and the barrels are also produced at the mills, so that the production is thereby much cheapened. Although our salt in the vicinity of Goderich is of a superior quality, yet, owing to the fact that the fuel must be provided, especially for evaporation, and the material for the barrels must be provided, the production cannot be carried on as cheaply as in Michigan. For that reason it is necessary, if we are to permit our salt manufacturers to furnish salt here, to afford them some protection. I do not know the question practically. I suppose those interested in it have made representations to the Minister which led him to make this increased charge; and if we are to have protection at all, I see no reason why we should not grant this protection to the salt producers.

Mr. CASEY. I did not ask that there should be no protection at all. I merely stated as a fact that, under the existing tariff, American salt does not come into Canada to any extent at all, and if the present tariff excludes American salt, I contend that it is sufficient protection.

Mr. PORTER. As I have the honor to represent a riding in which the salt industry is a large one, I may be allowed to say a few words as to the change proposed. There is no doubt that the salt interest is a very important one in this country, although confined to a very small district. It is well known to gentlemen who have watched the progress of this enterprise, that the people who have been engaged in it have lost money of late years, and it is also true that this industry has provided employment for many of our own people; and when this House has committed itself to the policy of protection for Canadian industries, it should not object to any means of promoting this industry which the Minister of Finance may offer. The duties now proposed will certainly be an advantage to the salt industry, and I think every man who has the good of his country at heart, would wish to see every industry of this country promoted, so long as the burdens of the people are not increased beyond endurance; and I think the trifling duty the Minister proposes to add to that which already exists on the article of salt, will certainly not be a burden upon the people, while it will be a great benefit and relief to those gentlemen who have had the public spirit and courage to engage in this enterprise, although at a loss of money for several years. I hope this House will generously carry this motion, and the Minister of Finance will receive no opposition whatever in his endeavor to carry out the policy of protection which he has advocated in this House.

Mr. MALLORY. I have no particular objection, as the policy of protection has been adopted by the country, that there should be a reasonable amount of protection, provided it is apportioned with reference to the quality of the goods, and with reference to those who use the goods protected; but I can assure you, so far as this item is concerned, that the farming community throughout Ontario, where very large quantities of salt are used for fertilising purposes, will regard this duty as very objectionable. I have the honor to represent an agricultural constituency, and I know that very large quantities of salt are used by the farmers. I know also that the profits farmers are able to derive from farming are comparatively small; that they are hampered in every way, and that nearly every duty which is increased by this tariff has borne more heavily on the farming community, and upon the poorer classes, than it has upon the wealthy classes of the country; and this increased duty on salt is simply adding another to the already heavy burdens imposed on the farming community. I speak of this because our farmers have spoken to me in regard to the matter, and I know that I am only speaking their views when I say that this measure will be very objectionable to them. Their profits are so small that any increase, no matter how

Mr. CHARLTON.

trifling, will be a source of annoyance and irritation to them. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Finance will be able, if it is absolutely necessary to increase the duty, to increase it on the finer grades of salt, and allow the coarser grades, which are used by the farming community, to remain at the present rate of duty.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The duty on salt has certainly not increased the price up to the present time, for never have the farmers got their salt at as low a rate as they do at present. But what makes the salt expensive is the enormous railway freights that we have to pay, and it is against these freights that the farmer needs to be protected, rather than against this or any other duty. I tried to get some salt for manure a couple of years ago, and, although the price at the wells was merely nominal, the freights over the Grand Trunk and Northern Railways were unbearable, so I had to give it up. There was no competition, and these railways charged just what they liked. As regards fine salt, that which is most valuable for curing meat and for dairy purposes comes from England; and, as for the duty being placed on fine salt alone, the farmers need that just as much as they do the coarse salt, so that there is no reason why there should be any discrimination between the two kinds of salt, so far as the farmer is concerned. As to the increased duty, a cent or two on a hundred pounds cannot affect the price to any extent. What we want protection against, however, is the exorbitant rate which the railways charge whenever they get a chance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. Minister of Finance had given us some statement as to the quantity of salt imported, it would have afforded some evidence as to the necessity of this change. My impression is that we do not import any.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The import of salt was 1,473,054 lbs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that import is almost wholly in the Maritime Provinces, and the increase is altogether unnecessary, because the existing duty absolutely excludes American salt from the Canadian market; and, certainly, the hon. gentleman has not proposed this increase for revenue, for even under the tariff that exists at present no revenue is derived from that source. In all these changes which are made in the tariff, not a single change is made in the interests of the agriculturists. The hon. gentleman in his Budget speech has spoken of the very great importance of our carrying out the principle of protection, and hon. gentlemen opposite cheered him; and yet we find that the protection is not protection for the community generally, but protection to small minorities, to particular parties, to persons engaged in special industries who call upon the Government to aid them at the expense of the rest of the population. The hon. gentleman proposes 120 changes in the tariff. And from the beginning to the end of those changes, he cannot point to one that is proposed in the interests of the farming class of this country. The hon. gentleman and his friends have been on the Treasury benches for nearly ten years, and to-day the lands of Ontario which had increased during the preceding four or five years at least 20 per cent. in value, are at least 30 per cent. less in value than they were when the hon. member first took office.

Mr. HESSON. Oh!

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says "Oh," but I say it is so. I say there is not a farmer, not a landed proprietor in this House, who does not own land in the immediate vicinity of some growing town or city, who can to-day obtain, as the cash value of property, what he might have obtained during the most severe years of depression between 1874 and 1879. The hon. gentleman, if he knows

anything of the value of property, knows that to be the case. The first Minister shakes his head, but I can tell him that there are loan companies in this country that loan on what is supposed to be two-thirds the value of the land, which are unable to obtain that value for the property to day. A friend of the hon. gentleman, in the Senate, is connected with one of the societies that loaned upon that principle, and were unable to proceed, that failed in business, in fact, simply because of the depreciation in the value of real estate. That depreciation is largely due to the fact that hon. gentlemen have from the first to the last, legislated in the interest of the minority and against the interests of the majority. What interest of the farming population have these gentlemen undertaken to protect? The hon. gentlemen have increased the public burden of this country to such an extent that what was a matter of choice has become a matter of necessity. The hon. gentleman knows it is impossible now, under the most careful administration, to have anything else than a high tariff. How does it improve this tariff? Take the case of the farming industry. So far as wool is concerned, no steps have been taken to protect the farmer in that respect. If there is anything in regard to which the farmer can be protected, that is left out of the tariff; if an article is imported into this country which goes into competition with what he produces, nothing is done to protect him. The farmer requires salt as a fertiliser. It is one of the things necessary to enable him to carry on efficiently his agricultural operations. The soil, from constant cultivation, has become depreciated and impoverished, and the hon. gentleman knows that it requires the use of fertilisers in order to improve its condition and increase its productivity. A farm which produces 15 bushels of wheat to the acre is worth less than one which produces on an average 25 bushels to the acre, yet the hon. gentleman proposes to legislate in such a way as to compel the farmer to be content with the average of 15 bushels. He legislates in such a way as to tax everything the farmer requires to enable him to cultivate his land properly. Is the cotton manufacturer dealt with in that way? No, the cotton manufacturer is allowed to import his cotton from the neighboring Republic free of taxation. The hon. gentleman does not pretend to tell the manufacturer that, the imposition of duty will not affect the price; but when it comes to anything that will benefit the farmer, a wholly different rule is adopted, and then legislation is had in such a way as to impose burdens upon him. Every step taken by the Legislature is a step taken to make the farmer tributary to the other persons in the community.

Mr. PORTER. I wish to say a word in regard to the agricultural position, as affected by this duty about to be proposed. I beg to say that the interests of the agriculturists will not suffer in the least degree by the proposed duty upon salt, because we know well that in this country there is salt enough and to spare, to supply all the possible wants that may arise amongst our people; and we know that salt is not to be in the control of one hand alone, but that it comes under the very salutary rule of competition. There are, perhaps, twenty different enterprises of this kind adjacent to the riding I have the honor to represent. Hon. gentlemen opposite are much exercised in reference to the farmers. Permit me to say, the farmers want, in Canada, nothing but fair play; we wish to share in the general prosperity; we wish to have no special benefit to ourselves, but that the same advantages be applied to us as are applied to all. If protection is applied to home industries, those engaged in the manufacture of salt have the right to the extension of that principle to their enterprises. No man who looks to the interest of the country and sees the vast extent of salt mines at our command, can for a moment suppose, except for the factious purpose of making capital before the farmers of the country, that the salt to be used

on land will be raised one cent, even by the waggon load. They speak to the farmers—I am one myself—as their special friend. Permit me to recall the words of an ancient poet: *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. "I am afraid of the Grits when they offer to be our friends."

Mr. HESSON. I regret the hon. member for Bothwell has on this occasion, as on all occasions when questions come up which may be discussed on their merits, endeavored to make some point with regard to the supposed disadvantages the agriculturists of Canada would labor under in consequence of the action of the Government. That gentleman lives in an agricultural part of the country and ought to be able to speak with a good deal of knowledge as to the surroundings of that country. Yet he stands here and professes to say, speaking for the farming community of Ontario West, that the farms are depreciated in value. He has stated what does not apply to any part of the country I have the pleasure of knowing. I have lived forty-four years in the county I have the honor to represent, and I can say that to my knowledge, and I think I know the western part of Ontario well, that that gentleman cannot point to an instance where farms in the west have depreciated in value. If I had the reports issued by the Departments of Ontario showing the improved value of farms and building stock, I could point out a tale that would rather startle the hon. gentleman. The value of these lands has increased millions and millions; in a very short radius of my district lands are sold to-day from \$70 to \$80, and as high as \$100, an acre does not show a tendency to decline in the value of land, granting what has been said to be correct, that the farmers are not making the great profits out of the management of their farms and out of their grain and stock they once did. But that cannot be avoided. It is absolutely impossible to prevent a recurrence of that, in face of the competition existing throughout the whole world, especially coming from India, Russia, France and the United States; all seeking that great market where our own exports have to go. If the grain that was shipped to-day is cheap, it would be still cheaper were it not for the National Policy, which gives at least control of our own market. I have here some evidence with reference to the very question that my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) raised. According to the Seasonal Papers of Ontario for the year 1885, the values of farm property appeared to be these: The value of farm lands in 1884 is given at \$624,000,000, and in 1883 at \$654,000,000. Is that a decrease? That shows an increase of something like \$30,000,000. The value of the buildings is \$173,000,000 in 1884, and in 1883 there is apparently a decrease of \$10,000,000, the amount being \$163,000,000. In live stock there is a decrease, but that is only because the values have decreased, while the numbers have largely increased. The whole statement of my hon. friend, in which he desired to show that farm value is less than it was, will not be verified by any hon. gentleman who is acquainted with the farming lands of western Ontario. As to the question of salt, we know that the coarse article which is of value to farmers can be obtained in the neighborhood of the mines very cheaply, for from \$1.50 to \$2 a load. That coarse salt, with a great amount of lime in it, is unfit for any purpose except agricultural purposes, but what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says is true, that, when it is necessary to haul it by the cars, unless the farmers combine and get a whole train load at a time, it would probably not pay them to get it for their purposes. I know, however, that salt has never been as cheap in Canada as it has been in the last few years, and, if the farmers combined, they could get it for \$1.50 to \$1.75 a load. My hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who once represented Huron, might say a word for the salt industry there. I do not know that it has had much advantage from this policy, and

I do not know that we could give it much advantage by adding this duty, but, if the producers are under the impression that they would be protected by a little addition to the duty, we might give them that protection. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that there was a very small amount collected for duty on salt in 1884, and I do not think that much would be added by the additional duty.

Mr. BROWN. I can speak with authority upon this question, as I have considerable dealings in the article. I know that never in the history of the country was salt supplied to the farmer or to any other consumer so cheap as it is to-day; and the result of such a policy as has been introduced now, in controlling the market for the salt producers, will be the same as has occurred in regard to other industries—not taxing the farmer by raising the price of the article, but by reducing the price of the article. Take the article of soap. My hon. friend from North Wellington knows well that to-day, notwithstanding that the tariff is prohibitory, the farmer buys his soap 20 to 30 per cent. cheaper than he ever did before, and the quality improving constantly, although hon. gentlemen opposite continually asserted that the farmer would have to pay an increased tax. It is unfortunate that clap-trap should be introduced into the discussion of a matter of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear;" but the farmer can understand that clap-trap which is intended to reach them as well as I do. They know that they get salt cheaper than they ever did before, and that the competition in this country may even make it cheaper. It is unfortunate that in the discussion of a question of this kind, matters should be brought in belittling the country in which we live, decrying the value of our lands, but the people would know more about this matter than the hon. gentlemen who are proposing to teach them. The farmer who buys the salt, and who knows that he is getting it cheaper than he ever did before, will understand the value of the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). I regret that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should have told us in 1878 and in 1882 that nothing could be done to protect the farmers. I take it that the farmers have never wanted anything particularly in this way, but have only desired to be placed in a position to take advantage of the times. In reference to this salt question, I think the Government have taken a step in the right direction in regard to what we know as the Liverpool salt, which will be admitted free. It is generally conceded the results obtained from that salt for agricultural purposes are more valuable than are obtained from Canadian salt. With regard to the coarse salt produced in Canada, I do not think that any results would flow from making it free when imported from the United States. We have our wells here; we want them developed; and I do not think there is a farmer who wants to have them lying still in order to increase the importation of coarse American salt. We know that the competition is keen, and that the prices are merely nominal at the wells, but it is the heavy freights that raise the price to farmers east of Toronto. I think the small duty which is now proposed is in the right direction. There can be no question that those who are engaged in the salt industry have been almost compelled to close their wells in the last year. Salt has never been cheaper. We want those wells continued, we want to see those industries prosperous, and I say the Government is taking a step in the right direction.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). There is just one argument for not placing this duty which is proposed by the Finance Minister. It will not affect the present price of salt, nor would it if you put on a duty of five times the amount which the Finance Minister proposes, because there is no salt at

Mr. Brown.

all imported from the United States for agricultural purposes. As has been stated on the other side, the price is as low as it ever was, and the farmers are buying their salt cheaper than they could get it for from the United States if there were no duty at all; but a few years ago the price of salt was down as low as it is to-day. It was down too low. The manufacturers could not make it at a living profit at the price they were getting for it. The consequence was that a combination was formed under the name of the Canada Salt Association. All the manufacturers of salt in Canada belonged to that combination, and the result was that the price of salt went up from 75 cents a barrel retail to \$1.40 retail in the town of Chatham. We were largely engaged in the salt business at that time, as we are to-day, and we sold thousands of barrels of salt for 75 to 80 cents retail, and after the combination was formed the price went up and it was sold at \$1.40 per barrel. The consequence was that so many men went into the manufacture of salt, on which there were large profits, that the competition was so keen that it broke up the association and the price came down as it is to-day. Now, the only thing I fear is that in placing a high duty upon this salt it may lead to a combination. The manufacturers have been for some time trying to arrange a combination to raise the price of salt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the same operation will be repeated and down will come the price.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). But see what the people lose in the meantime. There is no need for this high duty; there is no salt coming in at any rate affecting the manufacturers, as long as they keep the price as it is to-day, but if they form a combination and take it into their heads again to charge the people so much more for salt than they ought to charge them, then we will have a leverage to bring them to time by importing salt, if the people see fit, from the other side. That is the only reason why I think duties should not be placed so high. So long as they keep the price as it is to-day, there will be no need of any duty at all, because if you allowed it to come in free at present prices, no one could bring it in and live. There is another matter and that is in reference to salt used in curing and packing meats of all kinds. The packers tell me that this Canadian salt is not suitable for curing meats, and the consequence is that they have to import Liverpool salt altogether for that purpose. Now, the packing business is a very large industry in the west and in the east, and in Hamilton and in Montreal large factories are engaged in packing pork and meats of all kinds, and I think it would be a good idea for the Finance Minister, as he has proposed to allow salt to come in free from all the British possessions for the use of the fisheries, also to include it for packing purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It comes in now free for the fisheries from Great Britain or any British possession.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I think it is stated to be for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see it says: "Salt, coarse, not to include salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession for any purpose, or salt imported for the use of sea or gulf fisheries," so that it all comes free under the tariff.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I did not notice that. But it is the only thing which I think ought to be attended to, because it will materially assist in building up large packing houses that are now in their infancy, and, as I said before, it is the only point which I see against raising the duty. Other gentlemen have spoken about the high freights. So far as our experience has gone, the freights on the Grand Trunk have been very reasonable indeed. We have salt

imported from Clinton and Goderich for \$12 a ear delivered in the town of Chatham, and I understood the salt manufacturers had arrangements made whereby they could send salt nearly all over at a very low rate of freight. Of course, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated, when it came over two or three roads, probably there was a large increase in the freight on that account, but that cannot very well be helped.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say just one word with regard to the value of farms. In my section of country, land has dropped considerably in value. I have acted myself as agent for the sale of several farms, and I can testify that in one case a farm for which the owner was offered \$6,500, was sold three years afterwards, a year and a half ago, for \$4,900. I know that land has dropped seriously in value in my section; in some other sections it may not be the same. The reason why the assessed value of land in the Province of Ontario appears to be about the same as it was, possibly a little increased, is owing to the improvements that are made upon the land. Of course there is more land cleared and consequently that is improved in value. But it is no use hiding our eyes from the fact that the farm lands of Ontario to-day are not as valuable as they were years ago. You can buy land throughout this country very much less than you could four or five years ago. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) says that in his section farms have increased in value. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that in the township of Wallace, that used to belong to the county he represents. —I am sorry it does not belong to his county still — the farms certainly have gone down in price. In my last canvass, there was a farm pointed out to me that was sold five years ago for \$4,500, and the man recently sold it for \$3,800 because he was moving to another part of the country. With regard to this question of salt, I should like every advantage to be given to the farmers, because salt is a desirable fertiliser, and they have got to have it. I make this suggestion, not for the purpose of encouraging the importation of salt from the States, but to secure to the farmer an article that he wants at the lowest possible price. I think if the Government had seen their way clear to leave it optional with him to import or to buy it loose from the manufacturer, it would not be imported, but still it would keep it at a point that he would get it, in face of any combination, at the lowest possible price. I have no doubt that if an increase was put on, we will have another combination, and for three or four years the great majority of the people, and especially the farmers, who are the largest consumers, will have to pay an increased price for their salt.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very well for my hon. friend to say "no, no"; but he does not know as much about it as I do. I have owned land and farmed land, and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman does not own a farm. I own ten and I farm five, and I think under the circumstances I should be able to say a little more with regard to the matter than my hon. friend. I hold that salt is a necessary fertiliser for farms, and I say that it is highly desirable that a farmer should be allowed every facility for importing if necessary, because the farmer being allowed the facility to import it, will compel the producer to sell it at a reasonable price, such a price that he could lay it down for.

Sandpaper, glass, flint and emery paper, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase is 5 per cent., the duty now is 25, and it is proposed to make it 30 per cent. It will have a very slight effect upon the revenue, possibly an increase of \$1,000. The imports were \$21,995 last year.

Mr. JONES. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that under item 30, salt in bags should also be allowed to come in free for the fisheries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is all free for the fisheries no matter where it comes from.

School and writing slates, one cent each and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 25 per cent. The duty collected amounted to \$4 560. The proposed change will probably give an increased revenue of \$500. It is not, however, made for purposes of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not suppose it is; but it is practically a tax on knowledge, and there is an objection to this which does not apply to some other items. I do not think slates for school purposes form a very desirable article to increase, and the hon. gentleman is aware that the cost of purchasing books and articles for school purposes is somewhat severely felt by a considerable number of the poorer classes who have a number of children to send to school. I am sorry that on such an article there should be any intention to increase the duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The change to a specific duty is made for the purpose of preventing under valuation, and, therefore, unfair American competition. It is not expected to make any real increase in the price.

Mr. MALLORY. The class of slates used by the children of the poor classes is composed of slates of very small sizes and bought at very low prices. Many of them can be purchased at three or four cents, the larger ones being of course more valuable. The imposition of a duty on each slate discriminates against the small ones and those of low price. The duty ought to be arranged in accordance with the value and size.

Cigars and cigarettes, \$2 per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The change is a very considerable one. The value of the importation is \$331,730. There were imported 157,305 lbs., the duty on which was \$255,113. We assume that one-half will probably be imported, on which nearly the same amount of duty will be collected, and in addition 50 per cent. will be added to the amount collected for Excise, making an increased revenue from both Customs and Excise of say \$150,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the duty at present?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$1.20 per lb., and 20 per cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this expected to improve the quality of cigars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I think it will enable people who prefer the foreign article to anything manufactured in our own country to enjoy it, but it will lead to quite as good an article being produced by the labor of our own people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Previous to the last change in the duty, a five-cent cigar was a better cigar than has since been obtainable for 10 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that 90,000,000 of cigars are used in this country?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have sent that memorandum to the Excise Department for further information, which I will give the hon. gentleman. I think the number was as the hon. gentleman has just stated.

Varnishes, &c., 20 cents per gallon and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems to be a considerable alteration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is not merely an increase, it is the addition of some articles not included before, japan driers, liquid driers and oil finish. The duty, instead of being 20 per cent. and 20 cents per gallon, will be placed at 20 cents and 25 per cent., or an addition of 5 per cent., *ad valorem*; and it is expected to give \$1,000 increased revenue, because we suppose the result will be that more will be manufactured in this country.

Potatoes, 15 cents per bushel specific.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 10 cents per bushel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are they chiefly imported? Into British Columbia?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They come from the United States. They are imported into all the Provinces.

Mr. CASEY. What was the amount last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 53,170 bushels, of the value of \$26,620, on which there was paid a duty of \$5,817.

Tomatoes, fresh, 30 cents per bushel and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 30 cents per bushel, and it is proposed to add a specific duty of 10 per cent. It will give perhaps \$2,000 increased revenue. There were imported last year 10,666 bushels, of the value of \$10,716.

Vegetables, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 20 per cent. \$16,851 duty was collected. It is assumed that that will give an increase of perhaps \$3,000.

Watch actions or movements, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 20 per cent., and it is assumed that this change will not make any material difference in the revenue. It is believed that the effect of it will be to increase the business of the makers of the cases for watches, and prevent smuggling by making the inducement so much less.

All fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat, or other like animals, 7½ cents per lb., and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a reduction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I think it is rather an increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is an increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Something like \$100,000. The imports last year were 9,681,706 lbs., and the value \$7,404,360.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In point of fact, you conclude that the whole of the woollen importation is in this?

Mr. ELLIS. I call attention to the fact that Italian cloth, which is almost entirely used in hat making is included in this item. It is rather against the policy of protection to increase the taxation on that article.

Mr. WALLACE. It is used for many other purposes besides hat making.

Mr. ELLIS. It is used principally in that.

Mr. CASEY. I do not intend, of course, to discuss this item fully to-night, but I cannot let it pass without entering again the protest I have entered year after year, without much effect so far, to the effect that while all articles manufactured of wool have been highly protected, and it is now proposed to protect them still more highly, the Canadian

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

producer of wool is not protected. I think, now that the protection on the woollen articles which the farmer uses is being increased, I am bound to reenter in brief words, my protest against the injustice done to the farmer in the refusal to protect him. Some time ago a pretence was made of protecting the farmer by putting a duty on long wool, but as it was wool of a kind which we exported instead of importing, it had no effect. I urged then as I do now, that a duty on short and medium staple wool would increase the price to the Canadian producer, exactly to the extent of the duty put on. It would be a revenue tax, and it would also increase the price of the home-grown article to that extent. Now, if there is anything at all in the pretence that the Government are going to give protection all round, here is a chance for them to show their honesty by giving a protection to the farmer. Let them take this hint, and show their sincerity by putting a duty on the short staple wools. When I first spoke of the matter that kind of wool was little raised; now it is raised extensively, as the long wool got so low in price, that it did not pay to raise it. Here is a chance of benefiting, perhaps every second farmer, by putting a tax on this short staple wool.

Mr. BOWELL. What class do you call the short staple wool?

Mr. CASEY. The long wool is taxed now.

Mr. BOWELL. But what character of sheep produces this wool?

Mr. CASEY. All the Downs and the Merinos.

Mr. BOWELL. The wool of the South-downs is already taxed.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to item 480 of the present tariff he will find it reads thus:

Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown, combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools, and other light combing wools such as are grown in Canada, three cents per lb.

I know that merinos are not included in that list, because they have not been bred in this country to any great advantage. Formerly a number of our farmers used to breed that class of sheep in our section of the country but they found it would not pay, and consequently they have not been bred in late years. I think the argument used by the hon. gentleman is very much like the argument used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—that it would be like putting a duty on oranges, to try to compel the people to grow them out-doors in Canada. If in late years they have introduced the finer classes of wool-producing sheep in the western section of the country, they have not produced the fine wools, which come in free, and the wool from South-downs are already taxed.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interject a remark? That is the South-downs. The South-downs are a small class of sheep—so small that it does not pay to raise them, on account of the size of the fleece, although the wool is excellently fine. The larger downs, such as the Shropshire, Oxford and other downs are the classes chiefly grown, but the word South-downs would not include those; and the larger number of short-woolled sheep grown in western Ontario, are a cross between those downs and the long-woolled sheep, producing a medium class wool. The only classification which would give a protection to the farmer would be one which would classify the wool according to its length, instead of according to the breed of the sheep upon which it is grown. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is sincere in thinking that the reason protection was not given before was because the sheep were not in the country, but that was a good reason according to the policy of hon. gentlemen for putting on the tax in order

to bring them into the country. The chief reason which hon. gentlemen give for introducing new taxation is that it brings new industries into the country. I used that argument years ago in regard to sheep, that if the taxes were put on that particular class of wool, we would soon have the sheep that produced it. Now we have gone on and got the sheep without the tax, but I think we should have a protection on the produce. The Government would really make a great deal of capital for themselves in the country, if they imposed the duty in the way I suggest, by classifying according to the length of wool, besides doing a great deal for the farmers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will satisfy me of that, I will consider the matter most carefully.

Mr. CASEY. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman of it, by taking him on a ten-mile drive into any part of the country. I do not say he would win my support if he accepted my suggestion; but I am quite sure he would increase the popularity of the Government, and I am quite willing to take the risk of that for the sake of the benefit that would accrue to the farmers.

Mr. BOWELL. I want to point out that what the hon. gentleman has been asking for, is actually provided for in this item. What he is really doing is repeating what has been said so often on the stump, and nothing illustrates it so well as the remark made by the hon. member for Bothwell, as to protecting oranges in the country. The very kind of wool that has been grown in the country has been protected, with the exception of the very fine choice kinds that have been introduced as experiments more than anything else.

Mr. CASEY. Not at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not a farmer, but I have paid a good deal of attention to agricultural matters, and have worked on a farm, perhaps, as much as my hon. friend. I have been connected with agricultural societies, from township societies up to the provincial association, and I flatter myself that I know as much about sheep as my hon. friend. This clause provides for all wool known as lustre wool and other combing wools. These wools are those of the very crosses to which my hon. friend refers. If the hon. gentleman will show to the Government what he has been advocating to be correct, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says he will not only consider it, but place those wools in the dutiable list. I have no doubt the Government, whose policy is to protect all these industries, the farming as well as others, will place those wools on the list if the hon. gentleman shows that they come into competition with the finer classes of wool brought from the Cape and elsewhere and used in the manufacture of the finer cloth produced in this country.

Mr. CASEY. The remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs show, at any rate, that the election has certainly had some effect on the Government. If it has not destroyed their majority, it has made them comparatively mild, because on every previous occasion when I brought up this question of wool, when an answer was given at all by the then Minister of Finance, Sir Leonard Tilley, it was that this wool should be left free, because to tax it would be to tax the raw material of the manufacturers. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, is quite mistaken if he thinks the term "combing wools" includes the wool of the South-down, the Oxford-down and the Shropshire-down, and grades from them. Exactly the opposite is the case. Combing wools are the long wools. What I wish to have protected are the short wools, which come into competition with the Cape wools. The fancy breeds of sheep to which the hon. gentleman has referred, exist in his imagination and not in the

country. The wool I want protected is the ordinary grade wool from the white and black faced sheep which are becoming so common in western Ontario. If the Cape wool were taxed, the price of this home-grown wool would go up to the price of the Cape wool duty paid. It will undoubtedly add a little to the cost of the raw material to the manufacturers, but now that we are giving them increased protection they could and should bear that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think there is room for improvement in the classification of wool. I think the terms used here are a little confusing. At the same time, a term which admits the same grade as South-down will certainly admit all the fine wools grown in this country to which the hon. gentleman alludes. But still the classification might be better. There is this difficulty, however, that you will hardly find two manufacturers agree as to what classification or what terms should be employed, as different terms are used by manufacturers in different parts of the country. It is, of course, of no consequence whether the Cotswold wools and wools of that class are taxed or not, because we produce more than the country requires of those classes. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that what comes into competition with our fine wools are the fine Cape wool, the Merino, and the Australian wool. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs to take this matter into consideration, and, if he will consult both those engaged in the trade and manufacture of wool and those connected with agriculture, I think he will be able to make a better classification of the wool than he has at present, and can increase the duty on the higher classes of wool, so as to give some protection to our finer wools, which, as the hon. member for West Elgin says, come into competition with the finer imported grades.

Further consideration of resolutions postponed until Monday, 16th inst.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NIAGARA AND WOODSTOCK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Niagara and Woodstock Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As there are several Bills before the committee, and it is desirable that this should be referred, I would ask the House to allow this Bill to be read the second time now, and be referred to the committee. There will be no objection, I think.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 90) to revive the charter of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company, and to amend the same by extending the delay for commencement and completion of its works, and in other respects.—(Mr. Grandbois.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TYRWHITT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I shall be prepared to explain the Bill fully when it comes up for the second reading.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. TYRWHITT. The object of the Bill is to allow beer, wine, ales and cider to be sold in counties where the Scott Act is now in force.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that on a matter of this importance it is very desirable that the House should know the views of the Government. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, on a former occasion, declared and supported a resolution that it was the duty of the Government on a question of this importance, and, in fact, on this very question, to lead the House and determine what the policy of Parliament shall be. Now, I think we are entitled to know the views of the Government on this question. There is a large number of gentlemen in this country who are of opinion that we ought to have prohibitive legislation, that we ought to go beyond the principle laid down in the Canada Temperance Act, which the hon. member proposes in part to repeal. There are then, too, those who are content with that Act, and hold that an opportunity should be given to give it a fair trial. Then we have the license victualers and others, who support the view propounded by the Bill which the hon. gentleman has just introduced. Upon this subject we are entitled to know what the views of the Administration are, and the hon. First Minister is in duty bound, looking to the action he took on a former occasion, to undertake to lead the House on this matter. In fact, I remember when the Canada Temperance Act was before Parliament the hon. gentleman assigned as a reason for not opposing that measure that he was not sufficiently strong in this House to do so effectively, that it was not in his power to prevent the passage of the Bill, and therefore he would not divide the House upon it. I think, if I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman during the recent election declared he supported that measure; at all events, he has been represented as having said so. That, however, was certainly not the impression made upon the Government of the day when the hon. gentleman at the time declared that his reason for not dividing the House upon the question was that he could not have done so effectively. However, I suppose, as the hon. gentleman did not divide the House on that occasion, and as the measure was carried through the third reading without a division, he may put forward the claim he put forward on a recent occasion. On that former occasion the hon. gentleman declared that members of the Government should have the courage of their convictions, and he insisted that the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) should act upon that rule, when Dr. Schultz, who was then a member of this House, proposed a motion, a motion which received the support of the First Minister and those of his colleagues then members of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is *à propos* of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Simcoe. When that hon. gentleman rose to propose this Bill, hon. members called out "explain," and I think I called out "explain," too; and we got a short explanation from the hon. member, and having heard his explanation, we will take into consideration whether the Government will support this Bill or not.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 92) to amend the Acts relating to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal. He said: This Bill is to enable the harbor commissioners of Montreal, who can now only borrow money at par, to borrow money at any rate they may consider advantageous.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT AND TREASURY BOARD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) to amend the Act respecting the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board. He said: This is a measure consequent upon the other measures which now stand for the consideration of the House. If the Bills now before the House are adopted, the present Treasury Board must be altered, as hon. gentlemen know; and this Bill is merely to provide that the Treasury Board shall consist of six members, as it does now, but instead of having a cast-iron rule that certain members shall comprise that board, the members shall be appointed from time to time by Order of the Governor in Council. The Finance Minister will, as a matter of course, be a member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman proposes to carry out his plan of re-constructing the various Departments, and to create a Minister of Commerce, it will necessitate very considerable alterations in the functions of the Minister of Finance, of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I suppose that the Bills which the hon. gentleman proposes to carry will deal with that subject. I think the House should learn in general terms what are to be the functions of those various Ministers. I suppose this Bill is intended to define the duties of the Minister of Finance as well as of the Treasury Board, and that it draws a line between the functions of that Minister and the Minister of Customs. It would be interesting if the hon. gentleman would state where that line is to be drawn, and what duties devolving on the Minister of Finance are to be considered as pertaining to the Minister of Commerce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think much greater advantage would arise if, instead of having a perfunctory conversation across the floor now, the whole subject as covered by the four Bills were discussed by the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman might give us an outline now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to take up the subject before the holidays?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; we hope to take it as early afterwards as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the subject is not to be taken up before the holidays, hon. members might have an opportunity of considering it, if the hon. gentleman gave the House a brief outline of the divisions to be made and the duties to perform by the different Ministers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Bill is printed, of course?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us get through the tariff. The Bill is printed.

Mr. CASEY. Will it be distributed before we go.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it will be distributed to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McNEILL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: I may

just say that this Bill is a measure for the relief of those civil servants who entered the service prior to the passing of the Act of 1882, which Act entirely revolutionised the conditions of the service, so far as promotion is concerned. Prior to the passing of that Act, Mr. Speaker, diligence, intelligence, knowledge of the work to be done, the power to do the work to be done, prompt and cheerful obedience—in fact, approved and practical efficiency in the Civil Service was sufficient to entitle a civil servant to promotion. The Act of 1882 changed all that. The provisions with reference to examination, which were, I think, very proper so far as those who sought admission to the service were concerned, were extended also to promotion in the service. In this way the theory as to the fact was made to overbear the established fact itself. The theory was, and is, that a civil servant who is unable to answer certain questions propounded by the board of examiners, is not an efficient servant and is not fitted for promotion. The fact may be that the civil servant in question is known to the head of the Department, and to everyone connected with the Department, to be notoriously a valuable civil servant, well qualified for, and well deserving of, promotion. But the theory being that he is not fitted for promotion unless he has been able to answer those questions, that theory is made to overbear the fact which has been thus established, and he is assumed to be unfit for promotion. This measure does not propose to sweep away altogether this system of selection—a system which might have commended itself to some minds as being peculiarly anti-Darwinian, for it is certainly not a system of natural selection. This Bill does not propose to sweep away altogether this system of unnatural selection; it merely proposes that any civil servant who entered the service prior to the Act of 1882, without imagining for one moment that he should ever fall under the provisions of this extraordinary system of selection, shall not be made to fall under those provisions, and shall not thus find the doors of promotion closed against him and his prospects in the service ruined for life. In other words, it simply provides that the provisions of the Act of 1882, as far as they relate to promotion, shall not be retroactive.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid the hon. member who introduced this Bill drew rather a rosy picture of the state of affairs prior to the Act of 1882, when he represented that promotion at that time went entirely by merit and desert. I am afraid that Arcadian or Utopian state of things never existed in the Civil Service of Canada. But I agree to a very considerable extent with the proposition he has laid down. I believe that no examination, except an examination as to departmental matters, where such is possible, where technical qualifications are required before a man can be properly promoted—no examination but that can be any test of a man's fitness for promotion. I know quite well that there are Departments where an examination can be made a test of fitness for promotion; for instance, in the Inland Revenue, the surveying service, and probably in others, but nobody who is not expert in the business of the Departments could say off hand in which Department such an examination could be properly applied and in which it could not. I am, therefore, disposed to go a long way with the hon. gentleman in asking for the abolition of the promotion examination, all the more so because I find that it has been no bar at all in practice to the promotion of those whom the Minister of a Department wished to promote, and that it has been used very effectually against the promotion of those, however meritorious, whom the Minister did not wish to promote. I know parties—though, of course, I cannot mention their names, as it would be very injurious to them to do so—who are entitled by seniority and admitted merit to promotion, but who have been kept back by the simple expedient of refusing to

allow them to come up for promotion examination. One of them, to my knowledge, has applied for more than a year to be examined for promotion to a clerkship of the next class, but has been refused examination, so that the Minister is able to say: "I have not promoted this man because he has not passed the promotion examination," when the fact is that he has not been allowed to come up for examination, so that the Minister might make use of this pretext for not promoting him. For these reasons I am much inclined to go for the abolition of this examination. I think if we abolish it at all, with regard to any class of clerkships, we should abolish it with regard to all of them. I do not think it would be pleasant or workable to have clerks who have come in the service at a certain date subject to this examination, while those who came in before that date are not subject to it. I believe on the whole that it would be more practical, as well as more logical, simply to abolish examinations altogether, and throw on the Minister of the Department the responsibility of promoting according to merit and tried fitness for promotion. I shall not speak further on the matter until I have seen the hon. gentleman's Bill, but I thought it proper to make these observations at this stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANDRY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) to amend chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: "An Act respecting interest."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LANDRY. The object of the Bill is simple enough, and it is to make unlawful any charge for interest of more than seven per cent. per annum, on moneys loaned. On the second reading of the Bill I shall endeavor to give reasons why I believe it should become law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FREEHOLD LOAN AND SAVINGS COMPANY.

Mr. SMALL, in the absence of Mr. DENISON, moved second reading of Bill (No. 71) to enable the Freehold Loan and Savings Company to extend their business, and for other purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. I have had my attention called to the provisions of this Bill by some gentlemen connected with other companies in the city of Toronto, and, therefore, before it takes the usual course of being referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I take the liberty of calling the attention more particularly of the Minister of Finance to the question involved in the Bill. The communications sent to me are to the effect that this company, which is incorporated under the general provisions of the Loan Companies' Act, like all the other loan companies, of which there are a great many now operating in Canada, has borrowed money on its credit in England and in Canada. This company, by this Bill, is now asking for special borrowing powers far in excess of any heretofore given to any such company; and one of the other companies, the largest in Canada, so they informed me, sent a copy of this Bill to their London agents, asking them if there was any objection to it on general principles. They say they have received a reply to the effect that this Bill, altering as it does the entire contract between the company and the lending public, if passed, will have a bad effect on the credit of all such companies seeking to borrow money in England; and these other companies say they have a *locus standi*, entitling them to appear here to ask the Government not to allow any legislation in regard to one company, which, to-mor-

row, may become a precedent in regard to other companies. Of course the House is not now deciding on the matter; but if the Bill were to go to the committee entirely unobjectioned to, it might there be urged that the House had adopted the principle of the Bill, and that, therefore, the committee would scarcely be free to reject the measure. This Bill asks that the borrowing powers of the company may be equal to its assets—equal to its investments on real estate. Now, I think the time has arrived when no special powers should be given to any company of this class. The loan companies of Canada are sufficiently numerous to be dealt with by a general law, and I think it would be better for the country if they were all treated in the same way as banks are. We have a general Banking Act, applicable to all institutions incorporated as banks, and I think it would be well if the Government would take the responsibility, if the law requires amendment, of making it general. The interests involved to this country are so great that I think it is the duty of the Government now to control all such legislation by a general law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in calling the attention of the Government to this measure, for the reasons he has given. Of course, if this Bill passes, there can be no reason why similar extended privileges should not be given to all other companies of the same nature, and, therefore, it becomes a matter of general policy whether the extended powers should be given as a general rule to all such companies established in various parts of the Dominion, and which, in my opinion, have done so much good to the Dominion. Certainly all these loan companies should have the same powers and responsibilities in every respect. I think it would be a great mistake to allow any special privileges to any one of these companies in any particular whatever. Then, there is the other very serious point which the hon. gentleman has brought up that must be considered in the first place by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and secondly by the House on the report of that committee, that is, the rights and position of investors—of lenders to such companies which have certain privileges and are under certain restriction. People lend money to such companies under a certain state of facts, certain powers, certain checks and certain responsibilities. It may be held that these people would not lend their money to any of these companies if they had any very extraordinary powers unchecked by the provisions of the law. The hon. gentleman says, as I understood him, that the information he had got was that the investors in England look with suspicion on the exceptional privileges given under this Bill. Of course, we cannot speak for or against the Bill until we see it, whether it is a Bill we should pass or not. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in calling our attention to it, and I am quite sure the Committee on Banking and Commerce, especially after this debate, will see that under this Act the whole question relating to the powers of loan companies must be looked into.

Mr. CASEY. My attention has been called to this subject by several parties interested in other companies. I fully endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). I think that the granting of such exceptional powers to any company would greatly interfere with other companies to which they are not granted, and I fear that even if these powers were granted to all companies the effect upon the public credit of companies in England would be as injurious as if applied to one company only.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would depend upon the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. These powers seem very dangerous, whether applied partially or wholly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. MULOCK.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 58) to terminate the trust respecting the South-Eastern Railway, to authorise its sale, and to incorporate the South-Eastern Junction Railway.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Equity Insurance Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Halifax and West India Steamship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate "The Canada Accident and Indemnity Assurance Company."—(Mr. Mulock.)

GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HESSON, in the absence of Mr. TISDALE, moved second reading of Bill (No. 74) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me this Bill asks for an extension for a very great length of time—an additional five years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

MIDLAND RAILWAY OF CANADA.

Mr. DALY, in the absence of Mr. HUDSPETH, moved second reading of Bill (No. 75) respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. Explain.

Mr. DALY. I only move it in the absence of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth).

Mr. CASEY. Some of these Bills are important, and the practice of one member moving the second reading in the absence of another is becoming too common.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is highly improper. On the second reading of a Bill, its principle is recognised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is in error. The principle of a public Bill is admitted by the second reading, but the second reading is not understood at all in that way with respect to private Bills. The practice, which has been very convenient, is to send all these Bills, unless they are obviously objectionable, to the standing committees, which report on them, and it is on the adoption of the report that the principle is brought out.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I can tell my right hon. friend is this: I attend the Railway and Canals Committee pretty regularly, and over and over again I have heard the objection taken that the principle was sustained by the House. We always have to fight that question, and, at all events, it would be more regular to explain the principle of the Bill on the second reading.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Before the standing committee the first question is: "Shall the preamble be taken as proved?" The promoters have to prove that, and if they do not, the Bill is not proceeded with.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed the further consideration of resolutions reported from Committee on Ways and Means on 13th inst.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose, in the first instance, to go back to item 34 (*see p. 406*), which was allowed to stand. I propose to change that by adding to the words "trunks of all kinds, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*," the words "pocket books and purses."

Mr. MACKENZIE. After taking all our money he now proposes to take our purses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will relieve the purses. Then I propose in the last part of that resolution to strike out the words "pocket books and purses," and to add the words "cases for jewels and watches and other like articles of any material." It is simply transferring the pocket books and purses to the first part of the clause, so as to leave them at the present rate of 30 per cent., and to put the other articles I have named under this specific duty of 10 cents each and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the object of making a distinction between trunks and valises? They are made of precisely the same material, are manufactured in the same establishments, employ the same labor, and I do not understand why a trunk should be taxed 30 per cent. and a valise 10 cents additional.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to prevent the importation of elephants.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is in order to get more revenue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If that is the object, the hon. gentleman would get more revenue if he put the trunks in the valise class.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object of this is to leave trunks at the present rate of duty, 30 per cent., and to increase the duty on valises by 10 cents each additional.

Mr. MILLS. I see that, but I ask what is the reason for doing so?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is found that the difficulty of having these valises, satchels and carpet bags properly valued, makes it necessary to add a slight specific duty in order to prevent under-valuation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose a specific duty of 10 cents on a trunk would be a very small matter, while on a valise, satchel or carpet bag, the value being so much less, the increase would be much greater. It gives more protection; that is the secret of it.

Mr. CASEY. On a large valise, I should not think the 10 cents would go very far to remedy the under-valuation. We all know what we would call a trunk, and what we would call a valise, but I should like to know where the Customs officers draw the line between them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman can hardly answer that question, because he premised it by saying that all understood it.

Mr. CASEY. I might call a thing a valise which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) might call a trunk. A large valise with straps is called a trunk by some and a valise by others. I do not know what my hon. friend from Bothwell calls it, but I should like to know what the Customs officers would call it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They would call it what ever you would call it and what the hon. member for Bothwell would call it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope the hon. gentleman will put a good round tax on portfolios.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is the Opposition who put the tax on portfolios.

Mr. MILLS. No; the Opposition put the tax on those who hold them.

Barrels containing pork or other salted meats, 25 cents each.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask to amend that by striking out the words "pork or other," and the word "five," so that it will read "Barrels containing salted meats, a specific duty of 20 cents each."

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is the change of five cents made in the duty on barrels?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is leaving it as the duty stands at present. A meat barrel, if it comes in empty, is charged 20 cents, and it is to apply the same duty to barrels containing meat.

British gum, dressine, sizing cream and enamel sizing, one cent per lb. specific.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What would that amount to *ad valorem*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One cent a pound is equal to about 25 per cent. on a value of four cents a pound.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, that is clear, but what is the average value of those articles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the average value.

Mr. JONES. The change is from an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. to a specific duty equal to about 25 per cent. British gum was free before.

Collars of cotton or linen, 24 cents per doz. and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty is now 30 per cent., and this adds a specific duty of 24 cents a dozen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That makes on cotton collars a duty of about 55 per cent.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; at the average value of \$1.50 a dozen, the duty would be equal to 35 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. The average value of cotton collars is not \$1.50 a dozen, but very much less.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have to take an average of some kind.

Mr. BOWELL. That is based on the quality of these materials that have been imported, and the officers have made that computation showing that the average is equal to that amount.

Mr. CASEY. On cheap cotton collars and cuffs, that laboring men have to content themselves with, this would amount to even more than my hon. friend from Bothwell mentions; it would amount to 75 per cent. That is one of those cases in which a specific duty works as a real hardship, because it puts a higher tax on the article worn by the mechanic than on that which is used by the richer classes. The \$1.50 a dozen may be the average of all the goods imported, but it gives no idea of what the price of the ordinary cotton collar is, and how high the duty on it will be.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend was not in the House when the late Minister of Finance made a touching appeal on behalf of the seamstresses, or he would see that this is a concession to that very important class.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid the extra two cents each will not go to the seamstresses, but to the capitalists who employ them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does this include the collar of the K.C.M.G.?

Mr. CASEY. What percentage would it be on that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am happy to tell my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that, if he had complied with the desire of Her Majesty to decorate him, he would have learned that there is no charge on the collar of a K.C.M.G.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is an instance of the Government favoring itself. The hon. gentleman's statement

shows that this is a tax, not for the purpose of revenue, but for the purpose of prohibition. The intention is to exclude a certain class of goods from Canada in order to secure their manufacture here. No doubt, a tax of 75 per cent., and a tax of 100 per cent., as this will amount to, will exclude the foreign article in a great measure, but that 100 per cent. added to the price which the people will have to pay, the Government will not get.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We hope to prohibit prison-made goods, and the attention of Government was drawn to the necessity of making a change in this respect for that purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). On this subject I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a telegram I received from a large firm in Montreal, who are also manufacturing in my county :

"As you are aware we are largely engaged in the manufacture of paper collars and cuffs. Reports are being made to exclude from the tariff proposed by the Minister of Finance, celluloid collars and cuffs, on the ground that they interfere with no industry in this country. They operate most disastrously on our industry. Please represent our case to Minister as forcibly as possible, and ask that celluloid goods be included in tariff proposed for benefit of shirt and collar trade."

Mr. MITCHELL. Could not the Minister manage to exclude prison-made goods in some other way than by adding to the cost of the poor workingmen? I think he might put in a clause that would prevent the importation of prison-made goods at all.

Cuffs of cotton or linen, a specific duty of four cents per pair and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is supposed to be the average value of cuffs imported? What will a four per cent. specific duty amount to, *ad valorem*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The average value is about 27 cents per pair, and the duty of four cents specific and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, is about equal to 35 per cent.

Gas meters, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How is this to be collected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the same way that all other duties are collected, by the Customs Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, is the officer to visit all the private houses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for the purpose of leading to an industry in the country for the construction of gas meters. The present duty is 25 per cent.; we are making it 30 with a view to having them made in the country.

Mr. HESSON. What is the prospect of having them manufactured in this country? I feel an interest in this industry myself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The difficulty was that at present they come in as machinery. We have no statistics to show what amount has been imported into the country, but we hope, under this arrangement, to have them manufactured here to a large extent. We do not expect, therefore, it will be a source of revenue.

Mr. HESSON. We are dependent altogether upon the foreign manufacture now.

Glue, sheet, broken sheet and ground, a specific duty of 3 cents per pound.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is not this a tax that will bear rather heavily upon some manufacturing industries in this country? Glue, no doubt, is used as a raw material for various manufactures.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have abundant material, as my hon. friend knows, for the purpose of manufacturing glue in this country, and we believe this change will greatly increase the manufacture of glue in Canada. The amount

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

imported last year was \$33,039. The present duty is 20 per cent., as glue is at present among the unenumerated articles. The new duty is only equal to 30 per cent.

Mr. CASEY. What is glue worth a pound?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is calculated upon the amount imported.

Mr. CASEY. Common glue can be bought for less than 10 cents per lb. even at retail; I do not know the wholesale price. An hon. gentleman near me says the wholesale price of common glue is seven cents per pound. The Minister has pointed out that we have abundant material in Canada for making glue. That is a fact. Not only is there abundant material for making glue, but under the present tariff the glue manufacturer is allowed to import more material for the making of glue, duty free. This is another of the taxes to which I wish to call attention, in which the farmer is not fairly treated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The principal object is to help the farmer

Mr. CASEY. It will not help the farmer because the glue materials are to come in duty free. No matter how much the manufacture of glue is increased, it will not increase the price of glue scrap from the tanneries, and therefore it will not increase the price of hides, because all these goods come in free. In other words, the Minister is giving the manufacturers a protection of 45 per cent. and upwards—35 on his own calculation—while he continues to leave the raw material for glue on the free list. It is another instance of what a perfect farce it is to pretend that the National Policy is a National Policy all round. On the other hand, as is evident from the explanations given this afternoon, as is evident from the application of the hon. member for Perth to have special considerations for a factory in his neighborhood, it is nothing but a policy of shreds and patches, a patchwork policy, made up by special favors to this, that and the other manufacturer, not made on any general principle at all, leaving entirely out of consideration the largest class of the community.

Newspapers, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is now the duty on white paper not partly printed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty on paper is 20 per cent., 22½ and 25, according to quality.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not see anything mentioned in the tariff resolutions with respect to stereotyped plates. A good deal of feeling exists amongst newspaper men in regard to the duty on those plates, five cents per pound, and it is claimed to be altogether too high. Publishers are in the habit of receiving stereotypes which are placed upon wood blocks, and, when they have been used, they are returned to the parties from whom they were obtained, and by them broken up for type metal. It is said that this duty presses very severely on country newspapers. I call the Minister's attention to the subject, as there may be some just foundation for the complaint and the Government might see their way to reduce the duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of it; but so far as I have been able to consider the matter, I have found that there is a manufactory in the country of stereotyped plates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That will not in the slightest supply the want of newspaper men, as the Minister of Customs well knows. It is quite impossible to secure what is required by newspaper publications from any establishment erected here. In fact, these stereotyped plates are prepared for a number of papers; they are sent to one paper but not to another in the same district, and those used by some papers

here are used subsequently by different papers at distant points of the United States, whose circulation does not clash with Canadian papers. The real point of the difficulty does not lie with the Canadian manufactory of stereotyped plates, but with the printers. They sometimes object to matter being imported in this way for the purpose of filling up newspapers on which they think otherwise they would have an opportunity of setting type; but, in most establishments, there is an understanding between the publishers and the printers with respect to this particular matter, and a certain percentage only of it is printed. The tax imposed by the Government has the effect of withholding from Canadian publishers the opportunity of furnishing as good a paper as, under like circumstances, is furnished in the neighboring Republic, and this policy has also the effect of aiding to a certain extent his rival, the American newspaper publisher.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the best way to present this question clearly will be to read some extracts from a circular sent to members of this House by country newspaper publishers interested in this matter. They begin by setting out:

"1st. That the policy of the present Administration has been to assist in the diffusion of general information among the masses."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. That is a point which the hon. gentleman will not dispute. The circular proceeds:

"2nd. That the use of American stereotype plates by Canadian papers has vastly improved the quality of the reading matter issued by them, and has been the means of establishing a large number of papers which could not profitably exist without the use of such plates.

"3rd. That it is impossible for the newspaper fraternity in Canada to support an institution capable of supplying the high grade of matter furnished by American plate manufacturers without the trade of several thousand papers, whereas Canada has only about four hundred papers published in the English language.

"4th. That the present duty of five cents per pound is almost prohibitory, and is a heavy burden on the publishers using plates. If this duty were removed, a large number of small papers would be greatly improved and new ones established.

"5th. That the plate matter obtained from manufacturers in the United States is not sold at all, but the use thereof is paid for at stated prices, the metal in same at all times being returned to the manufacturers.

"6th. That on matter the value of which is one dollar and twenty cents (value for duty, one dollar) we are compelled to pay a duty of seventy cents and afterwards return the plates, a tax which is much higher than the duty protection granted other industries.

"7th. That American manufacturers have gone to great expense to supply Canadian papers with a service which is strictly non-political and non-sectarian, embracing all kinds of literary matter. This includes many finely illustrated and news features descriptive of the resources and industries of the Dominion of Canada, which are widely disseminated throughout the Provinces and the United States as well.

"8th. That plates made from celluloid are only dutiable at 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on the cost of their use, whereas the duty on stereotype plates ranges from 40 to 70 per cent. *ad valorem*.

"9th. That differences in cost of transportation would of itself be adequate protection to any person who might wish to engage in this business at any central point in the Dominion of Canada, and should a small plate institution be established in Canada there would still be ample room for the use of American plates, because the product of one establishment can be used in but one paper in a town."

The gentleman who sent me this circular also sent me a letter emphasising these points, and showing very clearly that the stereotype manufactory in Canada does not produce what is required, and that the Government should reduce this duty. What the Canadian manufactory does produce is chiefly stereotyped plates on special order; but it does not do a general business of sending out stereotype plates on a large scale and exchanging them, because the circumstances of this country will not allow it to be done profitably by Canadian establishments.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have received a letter from the publishers of a very respectable and excellent country newspaper, who take entirely the opposite view to that enunciated by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). They protest against the use of American plates and wish a very high duty to be imposed on them, or at all

events, that no greater facilities be given for their use. I find there is a difference of opinion in the press, because one class of newspaper publishers print altogether their own matter, while another class, from which that circular has emanated, and by whom small papers are issued, import the whole of the paper printed from the United States; and therefore the publishers of papers which print their own matter are exceedingly jealous of those of the other class of publishers who are able to publish at much greater advantage. So, in speaking of this matter, it must be remembered that there is a difference of opinion founded upon the matters I have just stated. When we are dealing with this question of the National Policy, a duty of 25 per cent. upon paper and printing is a very small one, and the Minister of Finance might have gone a great deal further and have increased the duty to a much higher rate. There is no particular advantage gained by newspaper publishers being dependent on the taste of literary men on the other side of the border, who are not as particular as they might be in preparing news for distribution among the rural population.

Mr. CHARLTON. The House is laboring under a misapprehension as to the duty being 25 per cent. It is said to be 70 per cent. The local press of this country has much difficulty in maintaining a foothold against the inroads of the metropolitan press. It, however, fills a very important position in Canada, and it should be the object of the Government to sustain it as far as possible. The country publishers are only asking what is simply a matter of justice. If it is proper for those country newspapers to obtain stereotyped matter from American concerns, which carry on the business of supplying such newspapers—if it is proper to do so, if they receive a class of matter which it is proper to insert in their papers, a class of matter which affords information on various subjects, it is just as well to insert it in the form of stereotyped plates as to set it up; but to these country newspapers which are struggling for existence it is certainly a hardship to impose a duty, amounting to 70 per cent. upon any matter which they use in the publication of their paper. It may be true that newspapers that set up their own matter may wish to adopt a policy which may freeze out competitors that have been recently established. But the interest of the Government is not in that direction; it is the interest of the Government to afford every opportunity for the dissemination of intelligence, and to afford every reasonable opportunity for these publishers to carry on their business. I hold that the proposition to impose 70 per cent. duty on these stereotype plates, which are simply used and then returned to be broken up and cast again, and are therefore simply borrowed, is a hardship on the country press. Although this matter is not under consideration, it has been brought to the attention of the Finance Minister, on behalf of the publishers of country newspapers, and those who may use these devices to reduce the cost of producing their papers. They are the parties aggrieved and their interests should receive the attention of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. There are two sides to this question. There is the one side, which is an important one, that if you adopt the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, you would, to a great extent, do away with the necessity for the journeyman printer. This matter is not sent over in the heavy stereotype form in which it was formerly sent. The plates as they are now made are very little thicker than paper. They are mounted on blocks when they arrive here, and of course they relieve the publishers of the newspapers in this country to a very large extent of the trouble and expense of composition for their papers. But if you put the duty on this matter down to a nominal figure, it will do away with a large amount of labor which is now necessary, particularly in the country parts, for I

am not aware that the city press or the leading newspapers use these stereotypes to any extent, if at all, as they are mostly made up of original matter, wholly set up in the office of publication. It may be that a portion of the matter, that which is more of a literary character than general news, may be used by the city or daily papers, but I am not aware that first-class newspapers use the stereotypes at all. The five cents per pound was adopted after a good deal of investigation last year, and after interviews with the American stereotype manufacturers. I admit that they thought the five cents was too high a rate, but, after a good deal of consideration, we came to the conclusion that, in the interests of the working printers themselves, the laborers who have learned the art of printing and are earning their living by it, that amount of duty was little enough to protect that labor, while still enabling the publishers to import such matter, if they thought proper to do so. Both the Finance Minister and myself have received a very large number of letters from publishers of newspapers, who take a different view of the question; but I have reason to believe that these were all prepared, and the expenses connected with them defrayed, by the manufacturers of American stereotype plates, so that they cannot be regarded as expressing exclusively the views of the publishers of country newspapers in Canada. No doubt they would like, as I should have liked when I was a publisher myself, to have their matter set up as cheaply as possible; but I do not believe it to be in the interest of this country and of the protection which we desire to give to the labor of this country, that that principle should be adopted. There is another objection to the general introduction of this matter. I do not know whether many hon. members have paid attention to this subject, but I have noticed that the class of literature, the news items which are filtered through American minds, and selected by these people to furnish in this form to the publisher in this country, are a kind which a Canadian publisher, having any regard to the character of the newspaper he is publishing, or the education which he wishes to impart to the rising generation, never would select. Hon. gentlemen can readily understand that the publisher who is in the habit of using these plates does not stop to read the matter which may be contained in every one of them that may be sent to him. They are simply sent to his office and then they are placed on the block and put into the columns of his paper without being read. There is no reading of the proofs of such matter—no corrections; and I repeat that much of the matter which appears in these journals is of a kind which few publishers in this country would ever think of selecting themselves. That is one strong reason, to my mind, why this system of bringing stereotype plates from the United States should rather be prohibited, if it were possible, than to have literature of that character brought into the country at so low a rate. Another fact is that there are stereotype establishments in the Province of Ontario which are entering largely into this work, and they represent to the Government that they are capable of furnishing, and they are prepared to furnish, all the stereotype matter required by the country press of Canada, and that they will do it at as cheap a rate as it can be furnished from the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Why then do they want protection?

Mr. BOWELL. We are not proposing to give them any protection; we are not proposing to interfere with them. This discussion arose incidentally, on account of the extra duty which has been placed on paper which is half printed and then imported into the country. Well, if the stereotype manufacturers of this country can produce a better class of reading matter, and can do it just as cheaply, there is no reason why that industry should not be established in this

Mr. BOWELL.

country. I go further, and I say that if it cannot be done quite as cheaply, it is a protection to the typo, as well as to the people who have to read this class of literature. I may add with reference to the item before the House, that hon. gentlemen will readily see the necessity for the change which has been made. Under the old tariff the duty on news paper was 20 per cent.; on calendered papers it was 22½; and on ruled paper 25. The item under consideration used to come into the country at 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; being an unenumerated article you could not place a higher duty upon it, although it was half manufactured, the whole of one side of each sheet having been printed in the United States. It was imported into this country at the same rate of duty as ordinary printing paper without any printed matter upon it, and hence we deemed it right that the rates should be raised at least to the duty which was paid on paper partially manufactured. I think the House will readily agree with me that for the reasons I have given, first, in the interest of the typo, and, secondly, in the interest of the reading community, the less of that general class of literature—though some of it is very good—the better.

Mr. CASEY. When the hon. Minister of Customs argues that the importation of stereotype plates will keep the journeyman printer out of work he is using the old-fashioned argument which was used against the introduction of labor-saving machinery in general, that it would cut the workman out of work, and I think it will be found as fallacious as that in the end. It has been found that labor saving machinery has increased the employment of mechanics, and I think it is shown by the circulars which have been sent to the Minister from country newspaper publishers that the use of stereotype plates will increase the employment of journeymen instead of diminishing it. It is shown, I think, conclusively, in those circulars that many country papers would be established, and many in existence would enlarge their business, if the duty on stereotype plates were removed or greatly decreased. Undoubtedly the establishment of more newspapers would give more work to journeymen. In other cases it might enable the proprietor of a weekly paper to turn it into a daily, and in that way give more employment to journeymen. It would also enable a publisher to give better wages to those he does employ, because his general expenses would be reduced. I think such a change would be all in favor of the working printer, and not to his detriment. As to the character of the matter employed, I am sorry the Minister has such a bad opinion of it; but I think on the whole, the matter is pretty fair. The American bureau has a special selection of matter for Canadian papers—clippings from Canadian papers and articles about Canada, its public buildings, its government, and so on. Certainly, I got among the samples one that I did not like very much, but I am sure the hon. gentleman would not speak of it in the terms he used, for it contained a picture of these Parliament buildings and portrait and very flattering notice of the Premier.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no hesitation in supporting this duty of five cents a pound. I understand that we are discussing an item not before the House; but as it has been discussed, and as I know something about the matter, I will say that in my opinion no inconvenience whatever will result to the public from this duty. We have at present, in Toronto, an establishment for manufacturing these stereotype plates, carried on by some of our young Canadians, and not only are they as cheap as those sent from the United States, but they are better, and above all, as the hon. Minister says, they are Canadian. My hon. friend, the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), was very sparse in his selections. There can be no objection to pictures of my hon. friend or the leader of the Opposition or the leader of the Government; but what the Minister referred to as

being in many of those stereotypes are jokes of a character not coming up to the high standard of the Canadian press.

Mr. DAVIES. Give us a sample, so that we can judge?

Mr. DAVIN. When my hon. friend, whom I used to meet some twenty years ago in a debating society in the Temple, London, meets me in the smoking room, I will give him some of those jokes, but we are now discussing matters in a respectable Parliament. Dealing with the question actually before the House, I think it is most important that a protective duty should be placed on those plates and upon those patent insides, as they are called, because we have in Toronto and in Hamilton establishments for supplying them, and what they supply are better, both as regards the quality of the reading and the quality of the paper, and in every other respect, than those sent from the United States.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. gentleman represents the metropolitan, and not the country press.

Mr. DAVIN. That is true. There is no doubt that I represent a capital, and not the provincial press. But, Sir, in that capital an Opposition paper is published, which is based on printed matter furnished in Toronto. I do not object to that, but I will say this, giving my experience as an editor of newspapers, that I think it is a pity that that system of insides or outsides has been adopted by our publishers at all. I hold that a little newspaper, like the *Edmonton Bulletin*, which is printed in the place where it is published, and gives the news of the place, is worth a dozen of those fraudulent—because they are to some extent fraudulent—publications that have, printed and published, at a certain place at the bottom of a column, while we know as a fact that most of the printing is done far away from the place where the paper is published and supported. That is, however, by the way. I heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) talk the other night about trying to build up a nationality, and he reproached hon. gentlemen on this side for not being alive to the conditions that would encourage the growth of a national spirit. What can so strike at the root of a national spirit as an unnational literature filtered into the country, and insidiously getting into the minds of those whose education principally comes through the newspapers? I remember taking up a Canadian newspaper of this kind some time ago, and reading a column discussing the affairs of the United States, which spoke continually of "our country," and referred to some United States man as though he were the greatest man in "our" country; and this in a newspaper drawing support from citizens of this Canada of ours. In this budget of the hon. gentleman, there is no step taken in accordance with National Policy that will more approvingly find an echo in the hearts of those acquainted with the subject throughout the country than the proposal now under discussion.

Mr. WATSON. I must take some exception to the hon. gentleman's remarks. I have received some circulars from the North-West, among them one from the Regina publisher to whom the hon. gentleman has referred as receiving his stereotype plates from Toronto, and he complains bitterly of the duty on these stereotype plates being so high. Therefore I feel it my duty to rise in my place and enter my protest against this duty. The publishers represent that they are able to print a much better paper by being allowed to bring in these plates at a low rate of duty. The metal is returned to the factories where it is produced. They can print a much better paper at the price they get for it than they could otherwise. In other words, a small country newspaper, a weekly paper, receiving only a dollar or a dollar and a half a year, cannot afford to set up a great deal of material for that amount of money. I do not know whether it makes any difference in the cost of the paper, but the people get much better value for their money, because they

get all this printed matter received from the American stereotype plates in addition to the ordinary matter. Mr. Atkinson, the editor of a paper in Regina, and several other editors in small towns, have set forth that they could give much better satisfaction if the duty on stereotype plates was much less than it is. The worthy editor of the *Regina Leader* does not expound the views and feelings of the newspaper men in all the Territories.

Mr. LISTER. I think almost every newspaper published outside of the cities in the Dominion has applied to the Finance Minister or the Minister of Customs to have the duty entirely taken off these stereotype plates. I regret that I heard only a few words of the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I have no doubt that if I had heard the whole of it—well, I have some doubt—I might have been converted to his peculiar way of thinking upon this subject, but you can scarcely take up a newspaper from one end of this country to the other, not published in the leading cities—I do not know whether the *Regina Leader* uses these stereotype plates or not—that does not import these stereotype plates, with which to fill up one side of the paper. Now, those plates are not manufactured in Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. They are manufactured in Toronto; I have used them myself.

Mr. LISTER. At all events, as far as newspaper men are concerned, they have unanimously asked that the duty be taken off these plates. When the Government are yielding to the demands of every other class in the community, I am sure they ought to give some ear to the class which has supported them so strongly in the past, and is ready to justify the putting of an extra duty on purses, portfolios, iron and everything else mentioned in the tariff changes. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) attacked the quality of the literature that appears in these papers. I differ from him altogether. The literature is not at all calculated to offend our sense of propriety.

Mr. DAVIN. *Chacun à son goût.*

Mr. LISTER. My taste may not be as clean as the hon. gentleman's. The articles that appear in these stereotyped plates are interesting to the farming community, as they all have something on the subject of farming. They are interesting to the ladies of the house throughout the country; they are biographical in their character also, and generally very interesting, and I think that the Minister of Finance would be only conceding to the wishes, not only of the newspaper men of the country, but of the general reading portion of the country, by allowing these plates to come in free of duty, or by, at all events, not increasing the duty.

Photographic dry plates, a specific duty of 15 cents per square foot.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the *ad valorem* amount of duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 30 per cent. This is estimated to be an increase of 5 per cent.

Mr. CASEY. This must be an increase of 25 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The average cost is 40 cents per foot.

Mr. CASEY. I can buy them much cheaper than that at retail. I am in the habit of buying photographic plates, and know the prices. I can get them for about 30 to 35 cents per square foot, the best articles. This will put a duty of 50 per cent. on the best, and there are cheaper plates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are you speaking of the square foot?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. If this is going to prevent my hon. friend from pursuing further the study of the interesting science of photography, I will oppose it most strongly. I have watched with no small interest the attempts made by my hon. friend from time to time to improve, and I think he is doing remarkably well.

Mr. CASEY. I do not object to a moderate impost in the interest of the manufacturer; but I do think it is a very high percentage on what is now almost a necessity.

Shirts of cotton or linen, \$1 per doz., and 30 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is equal to 35 per cent., an increase of about five per cent. on an estimated cost of \$9 a dozen.

Mr. JONES. What increase to the revenue will that bring?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About \$5,000.

Mr. JONES. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his ideas. You can buy shirts for about \$6 a dozen, and this duty particularly applies to the inferior quality, bearing more heavily on those who use the cheaper quality. I think the hon. gentleman will find this is an increase from 80 to 100 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. They can be sold for 75 cents apiece and bought for 50 cents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Linen shirts?

Mr. McMULLEN. Cotton.

Mr. WELSH. As far as shirts are concerned, I fancy the duty will be heavier on the rich man, and therefore I do not object to it. My hon. friend beside me says it is just the reverse. I think not. I know, if I pay 9 shillings for a shirt, 30 per cent. is three shillings, the specific duty is 8 cents; so that the rich man pays his duty of 70 cents, and the poor man will pay much less.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend forgets the specific duty in addition to the 30 per cent. If he takes into account that the poor man's shirt will not cost over one-third of the rich man's, the cost to the poor man, under the duty, will be a great deal more than to the rich man. I pay \$2.50 to \$3 for a shirt, while the poor man can buy one for 50 cents.

Mr. CASEY. This question of shirts is not a small matter to be passed over in a hurry. I think my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has seen his mistake in passing over the word "cotton" in this item, so I will not go back to that. It is very clear that the duty of 8½ cents specific, coupled with the 30 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on a shirt that costs 50 cents wholesale, is a tremendously heavy percentage on the price of that shirt, and one that will press very severely on the laboring classes throughout. Of course, I speak chiefly for the agricultural community. Our farmers are using a great many of these ready-made cotton shirts. A good many of them still use home-made shirts, but very many use these cheap cotton shirts for rough work in harvest time and at other times when they can be worn, and this will be a very severe and a very unfair impost upon them. I will leave it to my hon. friends from this part of Canada to speak on behalf of the raftsmen, and I will leave it to my hon. friends from the Eastern Provinces to speak for the fisherman, but I must speak on behalf of the farmer and the agricultural laborer and say that this is a most oppressive and unfair and disproportionate tax upon the poor man; or, rather, not simply upon the poor man, for many of them are not poor, but upon the man who wears a cheap cotton shirt while performing his daily duties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I agree entirely with the views enunciated by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I.

Mr. CASEY.

(Mr. Welsh). That hon. gentleman has distinctly pointed out that this application of the specific and *ad valorem* duty will principally touch the rich man, because it will only be a high duty on the expensive article. The *ad valorem* duty on an article costing 50 cents will be very small, but if anyone chooses to wear a dearer article, such as my hon. friend is accustomed to purchase, the duty will amount to a considerable sum, so that this will have the effect of imposing this impost upon the people who are best able to bear it. My hon. friend who has just sat down appears to be very anxious about the fishermen and about the raftsmen. I do not think he need have any such anxiety on their account. I think I can devise a mode by which the shirts worn by that class will not pay much impost at all. The effect of this will be to give employment to the seamstresses, to give additional protection to a most important class of the community, the females who are engaged as seamstresses, and I am quite sure that, on that ground, if on no other, it will commend itself to the approval of this House. The poor fisherman will buy a cheap piece of cotton, and his household will make it up for him into such a shirt as he will wear, and this will also apply to the other classes mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I do not think a great deal of revenue will be received from that source, but the duty will bear with some effect upon persons who buy a valuable article, who are able to indulge in a description of shirt costing a high price. That is the principal effect it will have. I quite agree with the views propounded by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Welsh), and I am quite sure that the suggestion I have made as to the class of persons who will be greatly benefited by this impost will meet with general approval, and that every member will appreciate it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not see that the hon. gentleman has succeeded in the slightest degree in breaking the force of the assertion made by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), that this specific duty, levied in addition to the *ad valorem* duty, will bear more hardly on the poorer man. On shirts costing \$24 a dozen, the duty will amount to 4 per cent.; on those costing \$12 a dozen, to 8 per cent.; and on those costing \$6 a dozen, to 16 per cent., or a duty four times as great—

Mr. BOWELL. Are you speaking of the whole duty?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, of the specific duty—a duty four times as great in the case of the poor man wearing a coarse cotton shirt as in the case of the rich man wearing a shirt costing \$2. If you take this specific duty as equal to an *ad valorem* duty of 16 per cent., and in addition an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent., you find there is an amount equal to 46 per cent. charged in the one case against 34 per cent. in the other—a discrimination of the most glaring character against the poor man. It may be said by the hon. gentleman that this will lead to the production of shirts in the country and will in that case be in the interest of the seamstresses; but I expect that, if any benefit is derived from it, it will go not to the seamstress but to the capitalist who employs her. It is one of the unjust and indefensible features of a specific duty—and I think this was never more glaringly illustrated than in this case—that it bears unjustly on the cheaper article and on the poor man, and I repeat that the poor man's shirt in this case is charged four times as heavily, as regards the specific duty, as the rich man's shirt. This proposal is in the greatest and highest degree unjust to the poor man, and I repeat that the illustration of the unfair manner in which a specific duty operates is shown in this case in a manner sufficient to convince anyone who examines it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be far more satisfactory to the House and the country, and would certainly be more convenient to the trade, if the hon. gentlemen were to

impose an *ad valorem* duty, and were to set aside the specific duty altogether. There are articles, it may be, in regard to which being unfairly valued, it may be necessary to put on a specific duty, in order to prevent under-valuation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is one of those very articles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not admit that, and, if it were admitted, it would be a reason for dispensing with the *ad valorem* duty altogether. But the hon. gentleman has not acted upon that assumption; he has imposed an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent.; he has assumed that there is no danger of the revenue being defrauded; otherwise there is no justification for his very high *ad valorem* duty. But, in addition to that, he imposes a specific duty of \$1 a dozen. The result of that is that the cheaper the article, the higher the tax, as my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has pointed out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But that is corrected by the *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not. If anyone purchases a shirt at \$24 a dozen, the duty is 34 per cent., but if the price is \$6 a dozen, the tax amounts to 46½ per cent., so that the hon. gentleman will see that, between the dear article and the cheap article, there is a difference amounting to 12½ per cent. That is what the hon. gentleman has proposed. The fact is that the hon. gentleman has not the courage to disclose to the public generally the amount of burden he proposes to impose upon them. He proposes to impose a tax upon this class of goods amounting to nearly 50 per cent. in the case of the cheaper article, and he undertakes to conceal that fact by making a portion of the duty specific. If there is any justification for the imposition of an *ad valorem* duty on such a high rate as he has proposed in this item, there should be an *ad valorem* duty alone and no specific duty at all. It would simplify the collection of the revenue, and it would diffuse the burden equally, because it would impose upon each man taxation according to what he is able to pay. Most men live up to their incomes, or nearly so. Their expenditure, at all events, is in proportion to their incomes, and, if the tax is fair and equal, those who have the largest incomes will pay the most. But the hon. gentleman proposes to impose a proportionally heavier burden upon the poorer class than upon the more wealthy.

Mr. WELSH. I cannot see it yet. The fact of the matter is I am a free trader right through, and would like to see no duty at all on shirts. But I see my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has got an eye to the seamstresses. I am very glad he has. I suppose he always had. Now, that is all right. I like to look after them myself, and if I could do them any good I would. But still, I do not agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), nor my hon. friend for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). No doubt it is all very fine to talk about this matter as if it was only a 50 per cent. *ad valorem*. My friend has argued from \$1 a dozen altogether. Now that is not fair. Let us come right down to the truth. I object to the whole duty, but if you are going to make it 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, in addition to the specific duty, that comes to nearly one-third of the cost. If they cost 108 shillings a dozen, and you add the two duties, you have to pay about 75 per cent. The poor man pays more of the specific duty, but if you put the two together, you will find that the rich man pays more than the poor man on that basis.

Mr. BROWN. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem on every occasion to pose as the farmer's friend. Now, I claim that if there is anyone thing more than another that can be defended as the right thing for both the farmer and the poor man, it is this item. We have one effect from this item of the

tariff, that all these starched up rubbish, and stuff that hon. gentlemen opposite would like to see brought in to cover the back of the poor man, would be left out of the country, and they will have fabrics made in our own country of raw material which is free, and we will be able to give employment to our own people in making these fabrics, to the poor man, the friend of hon. gentlemen opposite who are always posing as his champion. The poor man will get an honest shirt made up from material produced in our own country, and at a low price. That will give work to the seamstresses of Canada, and that is what we are after; and what the people of Canada are determined upon is that the labor shall be kept in their own country, and that articles like this shall be made in Canada. The operation of this tariff will keep out the miserable trash which is brought in here not worth half what it cost, and those who do import shirts will have to pay the specific duty and the *ad valorem*, and in that case we may depend upon it they will bring in good shirts.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not exactly catch the calculation of my hon. friend from Norfolk when he was talking about 38 and 60 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said a specific duty at \$1 per dozen reduced to an *ad valorem* duty, would amount, roughly speaking, to 4 per cent. on a shirt; on those costing \$24 per dozen, 8 per cent. on a shirt; and costing \$30 per dozen, to 16 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. A person who buys shirts, presuming the duty is paid by him, which I do not admit, costing \$1 each, pays 38¼ cents duty; if he pays \$2 each, the duty will be 68¼—I am speaking about a single shirt—if you pay \$2.50 for a shirt, such as my hon. friend opposite wears, he would then pay 83¼ cents. On a shirt costing \$3 he would pay 98 cents. That is the way the tariff will operate.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has given us the number of cents that the purchaser will pay on a shirt, but the hon. members for Norfolk and Bothwell put it in a much more comprehensible way by stating what this would amount to as an *ad valorem* duty. They pointed out very correctly that on a shirt costing \$34 a dozen, the duty would be only 34 per cent., while on shirts costing \$6 per dozen the duty would be over 46 per cent. There will be a difference of over 12 per cent. against the cheap shirts. I do not object to my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) having his joke about this, and stating his opinion that this works in favor of the poor man; but I was not prepared to hear the hon. Minister of Finance, or any Minister of Finance, take up that joke in a serious manner and say from his place in the House that it worked in favor of the poor man; that although the poor man paid a little more in specific duty, the *ad valorem* corrected that. He said "it was corrected by the *ad valorem*." Now, I do not object to the Minister of Finance having his joke either, but when he is joking again, he should not do it with such a serious face, or somebody might suppose he meant it. And it would be a calamity to this Parliament, to this country—it would be a calamity to the hon. gentleman himself, if the public believed for five minutes that the Minister of Finance meant that the effect of this specific duty was corrected by the *ad valorem*. The *ad valorem* remains the same, no matter what the value of the shirt is, but the specific is undoubtedly higher on the cheaper article, and therefore the duty on the cheaper article is out of all proportion to that on the dearer. The hon. member for Bothwell was correct in his statement that the specific duty has only been introduced to cover up the percentage of the tax, practically imposed by the two duties combined. But it is hard for us to listen without protest to this talk about the poor seamstress, that she will be protected. The Minister said there will be protection to the seamstress by the operation of this tariff, although he and his supporter from Hamilton (Mr.

Brown) admitted it would be a prohibitory duty on cheap shirts, at all events, and very little would be added to the revenue. How is this going to protect the seamstresses? Look at New York, where there is a high duty on imported shirts and imported cottons, and where the seamstresses get very low wages. The hon. gentleman's duty will introduce here the state of things in New York, and you will find that under a high protective tariff the women working in factories will not get as good a rate of wages as they got before. There is no protection for the seamstresses. The manufacturer of shirts here can import seamstresses from New York without paying any duty on them, and set them to work here, and take the work from Canadian seamstresses. The talk about protection to seamstresses is a piece of gush—I cannot find a parliamentary word to express it, but it is really below the dignity of a Minister to talk about protection to the seamstresses in the way he proposes to do it.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would like to know the reason for imposing this specific duty. I have not heard the Minister of Finance state why it was necessary to add a specific duty to this article. The *ad valorem* duty, of course, would bear equally on all purchasers, both poor and rich, whether the shirt is cheap or dear. I do not know why the Government should impose a duty of 30 per cent. *ad valorem* and add a specific duty, the latter of which operates directly against the workingman who buys the cheap article.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are two objects in view. One is to prevent under-valuation, and the other is to prevent the market being overborne by prison labor, the products of which are brought in from the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the reasons given by the Minister of Finance are not satisfactory. One reason given for the change is to prevent under-valuation. If the hon. gentleman will tell me how this will prevent under-valuation, I shall be glad. If the hon. gentleman is going to tax the poor man's shirt to the same extent as the rich man's garment for the purpose of preventing under-valuation, he is pursuing a course which is directly prejudicial to the working classes. His next plea is that he is going to prevent the importation of the products of prison labor. There is another method of accomplishing this end. The importation of the products of prison labor is prohibited altogether, and the hon. Minister might allow some of the Customs officers, who are so active and so strict in detecting the transactions of large houses, to exercise a little ingenuity in discovering importations of prison labor, and by that means accomplish the result, without taxing the poor men to the extent now proposed.

Mr. MULOCK. I have made a calculation as to what I think will prove to be the rate of taxation on both classes of goods, if the Government's proposal is adopted. Take a 50-cent shirt and a shirt costing \$2.50, the 50-cent shirt will pay 23½ cents, namely, specific duty 8½, *ad valorem* 15 cents, total 23 cents, or equal to 46½ per cent. on the value of the article. The shirt costing \$2.50 will pay: specific duty 8½ cents, the same as on a 50-cent shirt, and also 75 cents *ad valorem* duty, total 83½ cents, equal to a tax of 33½ cents. That is to say, that the poor man who buys a 50-cent shirt is compelled to pay a duty of 46½ per cent. on that article, whereas the wealthy man who buys his shirt at \$2.50 pays only 33½ per cent. In other words, the poor man is called upon to pay 13 per cent. more duty than the rich man on a similar article.

Mr. BOYLE. The fact is that with one exception to which I will allude, only the very best shirts are imported. The exception is to be found in remnants from the English factories, which are made up in large quantities and find their way into the auction rooms of Montreal and Toronto, where they are sold at a cheap rate for a purpose of imposing on poor men. There is no necessity whatever

Mr. CASEY.

for these goods being imported. They are a fraud, and if they were kept out of the country altogether the working class would be benefited. We are manufacturing fabrics in our Canadian mills for shirt-making, which are fully equal to English and American goods, and they are produced and sold at a very low rate; and I hold that these goods are the best material for our workmen to purchase, and they can be obtained at the lowest paying prices. I contend, therefore, that this plea for justice in the interests of the poor classes of our country is, in this instance, largely out of place.

Veneers of wood, sawn only, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the tax at present?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Veneers are now admitted free of duty. But we have now in this country establishments for sawing them, and that is the reason why this duty is proposed.

Colored fabrics, woven or dyed, &c., 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the present duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 20 per cent. They are among unenumerated articles.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the estimated increase of revenue?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$10,000.

Artificial fertilisers, \$6 per ton.

Mr. WELSH. What was the duty previously?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 20 per cent. They came under unenumerated articles.

Mr. WELSH. And what is the additional amount of revenue expected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing. We expect that is about equal on an average to the present rate.

Mr. WELSH. I desire to say that a duty imposed on this article will very injuriously affect the interests of my constituents. I find that the Minister of Finance made a statement to the Home Government that Prince Edward Island has a population of 51 to the square mile, while none of the other Provinces exceed 4.72; that the production of farm produce on the island was equal to 108 bushels, and in no other Province did it exceed 61 bushels; the fisheries of the island produce \$17.08 per head, while those of the other Provinces equal \$3.55. This change, I say, will press heavily on the people of the island. It is true, that the Finance Minister the other day, brought down his Estimates which contained an item of \$20,000 a year for additional subsidy to the island.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you not satisfied?

Mr. WELSH. I am satisfied so far as it goes. It is like throwing a bone to a dog. The claim of the island is for five millions. There have been many deputations demanding a settlement. By unanimous vote of the joint Legislatures, a memorial was sent to the Queen praying that justice might be done, and a deputation, composed of Hon. Mr. O'Sullivan and Hon. Mr. Ferguson, was sent to England to press the claims of the island. I observe that in a communication Earl Granville says:

"I may add that I had confidence in the kindly spirit in which the matter at issue will be dealt with by both sides, and that gave me the hope that some acceptable arrangement might be come to."

I have not heard yet any word as to what arrangement has been come to under this head. I am very proud to see this item of \$20,000 a year in the Estimates, and I only wish it was four times the sum, because this matter has to be settled. My platform before my constituents was that I would support no Government in Canada except one that

would settle the outstanding debts, which were a source of disagreement between the Local and General Governments, and these questions must disturb the peace of the Provinces towards the General Government until they are settled. It is the duty of the Government, no matter what party is in power, to have these questions settled by parliamentary procedure, by arbitration, or by reference or in some sort of way. But not a hand has been put forward and no explanation has been made as to how we are to obtain the five millions, which is the island's claim. This annual subsidy of \$20,000 additional, we are clearly given to understand, is only on account of the island not having received the same benefit from the Intercolonial and some other railways as has been received by the rest of the Provinces. It does not affect the claim of five millions and that claim stands. I hope before the House rises the Government will come down with a statement as to how they intend to settle the matter, so as to restore peace and quietness. I can assure the Government that this matter will come up again and again until it is finally settled. This giving a sop to Prince Edward Island, a sop to Nova Scotia, and a sop to British Columbia is all very gratifying in the meantime, but those questions will have to come up again and they will have to be settled. If we are going to have a united Canada we must have all these differences removed and have a fair and clear understanding. Take the case of Prince Edward Island. We went into Confederation with a duty of 15 per cent., and you gave us 80 cents per head; now the duty is 30 per cent., and why don't you give us \$1.60 per head? Yes, while you are giving us \$20,000 with one hand, you are putting the other in our pockets and taking \$30,000. The other evening, on the iron duty, the iron entered my soul when I thought that it will take \$30,000 a year out of me. You gave us \$20,000 and you thought you gulled us over that, but not a bit of it; Prince Edward Island people are not so green as that. My hon. friend the other day gave us a great yarn about England, and how they encouraged their industries by protection. True, they did it; all do it at first; in those old days—not as old as I am or as the Minister of Finance is—all the world went in for protection, but they broke loose from it—all except one—and became free traders. How has England got her prosperity? Under free trade. It is true she was a great country under protection, but what strides she has made under free trade. Look at her shipping. When they established protection in other countries they said they would sweep her off the seas, but she has swept them off the seas with her free trade. America is the very reverse. She commenced her career by fighting against England—against taxation without representation. When the ships came out of Boston harbor they carried on the flag at their mast head the words, "Free Trade and Sailors' Rights." But where are they now? The United States disgraced themselves; they went back on their first principles, the principles upon which they formed themselves into an independent nation. They got up the duty on account of a civil war and because they had a large debt; they had a grudge against us, and having this large debt they went for protection just to pay off the debt. But like many others when they commenced to sin, they sinned, and sinned, and went on sinning, and they have had a policy of protection ever since. Now they have so much money they don't know what to do with it. One fellow says: "Take off the whiskey duty;" another says: "Give us enough to build the canals;" they have more money than they know what to do with. We are in the reverse position. We have got into debt which we have to pay and we have got into it by protection. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. gentleman's speech the other night, and I was glad that he took such a pleasant view of the prosperity of the country, but I think there is a great deal that is visionary in it. But I know there is one thing that is not visionary,

and that is our debt; and our taxation is not visionary. They are both real.

Mr. MITCHELL. Come to the fertilisers.

Mr. WELSH. We will come to the fertilisers by-and-by. Do you want any? Protection was first introduced as a temporary thing; it was very insidious; at first, when it was introduced, it wasn't protection at all. It was just a readjustment of the tariff. But it has been going on and going on, and, as I said before, the United States don't want more protection, but they have got into a bad habit, and, although the treasury is overflowing with money, they won't go back on it. The hon. gentleman spoke the other day, and he spoke beautifully, and I quite agreed with him; but I thought he would have gone further, but he didn't. That was the fisheries question—no it wasn't. I will come to it presently. Reciprocity was one thing, I know, and the Washington Treaty was one. He spoke beautifully on reciprocity, and I compliment him on his views, and I only wish that with the powers he had from Her Majesty's Government to go to Madrid for a treaty, as charity begins at home, if he would only go to the United States and get a treaty nearer home, it would be a great advantage to us. In Prince Edward Island we are laboring under great disadvantages. You have markets here, you can put things in the United States all the year round, but we can only do it for a certain time. The United States is our natural market; we have no chance to come to your markets with our fish and our other produce. The farmer of Prince Edward Island will not be satisfied until we get this matter settled.

An hon. MEMBER. Fertilisers.

Mr. WELSH. No, not yet. There is another thing here I want to touch on. The hon. gentleman went on to touch on the French policy, and if I understood him aright—and I don't know whether I did or not—he said something about England and her sugar refineries. Now, if I understand it right—and if I am wrong I am open to correction—the French policy is to give a bounty to the sugar manufacturers, and when they manufacture sugar they put a duty on it to their own people, and the manufacturers of sugar in France send it over to England to the English market, and sell a first-class sugar at about two cents per pound. Now the English refiners have been suffering much from this bounty system, and they complained to the English Government, but the head of the British Government said: "Yes, it is true that you are suffering, and we consider the bounty system a great injustice, but if we interfere and protect you against the French bounty system, what will be the consequence? About nine hundred and ninety-nine men in England out of a thousand consume sugar, and if we protect you we will be taxing nine hundred and ninety-nine men in every thousand for the benefit of one," and so they refused. My hon. friends will remember, that while they are talking about the protection of home industries, what protection have they given our shipping. We have heard a good deal about subsidies, but I am opposed to every kind of subsidy except those for keeping up communication with Government railways and the conveyance of the mails. Under the bounty system of France they give a bounty for every mile that the ship sails, but there is none for our marine system. We hear about protection to our steamers, but isn't that taking it out of one pocket and robbing me in the other. I have sailing ships, and if the Government goes on giving subsidies to steamers how am I to live? What is to become of our great marine? What has become of the American marine, since they adopted a system of protection? What has become of our marine since the National Policy came in force? It is getting wiped off the seas pretty fast. Let them all sail on a level, and if the steamers are going to win, let them have an equal run. Here they are talking about a line—Egad,

yes, a line to Hong Kong and Singapore, but if this keeps on it is going to make us all sing so poor that we will go to Sing Sing or some place else like it. Egad, we will become so poor that we will commit robbery, and we will have to go to Sing Sing then. What is to become of us if a mercantile line is to be subsidised out of our pockets against our interest? I want to see fair play. Last year \$7,500 was given to a steamer for calling at Charlottetown. She just called five times in the year. Well, what did she take away? Any passengers? No. She carried deals, Sir, and she cut down freights because she had a Government subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will admit that we have done right to leave that off then.

Mr. WELSH. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I rise to a point of order. I want to know the practice of the House in this debate. I cannot see that the House is going to be informed very much on fertilising by the speech the hon. gentleman is making, and I do not care about staying, nor do some hon. gentlemen about me, and listening to a discussion that might come up later on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will perhaps allow me to say that we took up the second reading of these resolutions on the distinct understanding that there should be a continuation of the original debate, and the hon. gentleman is now discussing points raised in the Budget speech, and is, therefore, within the rule established in this discussion.

Mr. WELSH. Well, the hon. member for Argenteuil need not have got up to interrupt me, because if he likes to get up a dozen times I will not interrupt him. When the hon. Minister of Finance spoke, I asked the question of the hon. member for South Oxford, if I could speak after that, and he said I could speak at any time. Therefore, I hope my hon. friend from Argenteuil will bow his head and acknowledge his error. I do not wish to speak often, and I thought I would put the whole thing into one box. I do not know that I have a great deal more to say. I object to this protection policy altogether. This duty on fertilisers I would like very much to see struck off. The Government will get an advantage by taking it off, because we use a great deal of fertilisers in Prince Edward Island, and export a great deal of stuff, and the more fertilisers we use the more we will export, and it will be a benefit to the country. And if the hon. Minister of Finance will use his influence to get a reciprocity treaty with the United States, I shall be delighted, and so will every man in Prince Edward Island. I would remark, also, before I sit down, that I hope a Washington Treaty will never be renewed in this country. I say this much, that the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces I consider are of more interest to them than to men in British Columbia. Will any man deny the fact? And if the million and a-quarter of money got from the Halifax fishery award is paid into the Dominion Treasury and spent out in the Rocky Mountains, do you think that is the way we want to do it again? I say no. We want our fisheries for the benefit of the marine Provinces. We have nothing else, and I hope the Government will hold on to those fisheries. I back the Government in every step they have taken in defending those fisheries. I support them in that, and I wish to see them protect them in every way until the United States Government give us reciprocity. And if they like to strike us with retaliation, let them strike. I wish to maintain our rights, and I would like the Minister of Finance to have those powers which he says he has, to go to Madrid and negotiate a treaty. I hope he will use those powers and go to Washington and obtain for Prince Edward Island a reciprocity treaty. My platform is a reciprocity treaty.

Mr. WELSH.

Some gentlemen here have thrown slurs on the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) for having swallowed his principles. I have never seen any of his principles yet—. Now, I do not mind most of the men on that side laughing; but there is one man laughing who has no right to laugh, that is the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), for he is an Irishman. We know an Irishman can speak twice. If you had only waited, you would have heard what I was saying. I was saying that I never saw any of his principles yet swallowed by him. The hon. gentleman was an advocate of the reduction of the duty, but I will give the Government this credit, that they have foisted such a debt on this country that the possibility of reducing the duty is very small, and in my canvass I said this: When we went into Confederation we had a debt of only \$70,000,000 odd, but now we have a debt of \$270,000,000, and as an honest country we must pay the interest on that debt; therefore, you cannot expect as great reduction in the tariff as you might if our debt was only \$70,000,000. If we could do it, I would not go to reduce the duty altogether, because I am an advocate of home industries as well as any other hon. gentleman. But there is a difference between staring and being stark mad. There is a difference between 17 per cent. and 30 or 40 per cent., or a prohibitory duty. I want the Government to think of this now; and if we could get a reciprocity treaty with, say 20 per cent. or thereabouts, it would be a great benefit to the country, and the country would prosper. The hon. Minister of Finance said the other day that these duties were put on so that capitalists might develop the resources of this country. I take the ground that the resources of this country are getting developed, not by capitalists, but out of the earnings of the whole people of this Dominion. If capitalists wish to develop the resources of a country, there is nothing to stop them; and if we put a duty of 20 per cent. on the things they want to develop, I won't object. I do not want to occupy the time of the House, but I certainly move that that duty on fertilisers be struck off.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to second the motion of the hon. gentleman that the duty be struck off. I think it is to be regretted that the Government deem it necessary to tax that article.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We do not propose to increase the tax at all. We leave it as we find it.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not quite, I think, as the Minister of Finance states. As the Minister of Customs explained to me, the duty at present is 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and the object of making it specific is to discriminate against inferior grades.

Mr. BOWELL. That is one reason.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, whatever may be the reason, I think it would be far better to let fertilisers in free. The only object there can be in taxing fertilisers is, of course, to develop our own industries, and we have beds of phosphates, gypsum and other materials from which fertilisers can be manufactured. If it is necessary, then, to develop our own mineral wealth, it should be done at the expense of the whole country, by a bounty if necessary, and not by a tax which is going to fall on a particular class, a class which to-day is handicapped in the race of life. At the risk of offending the senior member for Hamilton, I may say I think we are entitled to speak for the poor men occasionally, and may even pose as the farmer's friends. When election times are on, hon. gentlemen opposite are extremely anxious to pose as the farmer's friends, but when taxes are to be levied they forget all about him. I am not going to assume that hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten any interest to-day. On the contrary, I will assume, as it is my duty, that they

desire to do what they think is best; but in this particular case the farming interest has been suffering quite enough without being compelled to bear an additional burden. Therefore, if it is in order for me to second the motion of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), I will do so. Last year we passed a measure which, I think, was in the right direction, namely, a law providing for a proper system of examining the strength of fertilisers. That Act, the hon. Minister says, is not applicable to importations, and therefore he thinks the duty is necessary in order to keep out inferior grades. I think it is quite possible to amend that Act so that it will apply to importations. Under the circumstances, considering the nature of the industry, considering the class of people who would be affected by it, I think the Government would be acting in the best interests of the country in admitting all fertilisers free. It is false economy to exclude from a nation anything that adds to the producing capacity of the land.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will have printed the voluminous papers connected with Behring Straits?

Mr. FOSTER. They will be put in the hands of the Printing Committee.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I find a Minister has arrived at last, I would ask him, in relation to the papers in connection with the outrage in Behring Sea, whether he would have them printed in pamphlet form and distributed to the members. They are entirely too voluminous to be read in manuscript.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would suggest that the hon. gentleman speak to the Chairman of the Printing Committee, who will, no doubt, order the papers to be printed. I will, however, as I perceive he is not here, try and see some member of the committee about it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am quite aware that is the course, but I notice in relation to the correspondence in connection with the fisheries, that on the Atlantic side of this continent the Government had them printed and brought down. I do not think it is the duty of a member of the Opposition to attend to this. I think my hon. friend should see it is done. It would take us two years to get through the manuscript.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The result of the delay in bringing down the other papers, through their being first printed, was that the Minister of Marine had reflections cast upon him every day for his tardiness.

Mr. MITCHELL. In this case he has shown there is no attempt at concealment, but at the same time the printing should be gone on with.

Artificial fertilisers, \$6 per ton.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I was going to say a few words before six o'clock with regard to these fertilisers. The protection given by this resolution is given to the farmers. The protection that is desired, so far as fertilisers are concerned, is to protect the farmers against the imposition practiced upon them for a number of years by the sale, from the American side, of a very inferior quality of fertilisers. So far as the resolution is concerned, it does not go far enough in discriminating against an inferior quality. In a great many States of the Union, these fertilisers, before they are admitted to be put on the market, have to be thoroughly analysed, and the analysis of each fertiliser has to be placed on the packet, but that which is to be sent out of the States is not analysed at all. The result is that inferior qualities, composed only of slack lime and some other inferior articles, perfumed to suit the olfac-

tory nerves of the farmer, are sent into this country and sold for from \$30 to \$40 a ton, while they are not worth more than \$7 or \$8 a ton. When I introduced the Bill some two years ago, my object was not only to have the fertilisers which were manufactured in this country thoroughly tested, and labels placed upon all packages put on the market, but also to have all the fertilisers which were imported thoroughly analysed before they left the place of importation or the first place they touched in Canada. That would cause a long delay to the farmer—probably two or three or four weeks—and in many cases the time for using the fertiliser would have expired before the good would have been obtained from it. I think the object is to discriminate largely against the inferior quality of fertilisers. In fact, if there were any way of prohibiting their importation altogether, it would be much better for the farmer, but at any rate they should be discriminated against as much as possible in the duty. The purchase by the farmer of an inferior quality of fertiliser means not only the loss of the money which he pays for the fertiliser, but practically the loss of the land upon which it is placed for one season. If he depends on that fertiliser to enrich his land and to produce a good crop, the money is lost, the labor is lost, and the land is practically lost for that season. So I think this Parliament cannot do enough in the direction of preventing and prohibiting, if possible, not only the importation of a spurious article, but the manufacture of a spurious article in this country. It is impossible for the farmer or for anybody else to detect the spurious article. There is no way, by any manipulation he might give it, by the sense of smell or otherwise, by which he could detect the spurious from the good article. It is therefore the duty of the Government to protect the farmer in that direction. I will only say further that this placing a specific duty on this article is in the right direction. You will observe that it reduces the duty upon the good and valuable article. It was 20 per cent. before. The value of the good article is \$35, \$40, and \$45 a ton, and 20 per cent. on that would be \$7, \$8, or \$9 a ton, so the duty on the good and valuable article has been reduced from \$7, \$8 or \$9 a ton to \$6 a ton, and that goes at all events to a small length in the direction of preventing the importation of the spurious article. Hon. gentlemen in discussing this question, should keep in view the fact that the protection the farmer needs is only the protection against the importation, manufacture and sale of a spurious article in this country, and I think this proposal, as far as it goes, is in the right direction.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I understand the question before the House, there is nothing in the resolution about protecting the farmer against a spurious article at all. There is no discrimination between good, bad and indifferent; it is simply a duty of \$6 a ton upon all farm fertilisers. Now, the story that our friend from the county of Welland (Mr. Ferguson) has told us, that it is intended to protect the farmers from spurious articles, is a very old story. It is brought up now without even a new dress to it. It is the old story over again. I remember well, when the high duty was laid on imported cloth, that it was said to be intended to protect the wearers from the shoddy article. It was the same with regard to sugar. The duty was to protect the poor people from the importation of an inferior article of sugar. It has been the same all through the gamut. Now we are told that this duty is to protect the farmers from a spurious article of fertiliser. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that seven-tenths of the duties which are imposed are paid by the farming community, and with all that heavy load for them to carry, it is proposed to-day to add to their burden by taxing them for the fertilisers they use in order to increase the productive capacity of their farms. We have been told that it is a protection. I submit that it will not do for this House to assume too much in the direction of protecting the farmer.

It will not do for this House to assume this paternal attitude towards the farmer, and to act on the presumption that the farmers are a lot of simpletons and do not know what is good for them or what is good for their farms. I tell hon. gentlemen that the farmers of this country are just as wide awake as any other class of the community, and that they can tell when an article is spurious and when it is good as well as the rest; and, if they have an inferior article offered to them or a good article offered to them, they do not want to pay \$6 a ton for the privilege of trying it. I hope the Finance Minister will see his way to strike this out and to give the farmers a fair chance in this matter.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I do not want it to go to the country, or for the hon. gentleman to infer, that I intended to say that the farmers were a lot of simpletons. I am a farmer myself, I was raised on a farm, and I think I know just as much about a farm as the hon. gentleman, and perhaps a good deal more. But when he tells me that any man, whether he be a chemist or a farmer, can tell the spurious from the good article without analysing it, he tells me what I know to be incorrect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But I contend that there is nothing in this resolution to discriminate between the good and the bad. Whether the article is good or bad the farmer has to pay.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that is where the hon. gentleman from Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) is wrong. The difficulty has been in discriminating between the inferior article and that which really is of value to the agriculturists. If they are compelled to pay \$6 a ton upon an article which they will and do import into this country at \$25 and even at \$22 and \$23 a ton, which is a spurious article, they will not be inclined to bring it in, but will bring in an article of a better quality and the farmer will not be cheated.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman laughs. No doubt he knows a great deal more about it than anyone else. Our great difficulty has been to prevent the importation into this country of a very low grade, which is comparatively valueless as a fertiliser, and we have been constantly sending that article to the Dominion chemists to ascertain its real qualities. The agents who represent these houses in the United States are selling an article which, I repeat, is comparatively valueless, and are charging a higher price than they ought to charge for it; but, if the importer has to pay \$6 a ton on the article, they will bring in a better quality. It is really and in fact a protection to the farmer.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a protection to the tune of \$6 a ton.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not to the tune of \$6 a ton. The hon. gentleman forgets that the higher class of these fertilisers, upon which 20 per cent. is paid now, is worth all the way from \$36 to \$40, \$45, and even \$50 a ton. Now, if \$6 specific is put on that article, it is much less than 20 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. I fail to see that.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot make you see it if you will not. If you take the value at \$50, and 20 per cent. on that, I think you will find it is more than \$6. If you take \$40, you will find that 20 per cent. is more than \$6.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it is a protection, why have it on at all? Why not wipe it out?

Mr. BOWELL. That is another point.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the point.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not arguing that point.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what I want you to meet.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman should confine himself to one point, and not when he is caught in one point run off to another, if the question arises as to making fertilisers free altogether, and thereby shutting up the manufactories of that article in the country, that is another question, and it is a fair one for argument. What I am trying to point out now is that taking the average price paid for fertilisers imported from the United States, \$6 per ton is a less rate of duty than is now paid at 20 per cent. and is consequently in the interest of the farmers. If you strike this duty off, and leave it at 20 per cent. where it was before, you do not gain anything for the farmers.

An hon. MEMBER. Put it on the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. To do that you would have to commence *de novo*. Now, I find from actual test, and from what has come under my observation in working this law, that the prices will range as high as \$60—the lowest price is \$23. If the hon. gentleman is a farmer, as he told us the other night, if he buys that \$23 per ton fertiliser, and uses it, he will find that he would have done better to keep his money in his pocket. It is really from the test we made of it, by the Dominion analyst, that we find it is not of any value. There is very little ammonia in it, and it is comparatively useless. Now, the entries have ranged from \$23 to \$60 per ton; 20 per cent. on \$60 would be \$12. You take the better qualities, say \$35 and \$40, the rate we now propose is really lower than that which farmers have been paying, being based upon a value of \$30 a ton.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend chooses to set up a figure and then knock it down. I do not propose that he shall dictate to me as to how I shall direct my argument to this House, nor will I permit him to place me in a false position before the House. My argument was this. The hon. member for Welland contended that this was a boon to the farmers, that it was really a relief to the farmer to charge him \$6 a ton for fertilisers. I said I could not see that; the Minister of Customs said he could not help it. I failed quite to catch him at the moment, but I pointed out that if he wanted to befriend the farming interests, the Government, if they were earnest in their desire, ought to wipe out that duty altogether, for I could not see how it was going to help the farmers, if he required fertilisers, to make him pay \$6 duty, nor how it was any protection to him. The hon. gentleman says they range from \$25 to \$60 a ton, and the duty on these fertilisers now is 20 per cent. But I say it was a duty that should never have been put on. It is a heavy increase to the burdens upon the farming community, and if the Government are going to make a revenue tax of it—because it is that, nothing more nor less—why should they attempt to create the impression that it was an act done to protect the interests of the farmer? Sir, it is nothing of the kind. If they want to keep spurious articles out of the country, they can do so. Let their revenue officers exercise the same keen watch that they do in the city of Montreal, where their interests are concerned in dividing the spoils and the plunder; but let them take the duty off fertilisers, and then the farmer will get some relief from the great stress there is now upon farming operations on account of the low prices of farm produce. Sir, I think so far from being a protection to the farmers, it is a positive tax. There is, perhaps, not a greater tax, taken in its average results upon the farming community, than this one. It is something like the protection the Government gave to the people of my county in respect to cornmeal, but I do not wish to touch on that just now. Sir, I take up this tariff, and in almost every item in it I find an average increase of about 5 per cent., and

there is scarcely an item that does not bear upon the people of my county, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point out one instance where the people of my county get any benefit from this National Policy which is being run into the ground. I am not going back on my principles. I am a National Policy man. I have been so from the beginning, and helped to fight the battle of the National Policy, and fell largely through it; but I never dreamed when I was advocating the National Policy, as it was considered at the time, that it was going to put a duty of 50 cents a barrel on flour, and 40 cents a barrel on cornmeal. When I find that everything the farmer requires to buy, everything the lumberman requires to use in the prosecution of his business, everything the fisherman want in following his calling, except salt, and, perhaps, one or two trifles in the shape of lines and twine—I say that everything is taxed; and they are adding to that from year to year. There has not been a year since this National Policy was adopted that they have not increased the tax. Now, they are re-adjusting it, as they say—practically, they are increasing it for revenue purposes. Sir, I went into this National Policy honestly, as believing it a measure of necessity, when we could not get interchange of our commodities with the United States, when we could not get our friends on the other side of the line to make a reciprocity treaty, I resolved to adopt the next best thing, but I only adopted it as a necessity under the circumstances, and I earnestly supported it, but I am not going to support the policy of running it into the ground, as they are now doing. I would like to ask my hon. friend when he took the duty off the anthracite coal, to relieve people of the Upper Provinces, why did he not take it off cornmeal and flour to relieve the people of the Lower Provinces? Why did he not take the duty off flour and off soft coal to relieve the people of the Lower Provinces who buy an enormous amount of the former article—three-fourths of what they usually consume? Why should these people be taxed who get no benefit from this National Policy? Sir, I say if the Government want to benefit the people of the Lower Provinces and to keep our young men and our young women from emigrating into the United States, let them reconsider and readjust this tariff with some honest desire of effecting their pretended object, instead of going on Session after Session increasing the taxes under a pretence that they are simply adjusting the tariff. Let them take the duties off from some of the prime necessities to help the people who are suffering from the depression of trade to an extent that they can scarcely live under it.

Mr. CLAYES. Hon. gentlemen supporting the Government claim that this \$6 duty per ton is put on for the protection of the farmers, that the farmer may be relieved from the danger of buying an inferior article. Now, if it can be proved that the farmer is liable to fall into the hands of the heathen Chinese, and to suffer in this direction, there is another and very effective way of relieving and protecting him. Let it be required of every importer of fertilisers that there shall be marked upon the bag or package precisely how much ammonia, how much phosphoric acid, or other ingredients the fertiliser contains. Some of the fertilisers manufactured here and in the United States are worth \$10 per ton. They have got ammonia enough, they have got phosphoric acid enough to be worked up. Others may be worth \$45 a ton, but it does not follow that the low priced article is not as well worth the money as the high priced. A \$6 tax upon the farmer is not going to protect him in any degree from danger, but a careful chemical analysis will relieve him and protect him absolutely. It seems to me to be intended as a reflection upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that we consider the interest of the farmer, and yet I hope some hon. gentlemen have relatives who are connected with the farming industry, for that forms the true source and basis of the prosperity of the

country in which we live. In olden times four-fifths of the people were always regarded as being engaged in the cultivation of the soil and the production of food. To-day the same amount of labor is not required to furnish us with clothing, with our dwellings to protect us from the inclemency of the weather, and all such articles as come from the artisan and manufacturer, and accordingly the farming population is relatively much larger than it was formerly. Representing a country like Canada it seems to me to be germane that we should consider the welfare of this great body of people who produce our food, who produce the raw material which is the source of our industry. I notice in this policy of protection that the farmer every time is the man to be taxed; the farmer is the man whom you forget. This Parliament appears to recognise the man who builds up a tower, out of the chimney of which comes forth flame and smoke. That kind of thing catches the eye; you recognise the importance of the tower, but, as I have said before, not more than one-fifth of the people are engaged in industries other than farming and live in towns. Four out of five live in the country and the welfare of the manufacturers lies in the protection of the labor of this country, and the great body of laborers of this country are farmers. A farmer in this country is not what a farmer is in the old world. There he is a capitalist, a gentleman of leisure, he employs men and pays them little to work upon his farm; but in this country, our farmers are laborers as well as farmers. They own but little land, they work themselves and their wives and their children. Unless we look after the laborers, the manufacturers have not the ghost of a chance in the race for prosperity. I was extremely interested in the speech of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh). We were all amused and all interested, and that speech was not only an exceedingly interesting speech, but it was a very suggestive speech also. The hon. gentleman referred to the time when the people of the United States separated from old England and started out with free trade and sailor's rights in their minds. That continued to be the idea which controlled and determined the policy of the American people up to the time of the great rebellion. Until 1861 the average taxes of the United States amounted to only 20 per cent., it was a revenue tax; that was the period of their prosperity, and that was the time when the masses of the people were in the possession of the comforts of life, when they had leisure which enabled them to cultivate their minds, when they were beyond all question as a body infinitely superior to the American people of to-day. Wealth was generally distributed. I remember the time when we used to speak of the millionaire: there was only one, and he was John Jacob Astor. Wealth was distributed among the great masses of the people, and, as a consequence, there was general prosperity, there was leisure enjoyed by the people, there were no strikes then, there was no room whatever for dangerous demagogues who are now seeking to arouse the people to a revolutionary attitude, dangerous and threatening to the state. But when the war came an enormous debt was incurred; a vast change took place in property through the decline in the value of money, property passed from the hands of the masses into those of a few speculators, and a new order of things came upon the face of the country, an order of things which has resulted beyond all question in carrying the people of the United States back to the condition of things from which the people of Europe have been struggling to escape. It is a great blunder for the Finance Minister of this country, and the gentlemen associated with him, to institute a policy here, the effect of which is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. It is only a little while ago that one of my neighbors sent me a book asking me to read it and state what I thought of it. It was a work by A. Russell Wallace. I had heard of him as one of the

great abstract thinkers of England, one who ranked with Herbert Spencer, the late Charles Darwin, and other eminent men there. This work was on "Bad Times." He had endeavored to consider the cause of the bad times, and he found as the result of his abstract reasoning, the application of his logic, that hard times in Europe and in this country were the consequence very largely of the enormous proportion of the people who were doing no work. He regarded the millionaires, who have multiplied so largely in Europe, as being very largely a source of the hard times. He ranked them with the great bodies of people who are engaged in carrying the musket and consuming and destroying. There is a great deal of force beyond all question in that argument. There is a certain amount of labor in every country which goes to produce its wealth, which being distributed secures the abundance, comfort and welfare of society. If that wealth takes the direction of the production of articles of luxury alone, such as the yachts of a millionaire, that means so much virtually extracted from the sum and substance of that which makes abundance and comfort among the people. It might just as well have floated over the falls here, 'so far as the whole people of a country are concerned. Whenever a man is engaged in the production of that which tends to the comfort of the people, and when under a system of just exchange you place within the reach of every man a market for his own labor, for that is really what he wants, for he wants a day's work for a day's work, and you enable him to make exchange—every man will have half a day's leisure on his hands every day. Not only would they be better fed and better clothed, but they would have plenty of time for the cultivation of their minds in everything which goes to represent the civilised man. And it should be the aim of every man possessed of power to give direction to that which determines the character of society. Another point I should like to make with regard to this question of commerce. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) said he was a free trader. It is not astonishing that he should be a free trader. I am only astonished that the Minister of Finance coming from Nova Scotia, coming from one of the Provinces down by the sea, should be anything else than a free trader. Why, they may talk about manufacturing as much as they like, and I admit manufacturing is essential, but when it becomes a business demoralising all round, as is the case under protection, it is a curse to a country and in nowise a blessing. Commerce, since the story of man's life was first told, has been the instrument of civilisation, of knowledge, of all things in which we rejoice. Look back into olden times—to the times of Phœnicia, of Carthage and of Greece. Look at Greece whose language we are to-day teaching in all our colleges; in our educational institutions the study of Greek is the one thing essential. Her influence is due to the fact that the Greeks were a commercial people. By her position on the Mediterranean and the stimulus of her commerce, her democracy, each little town competing with the others, they became possessed of whatever knowledge there was in the world, and that is the source of the pre-eminence of the Greeks, not only in the time of the old Greeks, but of her knowledge and influence even down to the present day. The other day a friend said to me: "Why, there is something about the atmosphere of England that enables that country to raise better horses, better cattle, better men than any other country in the world." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all foolishness. England is great simply by virtue of her commerce. It is the one secret which is the source of her eminence. I tell you that commerce is the one thing to be protected; but this kind of protection upon which the Minister of Finance congratulated the country as being the source of its prosperity is a source of death to commerce. At one time the United States were pushing old England in all parts of

Mr. CLAYES,

the world; everywhere where there was trade to be done you found the Stars and Stripes vieing with the Union Jack for that trade. How is it now? Why, Sir, you look in vain for the evidences of commercial enterprise among that people. Take our own country. The commerce of the Lower Provinces made Canada the third great commercial power in the world, and our system of protection has come near wiping them out of existence. The future of the Lower Provinces ought to be a magnificent one, provided you place within her reach those advantages for trading which nature intended her to possess. Her fisheries are a nursery for seamen; she has magnificent harbors; she has everything to put her in the very front of the commercial activity of this continent. But that has all been destroyed. A patriotic Minister of Finance proposes to substitute for the legitimate thing which we might have had in the Lower Provinces—an iron industry. Well, if there is anything that is likely to bring to him, if he lives long enough, the sorrows and discomfort of a sad reflection, it will be the result of his iron industry. If the people of the United States had raised the money, and had furnished all those iron kings with all the money they have made; if they had provided places for the comfort of all the laborers engaged in that industry, and given them no work to do, but had been allowed to buy their iron wherever they could buy it, for what it was worth, they would have been richer than they are to-day. Pennsylvania, beyond any state in the Union, has been in the hands of these iron men who gather round the Legislature at Harrisburg and really control the Legislature there. I know of no industry in the United States, of no industry anywhere, which when examined with reference to its influence on a people, its influence on a country, or upon the wealth of a country, will compare with the iron industry of the United States. This idea that you will make a people rich by preventing them from trading freely with other people, is such an absurdity. What we want to do is to exchange the result of our labor with the results of the labor of other countries. What we do is to take a day's work and try to find some place where we can get two or three, or a dozen day's work for it. That is the source of England's prosperity. She has gone to India and has taken with her the day's work of one of her laborers and exchanged it in India for fifteen or twenty day's work, and brought it back. Now, whatever she has brought from abroad is as much the production of her own labor as though she had produced it at home. It is an exchange of the labor of the men at home, whose industry was perfectly employed, for the labor of other men which can be bought for it. The great objection to this policy of protection is just this, that it tends to multiply the rich, to the accumulation of enormous fortunes, while at the same time it makes the great mass of the people poorer. It is a policy which lays on the labor of the country an enormous burden. We have been going over these resolutions, and in every instance we have been taking out of the pockets of the laborer of the country an enormous amount of money—for what? Not to defray the expenses of Government. No, Sir, in nine cases out of ten we have proposed to tax the country for the benefit of the manufacturers. The money does not really go into the coffers of the state, but it goes into the pockets of men whom you are making rich, and who give the community no return. The Minister of Finance was facetious when he was speaking on this question. He went on to say that on this question the leader of the Opposition had recognised the propriety of protection, that all parties regarded it as the settled policy of the country, and that, therefore, there was no necessity for further discussion upon it. Beyond all doubt this is true. We have so complicated the affairs of this country that we cannot abandon the policy of protection. Whether we will or not, we are bound to continue the policy of protection until we can change it, and change it

without injury to the new industries of the country. But it does not follow that we have abandoned principles of truth. Now, I would just ask gentlemen to consider that the welfare of a people of a country depends upon not violating truth in political economy. Gentlemen on the other side must know that protection is a folly, that protection is a falsehood, that protection finds the support of no man who is worthy of being considered as representing the application of the human mind to the consideration of this question. Among all the colleges in the United States their professors on political economy, and there are 300 or 400 of them, there is not one who is not a believer in free trade. All over Europe, all the men who think and who are recognised as having given to the study of this question the best thoughts and the best minds, without an exception, advocate free trade. There is no exception. I defy any man to name anybody who has ever been heard of that is not a free trader. I have no doubt hon. gentlemen will name some one whom nobody knows but themselves. I was in the library this morning, and I saw something written by somebody of whom I never heard, a book on American political economy. Well, Sir, the man who writes on American political economy is a demagogue and a humbug. Political economy is the same in all countries in the world. There is no different truth in America from what there is in Canada or in any part of Europe. Truth, in political economy, in one place, is truth everywhere. Now, with regard to the prosperity of the country, the hon. Minister of Finance, as an evidence of it, referred to the fact that life insurance had enormously increased. Is that an evidence of prosperity? Why, Sir, if a man sends his bark out on a dangerous sea, if he fears disaster, then he will seek for insurance against risk. If that is an evidence of anything under the sun, it is an evidence of fear that trouble is impending. So when a man insures his life, it is because he is not certain of his little accumulated wealth, and it is far from being an evidence of prosperity. Then, look at the strikes. If they indicate anything as to the condition of the labor of the country, they are symptomatic of a condition of things really dangerous to the public welfare. When the wealth of society is justly and fairly distributed among the men who work and produce it, we shall have no strikes. You will never have prosperity when you leave the masses of men suffering, and only the few, the millionaires and their associates, to rejoice. Now, one thing I would say with regard to the taxes. It is generally admitted by all writers on political economy that sooner or later all taxes fall on the labor of the country. Some gentlemen in criticising the financial statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, said that many people believe that the taxes fall on the farmer. In a certain sense they do. The farmers of this country are really the laborers of the country. Four-fifths of the labor of the country is done by farmers. Put a tax on the merchant, and what does he do? He simply adds it to the price of his goods which pass into the hands of the consumers, and they have to pay the taxes of the merchant. The same is the case with professional men. The doctor in dispensing his pills charges the tax in with the price the farmers around pay him. The same thing is true of all classes in the community. Ultimately all the taxes rest on the men who work, and in this country the men who work are the farmers.

Mr. PORTER. Without endeavoring to follow the hon. gentleman who last addressed this House in his essay on commerce and its concomitant political economy, permit me to say, with regard to the doctrine of protection, which he has endeavored to enunciate and attack, that his essay has fallen very flat on this House, and I can commiserate him on the ill-timed birth of his miserable ranting. Even his friends on that side of the House are not with him. This doctrine

of free trade is one that was certainly decided long before the gentleman's essay was delivered to this House. However, I would say this, that the subject of fertilisers, which are used in the occupation which I follow, seems not to have much attractiveness for those gentlemen who have touched upon it. The hon. member for Northumberland posed as the friend of the poor farmer and the gentleman who last addressed the House also bewailed their condition. Indeed I was much pleased to hear that they had so much sympathy for us. My heart was touched. The tear in his voice and the wail of his lament over the poor farmers was certainly very touching to those of us who are farmers. This question of fertilisers is one of the things in which I feel an interest, and his endeavor to remove the burden which I and my fellow farmers lie under, was certainly a great pleasure and satisfaction to me. But my sympathies are somewhat spoiled when some one told me that after all the farmers of Ontario import no fertilisers at all. However, let that be as it may, the hon. gentlemen who have so much interest in the farmer, if they know anything about the farmer, except asking him for his vote at elections or his money on mortgages, must know that every farmer must depend on fertilising the soil with the manure he raises on his own farm. So far as my own riding is concerned, none of the farmers in it use artificial manure. I would wish hon. gentlemen opposite, who take such an interest in this question, to name any riding or county in Ontario in which artificial manure is largely employed. I do not refer to men who have small pieces of ground of five or ten acres or so in extent, and who probably use these artificial manures, but I say that every farmer, who is worthy of the name, that is to say, a farmer who holds 50, 100 or 150 acres of land, has to depend on his own resources for the manure that is necessary for the fertilisation of the soil. These hon. gentlemen become very pathetic over the lot of the farmer. Well, the farmers are perfectly well aware that times may be rather hard and a little dull at present, but there is not one of them who understands his business and the trade of the country, who will for a moment place the depression under which he labors at the door of the Government. It is not because farmers, as is alleged, pay more for what they purchase that there is any hardship amongst them. Every effort of the Government has been in the direction of helping the farmers, and those duties which are imposed upon grain and cattle are in his interests and tend to make his condition as far as possible better than it otherwise would be. I say that the sympathies these gentlemen cast upon the farmers are thrown away. We have no desire to throw ourselves into the hands of any particular individual or party in this land; all we wish is fair play, and we do not wish to be known, when we form farmers' clubs, either as Grits or Conservatives. We wish to keep our farming interests altogether free from party political, and to discuss every question affecting us free from political bias. These gentlemen will best help the farmers if they will leave their sympathies out of the question altogether, and discuss our matters purely as business and not as political questions.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down ventures to accuse the hon. member for Missisquoi of lecturing the House and of delivering an essay. I am sure we cannot compliment the hon. gentleman who has just spoken on delivering a systematic essay, but, so far as lecturing is concerned, his remarks were nothing else but a lecture composed of vague generalities. The hon. gentleman wound up by saying we should discuss farmers' interests apart from politics, yet there was not a word in his speech that was not tinged, that was not dyed and saturated with politics. He says the National Policy in every one of its details benefits the farmers. He makes that bold assertion without bringing forward in its support an atom of proof, and

he makes it in the face of a proposal to prevent the farmer buying artificial fertilisers where they can be the cheapest. The hon. member for Missisquoi showed clearly that the farmers were the laboring class of this community. It is not the few industries we have in the towns that can call themselves the laboring interests of the country. It is not the manufacturers, with their few chimneys and their manufacture of patent manures, who are seeking favors at the hands of the Government in redemption, no doubt, of election promises, who represent the interests of the laboring community. But it is that class of the community who pay all the bills of the country, who furnish primarily nearly all the wealth of the country, who are the wealth producers, and who are making this country prosperous, if anybody is. I am sorry to have to confess that at present we cannot do a great deal in adding to its prosperity. Everybody knows the farmer does not get the prices he used to get, and that he pays more than he would have to pay were it not for the present tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. I will not say everybody, because there are some Tories so ignorant that they are not aware even of that. Every farmer must know, from practical experience, that he is not making as much profit now as he did ten years ago. The contention of my hon. friends and myself is this, that, when the Government has to deal with other classes, who are not doing a-tenth, a-twentieth or a-fiftieth as much for the wealth of Canada as the farmers do, the Government give them most peculiar and extraordinary advantages, as the Finance Minister is proposing to do under this amended addition of the tariff. Yet when they come to deal with the farmers, the men who buy what the manufacturer produces and who pay the Ministers their salaries by the consumption of dutiable goods, no consideration at all is extended to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will drop the fertilisers if the hon. gentlemen will let us go on.

Mr. HESSON. I want to make an observation that I think is very opportune on this subject in which a great deal of feeling has been displayed by many a man who never cut down a tree, or cleared an acre, or put his hand to the plough.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to give the House a little information, and if the hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to have it put on record, it is their fault. But I will get it into the *Hansard*. After all the sympathy hon. gentlemen opposite have shown in this matter in behalf of the farmer, it appears that there is not one single ton of phosphate or fertilisers imported into Ontario, the little that has been imported having been brought into Nova Scotia. Fifty-three tons only were imported into the whole Dominion, of which the value was \$1,849, and the duty \$369. Now I have this good news for the friends of the farmers, that we have a surplus of the very best phosphate, and have exported during the past year no less than 25,974 tons of phosphates, valued at \$431,957. When we have a material so valuable as that which we can export, where is your sympathy for the farmer? Cannot he procure it here? I direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to another point that was debated here on Friday last, that salt, which is one of the best fertilisers, can be produced in this country for \$1.50 a ton—that is the coarse quality which is suited for the purposes of the farmers. Again, we have plaster of Paris manufactured in the country, upon which there is not a cent of duty. Immense quantities of that are being made in the country, and are being used by the farmers of the west on their clover fields and on their grain and corn fields; and my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) knows that as well

Mr. CASEY.

as I do, and if my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) were here he would be able to give the same information. So I think the sympathy of those hon. gentlemen is lost, seeing that the Government have not collected a cent of duty from the farmers on fertilisers, except in Nova Scotia, where they have collected the great sum of \$369. These facts are worth knowing, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite should have patience, and should have patriotism, and love of country and respect for themselves and for us, when we export such large quantities of valuable phosphates from this country, and when those phosphates are free to the farmers here, without a dollar of duty on them. The effect of the proposition of the Minister is that the farmers of Nova Scotia, if no change were made in the present tariff, would be left to pay about \$7 a ton duty instead of \$6 which he is now proposing. Instead of helping the farmer you are damaging the farmer by demanding that the Minister should change this proposition in order, if possible, to make a little party advantage or to say that you are the only friends of the farmer in this House. We have heard a great deal from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), and the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Claves), who perhaps never ploughed for a whole day in his life.

Mr. CASEY. I dropped the discussion of this matter because I thought it was going to drop on both sides.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought so too.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has made some statements that call for a word or two. The fact that we have imported no phosphates shows that the existing duty is a prohibitory duty. My hon. friend's objection to the tariff was that it would be equally prohibitory in regard to certain grades, and would not be fair, but I will not discuss the proposed change, as he has dropped it. The member for Perth has brought up the fact that a large quantity of phosphates are exported. That is a reason why we should not have any protection at all to the phosphate industry, because the article is so abundant, so cheap, and does not need any protection. He says it is overflowing, and running out of the country. Then why should we have a duty to keep foreign phosphates out? I have ground, on what the hon. member for Perth has stated, to ask the Finance Minister another thing, and I do ask him, to abolish the duty on fertilisers altogether; and I say that the farmers' case will not be met until the hon. gentleman does abolish a duty which is absolutely unnecessary in order to protect even the interests of the manufacturers of phosphates.

Maccaroni and vermicelli, 2 cents per lb. specific.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What tax does the Finance Minister expect from this in the shape of *ad valorem*? Is not 2 cents a pound almost 100 per cent.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These articles are, at present, among the unenumerated articles paying 20 per cent. The increase will be very slight. The new duty will be about 40 per cent., and, I suppose, may possibly give us \$1,000 increase. That is calculated on an average of five cents a pound.

Oranges and lemons, in boxes not exceeding 2½ cubic feet, 25 cents per box; in half boxes not exceeding 1¼ cubic feet, 13 cents per half box; in cases and all other packages, 10 cents per cubic foot; in bulk, \$1.60 per 1,000 oranges or lemons; in barrels not exceeding in capacity that of the 196 lb. flour barrel, 55 cents per barrel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of Finance whether these duties on oranges and lemons might not be abolished. They are really no protection to any industry in this country. They cannot be imposed for that purpose. They are of no consequence as matters of revenue,

and are of very considerable consequence as contributing to the health and comfort of the population. In fact they are coming more and more into use, and are becoming more and more necessities of life to the entire population; and it does seem to me that this is one matter about which we might agree, and the hon. the Minister of Finance might, without any detriment to the revenue, and without in any way impairing the policy upon which he has entered, repeal this tax. The hon. gentleman is himself a physician, and he knows how largely the general consumption of these fruits contributes to the general health of the population, and he might confer upon the people of the country generally an important service here, and do no damage or violence to the policy to which he and the Government are committed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I recognise the force of what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said, but I am afraid that I can hardly afford to give up the revenue upon that which is, after all, to a large extent, a luxury. There is no desire to increase the duty on this. This is done for the purpose of simplifying the tariff and making the administration of the Customs more equable and regular than it is under the present tariff. The change is not for the purpose of getting increased revenue, but the revenue derived from that source last year was \$70,388. I think, when I mention that to my hon. friend, he will feel that there are other sources of revenue that it would be desirable to strike off before that one which he has proposed. There is no doubt that there is great force in what he has said, but, at the same time, these fruits are largely consumed by persons who are very well able to pay for them. I am afraid I must adhere to this proposal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I fear the Finance Minister is slightly in error. I think the consumption of oranges is coming more and more into general use among the entire population, and whatever would contribute to cheapen them would be of general advantage to the community; and certainly with regard to lemons, the hon. gentleman knows how very beneficial they are to the health of the people.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason for making this change from the 20 per cent. duty to that which is now proposed—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not objecting to the form.

Mr. BOWELL. It is to meet the difficulties which present themselves in regard to the consignments, especially from the Mediterranean. A large trade is growing up between Montreal and the Mediterranean ports in these fruits. Only the other day two large cargoes were sold in Montreal at public auction, at which sale, I am informed, were parties from the western States and from a number of the large centres of the United States, to whom were sold the most of them. They are consigned to people in Montreal at \$3 and \$4 per box; and lemons of what they term the November crop, when purchased by a merchant and perhaps brought in the same vessel, are invoiced at \$9. Then the difficulty arises as to the actual value upon which the 20 per cent. should be collected. If you raise the value for duty upon the shipment, then we have to assume the highest price at which they are sold to the party who purchases and not to the consignee, and the result of that is constant difficulty and trouble with the importers. This is based upon what is supposed to be the average price. But I think it will realise a little larger revenue than we collected last year. As the Finance Minister says, we cannot afford to give up that revenue, it being virtually a revenue tax, and will produce about \$80,000, I have no doubt, next year, and probably more if this trade, to which I have referred, increases.

Mr. DAVIES. The House will see that the Minister of Customs has not answered the point made by my hon. friend

the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but he has defended, more or less successfully, the change made in the tariff. Formerly it was 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, now he has made it specific. I suppose he alone is capable of judging properly whether the change is beneficial or not. I have nothing to say against it, and do not understand the question sufficiently well to judge. I will assume the change is all right. The question I put to the Minister is this: Whether, in view of the fact that these kinds of fruit cannot now be properly classed as luxuries at all, but really are almost necessities to our present existence, whether it is not an unwise policy to levy a heavy tax upon them. No one knows better than the Minister himself how largely these fruits are consumed by invalids in hospitals and poor people everywhere, and I cannot conceive anything more calculated in the wrong direction than a tax on an article of this kind which now enters into consumption by almost every family. I do think it would be a great public boon if fruits of this kind could be cheapened, and the \$80,000 additional tax proposed to be levied upon these fruits could be shifted and the amount raised from some other articles. I think the Minister might well consider the suggestion, and I believe it would meet with the general approval of both sides of this House. It protects no industry in this country; fruit is not a luxury in the sense in which the word is generally used, and I think it would be a move in the right direction if the tax was taken off altogether.

Paper, tarred, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is not for the purpose of obtaining a revenue. The present duty is 25 per cent., and this is estimated to be the same.

Mr. WATSON. This is another article which is not a luxury at all, but is a necessity. I come from a Province where this material is used in the construction of buildings. Almost every building in the North-West is covered with tar paper, and I expected that the Government would take the duty off this article altogether. If the duty was taken off this article, along with some other materials used in building in the North-West, it would encourage people to go into that country and build more valuable houses at a less cost than they are paying now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no increase of duty.

Mr. WATSON. I know there is no increase, but there should have been a decrease. If the Government wishes to assist the manufacturers of tar paper, I suggest they take the duty off tar and leave to the manufacturers the natural advantages they now possess in manufacturing this paper, but do not compel the people in the North-West to pay even the first duty.

Axes, chopping axes, a specific duty of \$2 per doz., and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the duty now?

Mr. BOWELL. 30 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that so that it will read: "Axes of all kinds, adzes, hatchets and hammers not elsewhere specified, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*." This is an increase of five per cent. over the present duty. There is no specific duty.

Mr. CASEY. I think the absence of this specific duty takes away a great part of the objection to this, but it is a direct tax upon industry in all respects.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have increased the cost of the iron.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman think he can get this five per cent. on something else?

Mr. DAVIES. Under what acts do axes come in the Customs Act?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is item 406 in the old tariff. Axes of all kinds are there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Finance Minister bases this upon the assumption that he has increased the tax upon the raw material, that is, on the iron and steel?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, then, we are to understand that the hon. gentleman persists in that increased tax on iron and steel?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to carry the resolutions now before the House if I can.

Broad and ship axes, adzes, and hammers weighing 10 pounds and over, a specific duty of \$3 per dozen, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that item so as to read—

Picks, mattocks, blacksmith's hammers, sledges, track tools, wedges and crowbars of iron or steel, \$1 per dozen, and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why does not the hon. gentleman propose an *ad valorem* duty alone? What is the reason he makes it a specific as well as an *ad valorem* duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This will be equal to about 35 per cent. on tools worth 10 cents per pound.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not place the duty at 35 per cent., which will simplify the matter very much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have had a good deal of difficulty in getting this classification into such a shape as to meet the case all round, and this is the best I can do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Although the hon. gentleman has become enlightened, we are left in the dark. It is very desirable he should present to our minds the information which satisfies him that this mode is the most convenient one of taxing these particular articles. It would appear at first blush to be a very convenient way to impose a specific as well as an *ad valorem* duty, where it can possibly be avoided.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The tendency is all the other way. It prevents under-valuation, and affords a better protection to labor.

Mr. MALLORY. I cannot see how it is going to affect under-valuation. The valuation has to take place in order that a duty shall be collected in the first place, and the simple addition of an extra duty of so much per pound cannot affect the valuation of the article. If the hon. gentleman can explain how the addition of one cent per pound can have any effect on the valuation, I should like to hear it. A proper valuation has taken place on an article for the purposes of duty in any case.

Axles and springs, one cent per pound, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change resolution 61 to read as follows:

Axles and springs of iron or steel, or steel parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks or forgings for carriages, other than railway and tramway vehicles, without regard to stage of manufacture, one cent per pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

The old duty was 25 per cent.; the new duty is equal to 35 per cent. on the value, at 14 cents per pound. I have incorporated in this section part of 98.

Mr. CHARLTON. The specific duty of one cent per pound will amount to more than the *ad valorem* duty of five cents. The cost of the article will not be 14 cents, but nearer to 10 cents, making the duty about 40 per cent.

Hoes, garden rakes, &c., five cents each and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change No. 62 to read as follows:

Mr. CASEY.

Hoes, garden rakes, two and three prong forks of all kinds, five cents each and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

The old duty was 35 per cent.; the new duty is equal to 35 per cent. on a value of \$6 per dozen.

Mr. CHARLTON. Here is another illustration of the unequal manner in which a specific duty works. This specific duty of five cents may amount to 100 per cent. on a low grade of garden rakes—they are imported at about 60 cents per dozen—beside the *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. CASEY. The duty proposed will be equal to 75 per cent. on the average, as I am informed by a large wholesale dealer in London. I find by my personal experience in the use of the articles, and by the universal testimony of all wholesale hardware men dealing in Canadian and American goods, that the effect of the high duty has been not so much to put up the price as to reduce the quality. Our manufacturers have found themselves compelled to sell at somewhere about the same prices that formerly prevailed. But they have reduced the quality, so that now Canadian spades, shovels, rakes, hoes, or other implements are not nearly so good as the American article of the same class. Any wholesale dealer will express similar opinions, except before elections. The change from *ad valorem* to specific will increase this tendency, and as the manufacturers are bound to get a profit somewhere, and as they do not want to raise the price, they will reduce the quality still further; and while ten or fifteen years ago Canadian manufactured articles were almost as good as American and in some cases better, now they are very remarkably worse.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CASEY. I say that they are worse than American tools of the same sort. That feature of the case will grow worse by the change which the hon. gentleman has made. I protest—though of course it will be an unavailing protest—in the name of my own class, in the name of those who principally use these articles, that is the agricultural class—I protest in their name against such a state of things. They are not permitted to buy good tools for agricultural purposes at former prices. They are compelled for the benefit of a very few establishments—three or four, I think, altogether—to use inferior implements at slightly higher prices than before—not so much higher, because, as I said before, the change is in the quality rather than in the price.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Competition in the country will always keep these prices down. The hon. gentleman has already said so.

Mr. CASEY. It keeps down the quality.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that the fact of that competition will raise the quality. The very fact that there is this great competition in relation to an article, will always put the price down and improve the quality, because the maker knows that if he makes an article of a better description than any other maker, at the same price, he will get the sale. Besides, this is one of the articles in which the competition from prison labor comes into this country, and for that reason it is not desirable to place it at too low a rate. I am certain that there will be no difficulty so far as these articles are concerned.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman talks theory, but I talk the facts. I know as a matter of fact that, while the competition has kept down the prices to a considerable extent, it has depreciated the quality, just because it is not free, open, healthy competition, but competition within a ring fence, so to speak. They cannot afford to make as good an article as before the National Policy was introduced, because the price of the raw material has increased. It is to be increased again, and that will still further depre-

ciate the quality of the metal they put into these agricultural tools, in order to get even with the increased cost of the raw material. As for the prison labor argument, it is played out; it will not work any more, because the law prohibits the importation of prison made articles.

Mr. TAYLOR. How are you going to keep out prison made goods?

Mr. CASEY. It is not for me to explain how. That is the duty of the Government. They passed the Act, and it is for them to find out how to enforce the law. I think the Minister of Customs is capable of enforcing it, and that he will see the importance of enforcing it. The mere fact that we have had to increase, even to this extent, the duty on this article, after increasing the duty on the raw material, should show everybody how in every case the payment of the duty ultimately comes down upon the consumer of the manufactured article. You cannot give a protection to the manufacture of pig iron, without increasing the cost of raw material to the manufacturer of every hoe, rake, and shovel that is made in the country, and without, therefore, increasing the cost or depreciating the quality of every one of these articles to the consumer. You cannot tax any single article of raw material imported into the country without filtering that tax down to the final consumer.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to ask the Minister of Finance what he supposes the duty will be on a pitchfork. I have figured it up in a rough way, and I fancy the duty on a fork, or a shovel, will amount to something like from 34 to 40 cents.

Mr. MITCHELL. How many prongs.

Mr. WELSH. Two or three, whichever you like, and a rake at the back of it. I want that point explained.

Mr. CLAYES. I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that the effect of the duty is to produce poorer goods, because the quality of the goods has been very materially improved. Though there are nominally three concerns which manufacture these goods, there are really only two, and they have been united and are practically in the hands of the same men. They are protected to the extent of 35 per cent. and yet with all the cunning they can put forth, even with this protection the Americans send these goods into the country, and sell them after paying the duty. They make their profit on the other side, and the wholesale men make theirs here, and yet they compete with us successfully. That is an illustration of the result of attempting to force the production of an article in a country which is not adapted to producing these things at a profit. The reason is this: Take forks, for instance; there is a special skill required to make forks of two, three or six tines; you will find a man devoting himself to two-tined forks alone. After a time he becomes so skilful that he can do the work for half what he could before, and after a time the work becomes automatic and requires the exercise of no mind whatever. Hence the production of these articles at very low prices.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman therefore advise us to abandon the manufacture of hoes, forks and articles of that class, and depend entirely for them upon another country?

Mr. CLAYES. The reply to that is, that after encouraging men to put money into these industries, it would be unfair and unjust to ruin them. It is only by degrees that we can get rid of the system, and that really illustrates the position of Mr. Blake upon this question. He recognised the necessity of accepting that which we cannot justly avoid. But at the same time it would have been infinitely better for us if, under a free trade system, we could have allowed

the farmers of this country to buy those goods where they can buy them cheapest. We should always remember that, by buying in that way, by exchanging the products of our labor for the products of foreign labor, these articles would be as much the production of the labor of this country as if they were actually produced here, and that it is better to do so, especially if we are cunning enough to make something by the operation. And we intend by the exchange to make something. Hence it is that free trade everywhere has brought prosperity to the people who have adopted it.

Shovels and spades, \$1 per doz. specific, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change this item by substituting "shovels and spades, and shovel and spade blanks, \$1 per doz. and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*." The shovel blanks are cut to shape, and these shapes require only to be struck in a die to be completed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these shovel blanks found in some other parts of the tariff, or are they an addition?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are an addition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman in this item is retaining a form of specific taxation which he has abandoned elsewhere. He taxes by weight elsewhere, while here he taxes by number.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You could not very well tax shovels by weight.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As well as hammers and axes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. What would the specific duty of \$1 a dozen on shovel and spade blanks cut to shape amount to?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty is now 35 per cent., and this will be a small increase.

Mr. CHARLTON. I imagine that steel shovel and spade blanks would not cost over \$2.50 or \$3 a dozen, so that this duty would probably amount to 70 per cent. on that class of goods. The price of steel is very low, so that the steel cut into shape for shovels would not perhaps be more than one-third of the cost of the finished article with the handle.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This duty amounts to about 35 per cent. on the value of \$6.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman can give us the weight, perhaps we can judge of the amount of the taxation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From four to eight pounds. They differ pretty much in weight.

Mr. CHARLTON. In the majority of cases I should say the weight would not be more than three pounds.

Mr. MITCHELL. The fact is that with regard to this tariff we are all in a fog. We really do not know what we are doing. This double system of a specific duty by weight and by number, and an *ad valorem* duty in addition, is just leaving this House at the mercy of the Treasury benches. They can put what taxes they like on the people and I protest against it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say my hon. friend is a little unfair. We have endeavored to make the calculation with the greatest care, and we give it to the House; and I say that according to this calculation, based on the best information we can get, we do not consider that in all of these items we are adding materially to the tariff. We have given all the information we can, and I am extremely sorry it is not more appreciated.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says he is giving all the information he can. Almost every time he has given information, some gentleman conversant with the trade gets up and gives different information. For my part, if the

Government are determined to vote whatever taxes they choose, I think their proper course was, in submitting this scheme, to come down with a separate column showing the difference of the two systems, what the duty was under the present tariff, and what it would amount to under this double-barrelled tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have done that in every case.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot see it. You have given us verbal explanations, and we are bound to pass these items in the dark. We are increasing the duties on the people to whom we must hold ourselves responsible, and we are unable to explain them.

Mr. JONES. Is the increase greater than the increase on iron?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is not any greater. It is on the same basis, except with regard to agricultural implements, on which we keep the duty below, not above.

Mr. JONES. As a matter of course, having increased the duty on iron, you are now increasing it on articles manufactured from iron in the same proportion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to point out to the Finance Minister an inequality that exists in this duty. A specific duty of \$1 a dozen is placed on shovels and spades that are completed, and the same duty is placed on shovel and spade blanks, which are essentially raw material, which will be imported into the country by manufacturers to be finished. A shovel or spade blank cannot amount to one-half of the value of the shovel or spade, and yet the specific duty is the same in each case. It is a discrimination against the manufacturer who wishes to make shovels.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be corrected by the *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that shovels and spades are made largely in the town where I reside, as well as in many other towns in Canada, and I have here specimens of two shovel blanks that have been manufactured in a foreign country and imported into this country. All they require to be completed are the handles. I may say that these goods are selling to-day at five per cent. less than they were six or eight years ago.

Mr. JONES. Iron is cheaper; that is no argument.

Mr. TAYLOR. These are not iron, they are steel. Nevertheless, that is the fact, that the farmers of this country are getting these goods to-day at a less price than they did previously, owing to the National Policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I was surprised to hear the hon. member for West Elgin state that the goods manufactured in Canada were not as good as those manufactured in the United States. The great trouble in the shovel industry in this country is the importation of prison made goods. These goods are made in the prisons of the United States and sold to the hardware trade in the United States. These hardware men, by some way of their own, get a certificate saying no part of the goods were made in the prisons, and our Customs officers are bound to accept those certificates. Notwithstanding such declaration, I believe, from the best information I can get, that these goods are produced in the United States prisons. There is no mark on the goods, so that unless you can get admission into the prisons and follow the goods up to the hardware merchants, you cannot tell that they are penitentiary goods.

Mr. MITCHELL. Better do that than put on a duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. The farmers are not suffering, and the question is whether we are going to allow the labor of Canada to produce these goods or the prisons of the United

Mr. MITCHELL.

States. We can only do the former by putting on a duty that will keep the trade to our own manufactures.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman tells us we can get these articles cheaper to-day than we could ten or twelve years ago. He is simply insulting the intelligence of the House in so arguing, because he keeps back the important information that the material from which these articles are manufactured was never so cheap as it is to-day. Why increase the duty, if the price is not to be raised? The Minister of Finance will admit that if the duty, which is to be 35 per cent., be taken off, the goods would be so much cheaper, every five per cent. he puts on makes the goods so much dearer to the people. I can see no use, therefore, in arguing about every article, for we must accept as the principle of the tariff, that it is intended to make the goods dearer to the purchaser.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. JONES. Hon. gentlemen say "no". They must have a very indistinct appreciation of the effects of the tariff on the price of an article, if they maintain that the price is not affected by the duty imposed. If it be not affected, then take the duty off. I say, therefore, that instead of discussing these various items, we might just take the general principle that what the Government are aiming at is to get \$500,000 more to waste, as they have wasted the revenues of last year. The Government took \$500,000 out of us last year by a change in the sugar duties, and they are now proposing to take another \$500,000 from us to-day by changes which will make the articles affected dearer to the extent of those changes. Hon. gentlemen must see that is the principle the Government are aiming at, and therefore all the articles affected are intended to be made dearer to the farmers who have to buy them.

Mr. BOWELL. Has the hon. gentleman made a calculation to show whether the prices to-day are relatively dearer, considering the price of steel in 1879, when the tariff was put on? Unless he can show that, his argument is useless. The hon. gentleman referred also to the sugar duties and to the fact that we collected more revenue this year than we did last year under the system which now prevails. I take it the statement made by the hon. gentleman with reference to sugar is quite correct, but he must bear in mind the tariff was made in the interest of the city he represents, and not only at the instigation but at the earnest solicitations of those interested in that particular industry, and in the West India trade. If you will take the prices of sugar, taking that as an argument, with the other—I have not made the other calculations and consequently do not speak positively on that point, but taking the relative value of raw sugar in 1869 under the old tariff and the value of it to-day, and the prices at which it is sold, the consumer to-day pays less relatively than he did in 1869 under the old tariff. I have made the calculation, and am positive that what I say is correct.

Mr. JONES. I think it rests with the Government to prove that these articles are relatively cheaper as compared with the raw material than they were at the time to which the Minister of Finance refers. That is the proof the Minister of Finance should give the House before asking us to adopt the change which is very important, and will bear heavily on the farmers and people generally. With reference to the sugar tariff, the hon. gentleman said that was made in the interest of the trade of Halifax and the West India Trade. I admit frankly we recommended that change but not on the basis which the Government adopted. We only recommended the principle, and, of course, we did not go to the Government to recommend the basis on which that duty was to be fixed. We pointed out that the mode of collecting duties on sugar was unsatisfactory; we knew there were irregularities going on in certain ports of the Dominion,

and I was one of those who urged the importance of changing the principle upon which the duties were levied, but, the hon. gentleman will admit that the principles they adopted in fixing the minimum at which the polariscope test was to be applied, made the duty on sugar 30 cents per 100 pounds more than it was under the old tariff. This duty of 30 cents on our consumption last year of 200,000,000 pounds made \$600,000 which the Government took out of the consumers last year more than they would have had the change not been made. If the Government were to reduce the tariff on sugar to-day, the sugar would be that much cheaper. Go to England where there is no duty, and you will buy a very good article at retail for a penny or a penny-halfpenny per pound. The same principle applies to sugar that applies to other things, the more you advance the tariff the more you increase the price. That is the principle we should recognise in discussing the tariff, instead of going into all the details. I am disposed to let them take the whole tariff and deal with it as they like, only I protest against the principle these hon. gentlemen recommend for our adoption. I protest against it in the interests of our consumers. It is intended to foster and protect every little industry throughout the country. I know that in the Maritime Provinces, whenever an article was imported that was found to interfere with some small manufactory in Ontario or in the west, up went the duty, by an Order in Council very generally.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman says "No." I can tell him that tar paper was introduced for some time at five per cent. *ad valorem*, but it was found to interfere with some paper manufacturers in Ontario, and by Order in Council they put the duty up to 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. JONES. Well, it amounted to the same thing. It may have been by a different classification. People in Halifax asked what was the duty on tickets which they had printed for steamboats and railroads. They sent to England for them, and brought them out. They were told the duty was 30 per cent., but when they brought them out the duty was 110 per cent. And why? Because, before that, they had come to be printed at the office of the *Montreal Gazette*, and that had to be protected. So with regard to everyone of these items, the moment they are found to interfere with some vested right or something which is supposed to be a vested right in Ontario, or is in some part here in the west, up comes a new regulation from the Customs Department, either an Order in Council or a new classification, I do not know which, and the whole basis of the duty is changed. I contend that my statement is sound, that these gentlemen, in changing the tariff now, are carrying out a principle which is going to take more money out of the consumers of the country in order to benefit the manufacturers; and the higher they put the duty up, barring all the smuggling that may take place, the more the people will have to pay and the more money will go into the pockets of the manufacturers.

Mr. ELLIS. With reference to the duty on sugar, I may say that in the last week of April the selling price of wheat in Montreal was 92 cents to 94 cents per bushel. On the same date, the price in London was 7s. 2d. per 100 pounds, equal to \$1.03 for the bushel of 60 pounds. The actual value in Montreal and in London would be about the same, and you may allow 10 cents for the freight. Suppose the farmer wanted to exchange his wheat for granulated sugar. That article was quoted at 15s. to 16s. per 100 pounds in England, equal to 3½ cents a pound, while the wholesale price in the Montreal market at the same date was, according to the *Montreal Trade Review*, 6½ cents to 6¾ cents, but I will put

it at six cents. The seller could, therefore, exchange his wheat in London for 260 pounds of granulated sugar, while all he could exchange it for in Montreal was 155 pounds. It is urged by hon. gentlemen on the other side that things are as cheap or cheaper now than they were. I believe the real explanation of the fact that goods are cheaper, is that the price of gold is higher. The price of gold has risen all over the world, and where it affects the workingman and the laborer is that he has to give more time to earn the gold than he had before, so that the burden falls upon the workingman in the end. He is no better off than he was, and the addition of the duties makes him so much the worse off. I have said nothing in regard to the duties on axes and these other articles, but certainly the Minister has added to the taxation of almost every tool used in the Province of New Brunswick in the production of our staple articles of trade.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is about time we heard the last of the importation of prison labor from the United States being the cause of all these advances, or that we had an admission from the Minister of Customs, when he took the glory to himself amid the applause of his followers, which we can almost hear now, when he took the credit and they gave him the credit for having excluded the result of that labor by Act of Parliament—either he must abandon that as an argument, or he must candidly confess that he has put a clause on the Statute-book, for which he took the greatest amount of credit, which has been a perfect dead letter, which he has not carried out, which he has been unable to carry out. That prohibitory clause is on the Statute-book to-day. They claimed credit for that. They take great credit for that, they claim great credit for that from the workingmen of the country for doing so. To-day we are told by a great many members that it is a dead letter, that it has accomplished nothing of what was expected, but that it has greatly enhanced the tax upon imports. A word or two with reference to the price of sugar. I understood the hon. gentleman stated that it was relatively cheaper than it was under the Cartwright tariff. If he only said that, he did not go the length of his colleagues. Before the last election, the hon. Minister of Justice stated that they had saved to the farmers of this country three and a half millions in the tax on tea, coffee and sugar, and the Minister of the Interior at Hamilton is reported to have said that we are getting our sugar a cent a pound cheaper than under the Cartwright tariff. Sir, we see these statements made by men occupying positions of trust and of honor, gentlemen going through the country with the avowed purpose of enlightening the electors, of stating to them what are the facts. Sometimes we wonder how it is that there are a great many people who believe what the hon. gentlemen tell them, and therefore I say it is the bounden duty of the hon. gentlemen, as honest and honorable men, when they have an audience looking up to them and believing implicitly in their words, that they should tell them the truth when they are discussing this question. Now, let us see what are the facts of the case in reference to this sugar duty. It is not a question of veracity as between myself and the Minister of Customs. It is simply an experiment that every independent member of this House can apply for himself. Go to the *New York Herald* for quotations of granulated sugar, and from that go to the *Montreal Journal of Commerce* and take the Montreal quotations. Do not ask the Minister of Customs for it; do not ask the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); ascertain for yourselves, and what will you find? You will find that what I did, that at the very time these gentlemen were telling that story, the papers declared that granulated sugar was \$6 per 100 pounds in Montreal. There is a discount of 2½ per cent. off for cash, net price in Montreal \$5.85 per 100 pounds, and at the same time the price in New York was \$5.75 per

100 pounds. Take off a drawback of \$2.82 and you have the net price \$2.93 per 100 pounds. How was it under the Cartwright tariff? That would be 25 per cent. and one cent per pound, or \$1.73 for revenue, add that to the net price in New York and your granulated sugar will cost you under the Cartwright tariff \$4.66, or \$1.19 less per 100 pounds than Montreal sugar. Now, I say the fact that the people believe these hon. gentlemen on the platform, ought to induce them to try at any rate to state something near what the actual facts in the case are. It is the simplest thing in the world to ascertain the price of granulated sugar in New York; it is the simplest thing to ascertain that there is \$2.82 of a drawback, and deduct that per 100 pounds from the long price in New York, and having found the net price in New York, it is the simplest thing to add the cent a pound specific duty and the 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Any man can do that for himself. I pointed out to you that not only in this, but in many other instances I mentioned, these gentlemen were going through the country, explaining their policy and asking for a renewal of the confidence of the people, and obtaining that renewal of confidence, upon statements that will not bear discussion for a moment. I say here is a position in which they ought not to pride themselves. That is a result of the sugar business. How is it with many of their other duties? As the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said, you are putting other changes in the tariff that will derange almost the whole current of trade in this country. You are doing that without the proper information that we ought to have. The Minister of Customs himself, with the knowledge he must have of this question, is only able to afford us the most meagre intelligence, and even that some of us have found to be inaccurate. So you are going on, adding to the volume of the taxation. Sir, there is this trouble I find in reference to this matter. I think before we get through with the manufactures of iron, the Finance Minister ought to give us an exhaustive statement upon that point. He did make an inflated balloon and sent it up into illimitable heights, and surveyed charcoal pits, blast furnaces and fields of iron all over the country. It was very pleasant to listen to him, but when he came down to the region of solid sense, I want him to tell us whether he expected that with the increase of duties he has placed upon the raw material, he will be able to supply the hundreds, if not thousands, of factories in this Dominion; and how soon there will be a supply of iron to meet the demand required by these different manufacturers. Then I would like him to give information with reference to the additional cost that will be thrown upon the different manufacturers that are engaged in all the different iron industries in this country, and they are very many. I think this information we ought to have; we ought to have it before we can enter upon a discussion of these iron items, and give them that consideration they ought to have. I think it is only a reasonable proposition. I have been told by those who think they know, that with the excessive duty he is placing upon the iron, it will almost ruin some parties in this country; as violent and sudden tariff changes will. A lack of permanence in the tariff, is one of the most disastrous things that can come upon a country. I have been told by some of these gentlemen that they question if, under this very excess of protection, he will be able to bring into existence what is required of raw material for the needs of this country. What are the benefits we are to get from this, and when are we to get them? What are the burdens to be imposed upon the people? How long are they to last? How long shall we go until we get relief from that home competition which he has promised to give us? At the present time there is only one industry in existence in this country, if I am rightly informed, and I do not know whether that is running or not. But over

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant).

and above all that is this fact, which is stated to me by gentlemen engaged in the trade, that the ore that has been produced in Canada hitherto cannot be used alone, but it must be mixed with iron brought from other countries. There comes in another phase to the question. Then we come to agricultural implements which he leaves at 35 per cent., a new tax that we put on because these gentlemen urged it was necessary for the protection of men engaged in that industry. Well, if it was necessary before I suppose it is necessary now, but when you increase the duty on their raw material, its effect, so far as the manufacture is concerned, is to take away from him the advantage that he had before, but he makes no more profit than before. He must either cut the price of labor or he must cut his profits in some way, and if he does not do that, if he is only living now, and getting a fair thing, as the Minister of Finance and other gentlemen are bound to believe, it follows the Government are doing an unjust thing when they come and take off the only advantage he has, and the result of the whole is that the consumer must pay more for his goods. It is believed by many that 35 per cent. on agricultural implements is a very heavy tax on the farming community at this time. It is a very complicated question, and I think these radical changes that are being initiated by the Minister, in reference to the iron industry, will bring up the whole subject of this tariff, and lead many men to think upon it in all its phases, who have, perhaps, not given it as much attention as they ought to have done. I think that in order to discuss intelligently these different iron items, we should have the information that I have asked for in reference to the points I have stated.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that ores are all free.

Mr. BROWN. I may be allowed to occupy the time of the House for a few moments in reply to the hon. gentleman's remark on the question of sugar. I have before me, a prediction which was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when the country adopted the National Policy in 1879, which I will read:

"You have excluded the best sugars of every class, whether raw or refined. You have made special provision for refining here inferior yellow sugars. You have specially provided that your people shall have an inferior article at a high rate, and you have provided for dividends of 10 per cent. a month upon capital invested in the business. Redpath's refinery at Montreal will, if put in operation, refine 60,000,000 pounds a year. Its capacity may be easily doubled. With your limited market you provide for a monopoly."

The hon. gentleman then predicted, first and foremost, that the tariff was providing and preparing the way for the refining of inferior sugar and offering to the people an inferior article, that that was to be the result of the tariff then proposed and carried through Parliament; and, further that the result would be a monopoly, and that we would be all at the mercy of this one refinery, giving us a poor sugar and charging a high price for it. I am prepared to stand here and challenge the disputation of the assertion which I make that, not only is the prediction there made unfulfilled, but the very opposite is the case, and we have to-day the best and the purest sugar offered to the people of Canada that is produced in the world; and more than that, there is no monopoly. The tariff passed by Parliament in 1879 produced the effect which we as protectionists claimed would be the effect, always of creating competition. Instead of one refinery, we have now five refineries in the country, and, taking the duty which is paid on the raw material off the price which the consumer gets the sugar for, I assert that there is no country in the world that gets sugar as cheaply as the people of Canada. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had the courage to assert their convictions, they would say so, and, if they are ignorant of it, their wives are not ignorant of it; those who take charge of the household affairs know that they can buy their sugar

cheaper than they ever did before and can get better quality. When the hon. member for Bothwell made his wonderful prediction that this country would be flooded with inferior sugar as the result of the tariff, I ask hon. gentlemen what they think of the predictions of some hon. gentlemen to-night, when they are predicting all sorts of calamities, if they are weighed in the same balance as the predictions which were made in 1879. The same statement was made in regard to cotton. It was stated then that the people were to be taxed the 28 per cent. which was placed upon cotton. What is the position of matters to-day? Is it not a fact that, in consequence of the competition created by the tariff, you can get cotton a great deal cheaper than ever before, and yet they said the people were to be taxed 28 per cent. At the time this statement was made, while not a member of the House I read the proceedings of the House. When the statement was made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the folly of the Government in taking the course they did with regard to sugar, and it was also alleged that, not only would there be this high price to the consumer, but the Government would get no revenue. I think that I am safe in saying that to-day not only are the people supplied with a good wholesome cheap sugar, but, taking the duties which are collected on sugar, notwithstanding the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite that no revenue would be collected and things would come to a general smash up and collapse, we are collecting more revenue than at the time the tariff was passed, and are employing the labor of our own people. We are giving labor to our own people. What was our position in relation to sugar at the time the tariff was passed; what was the position of Canada in regard to getting the article from the direct market? At the time we passed the National Policy we were receiving only 6 per cent. of our raw sugar from the market of its production, and now we receive 89 per cent. This means saving all the profits of the middlemen. If there is one thing more than any other for which the Government deserve the gratitude of the people, it is for their policy in respect to sugar. Hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as I can tell them that the people who are the best judges of this question, because they are the consumers, and they know the difference in the cost between days gone-by and the present time, hold this opinion, and I think the best evidence of this is that the predictions in which hon. gentlemen opposite indulged in 1879 proved false. If I had time to read those predictions they would show that they declared that the present Conservative party would receive their reward. They went to the polls. The people rewarded them by sending them back here. Hon. gentlemen opposite again declared that this very heavy tariff taxation would seal their doom, that it had signed their death warrant; according to one hon. gentleman opposite they were going, like Nebuchadnezzar, to eat grass like an ox because of their sins and iniquities. But these hon. gentlemen are here still, and they are not eating grass like an ox; but to all appearances, so deep a root have they taken in the hearts of the people, they will remain in power for long years to come.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman says that the party of the Government, after having inaugurated the National Policy with respect to cotton and sugar, went to the country and were triumphantly sustained. They were sustained, undoubtedly, but they were sustained by such misrepresentations as the hon. gentleman made here to-night. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came to Halifax and held a meeting there, he, speaking with all the influence and position of a Minister of the Crown, declared the net public debt of Canada the day he spoke was \$196,000,000. No later than last week or the week before last, in reply to an enquiry made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the Government were obliged to

admit that on that date the net debt was \$225,000,000, just \$29,000,000 more than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated to the people of Halifax during the elections. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has spoken with reference to sugar. There were never more misrepresentations on any public question than have been made with reference to the position of sugar. That sugar is cheaper to-day no one denies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. Why, yes. That cotton is cheaper to-day, no one denies. That, unfortunately, wheat and barley are cheaper to-day no one denies. I do not hear hon. gentlemen cheering that sentiment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. Yes. But when the hon. gentleman says that sugar is cheaper to-day, he forgets to state to the House, as he should have stated if he wished to be true and honest with it, that the price of raw sugar to-day as compared with the time to which he has referred is just 50 per cent. cheaper. It was £20 per ton at that time and to-day it is about £10, a great deal of it is less, some being as low as £8 and £9. And therefore it would be only natural under any circumstances that sugar should be cheaper. It would have been much cheaper still if the Cartwright tariff were in operation; it would have been much less again if there had been no duty whatever. Hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that if they reduce the duty on sugar we would have it that much proportionately cheaper to-day, and that applies not only to sugar and cotton but to every article in the tariff which is naturally affected by the duties placed upon it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown) has said my hon. friend was in error in regard to his statement as to the prices of sugar in New York and Montreal. My hon. friend is quite correct. From what I know, and I am interested in sugar as much and probably more than any hon. gentleman in this House, and I am bound in my position as a representative to state the facts of this case, the facts are these: that during the whole time covered by the remarks of my hon. friend, granulated sugar could have been imported from New York at \$4.75 per 100 lbs, while it was selling at Halifax and Montreal at from 5½ cents up to 6½ cents per lb. The hon. gentleman has only to refer to the *New York Journal of Commerce*, or to the *New York Herald*, where he will find granulated sugar quoted in bond less duty, and he has only to add the duty under the Mackenzie tariff to ascertain the facts of the case. That is the position in which the sugar question stands to-day. If hon. gentlemen opposite will only start on honest grounds, and admit, as they should admit when addressing an argument to this House, that the raw material is just half that it was at the time to which he referred, the whole force of his argument falls to the ground. With respect to the duty on iron which the Minister of Finance proposes to increase, I would like to ask him just one question: Does he remember that in all this tariff he is placing on the fishermen and the shipping interests of the Maritime Provinces increased burdens? Does he remember that every vessel, that every banker, every fisherman's boat that is fitted out by a fisherman for the pursuit of his industry, uses a large quantity of iron in construction. The hon. gentleman has given as his estimate that 264 pounds of iron is, *pro rata*, used throughout the Dominion, and he must remember that the use of iron for the construction of ships falls very heavily, indeed all, on all those engaged in that industry.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as that is concerned, the Government has met the question of allowing everything that enters into a ship to be free by arranging for a drawback per ton, estimated on the amount of duties paid on articles going into the ship; and the same principle will be applied here. Whatever increased duty is involved in the

construction of ships will be estimated in the same way as duties under the present tariff are.

Mr. JONES. The Minister of Finance will remember that the arrangement to which he refers only applies to large ships; it never applied to any of the smaller ships engaged in the West Indian or the fishing trade. There was never a drawback of one cent allowed for iron entering into the construction of any small vessel in Nova Scotia. If the Postmaster General built a large ship he got his drawback on the iron going into its construction; but if I or any other man interested in the West Indian trade or the shipping business, built a vessel for such trade, we would not get one cent of drawback.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It applies to all registered vessels.

Mr. JONES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will find on reference to it, that he is laboring under an erroneous impression. I am not surprised at this duty on iron being increased. I remember that during the late elections the hon. Postmaster General, in his election campaign, and particularly at the little village of Londonderry, where those mines are situated, told the people—nearly half the houses in this place are closed: if the Government are defeated every house here will be closed, and the mines shut up; but if the Government are sustained, I know a company who will immediately reorganise the Acadia works, and go on and extend them to a greater extent than before. The moment the hon. Finance Minister brought down his tariff, with an increased duty on iron, my colleague from Halifax, in pursuance of an arrangement which of course had been made before, introduced a Bill to reorganise the Londonderry iron works. Now there is a company which began work before Confederation, a company that up to the time of the Mackenzie Government were in power worked successfully, a company that only got into trouble under the National Policy, a company that has been fostered by carrying coal to Londonderry, a distance of sixty miles, for 25 cents per ton, a company which has a bonus of \$1.50 on their production, and now they come down and ask for an additional protection of \$2 a ton. But, with all this, I am very much afraid that the Londonderry mines will be in the future, what they have been in the past, unsuccessful. I regret it very much; it is no source of gratification to me; on the contrary, I should like to see a large enterprise like that, in which so much money has been invested, succeed. But I have no hopes that, under the arrangement now proposed, they will be successful. And the hon. gentleman will see how unfairly this increased duty on iron will fall on the small vessels and the fishing interests of Nova Scotia; and in addition to that, he is going, by this tariff, to increase every article which enters into their daily use or consumption. I think the hon. gentleman has not kept that properly in view, because he must remember that these fishermen can only follow their natural pursuits by constructing these vessels. These vessels require a large quantity of iron to make them, making them so much more expensive, and they will be made all the more expensive by the tariff which the hon. gentleman proposes to-night. In addition to that, everything they require in the daily pursuit of their calling, is rendered just that much dearer to them. I think the hon. gentleman is doing a great injustice to his native Province, and that he does not fully realise the character of the changes he proposes.

Mr. McKEEN. The iron question has been so ably and exhaustively discussed by the hon. the Finance Minister, in his comprehensive budget scheme, that perhaps any remarks from me, or from any one, on this subject might appear unnecessary. But, Sir, representing as I do a county in which these industries are largely developed, in which we have large coal and iron deposits, when a measure of this nature

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

is brought before the House, I would fail in my duty to my constituents did I not raise my voice in advocacy of any measure having for its object the benefit of their interests. I may say, Sir, that I represent a county that has supported the National Policy from its first inception, a county which has believed in that policy. The electorate of that county have always believed that the principles of the National Policy had for their object the development of all those industries which tend to the advancement of any country, industries such as iron and coal for instance. And, Sir, believing this they have always upheld that policy, and judging from the result of the unequal contest in which we have lately been engaged, when five Conservatives were opposed to two Liberals, and when two Ministerialists were triumphantly returned, you may see that the Conservatives of that county have not lost their belief in the National Policy. I may say, further, that we may justly lay claim to the high distinction of being the banner National Policy county in the Dominion. Our attention was drawn the other night to those countries which have adopted protection, and the rapid advancement that has been made in the iron industries of such countries as France, Belgium and Germany, as well as the United States. We were shown more fully than I have the time or ability to mention to-night, the immense progress that was made in the United States in the development of this trade; but I will venture, without wishing to tire the House, to draw attention to what has been done in that country since the adoption of the duty on iron in 1861. When that tariff was imposed an immense forward impulse was given to the trade. The total pig iron production in that year was 731,444 tons. But in the short space of three years, that is in 1864, the production went up to 1,135,996 tons. In the next four years, that is up to 1868, the production reached 1,603,000 tons; and in 1872 it had attained the enormous output of 2,854,558 tons. In the next four years, up to 1873, and from that to 1876 inclusive, the yearly average production was 2,500,000 tons. Without, however, wearying the House with too long an array of figures, let us come down at once to 1885 and 1886, and we find the same marvellous increase of production going on. In 1881 the product was 4,295,414 tons. In 1885 the pig iron product of the United States reached 4,529,869 tons; and in 1886 the production reached the enormous output of 5,581,246 tons. Now these figures show in one year an increase of 38 per cent. from 1885 to 1886. The value of iron and steel exports of the United States in 1881 was \$15,000,000, exclusive of locomotives and engines, against the small amount of \$5,366,279 in 1875, six years previously. In 1874 the number of blast furnaces in operation in that country was 735, with a producing capacity of 4,500,000 tons per annum. In 1875 we find that the number of these furnaces had largely increased. These were divided as follows, according to the fuel used:—Using anthracite, 229 furnaces; charcoal, 322; bituminous coal and coke, 184; total, 735. In treating of this subject in his history of the "Industries of the United States," Bowles says:

"A fresh development was given to the blast furnace business by the war, and the tariff of 1861."

In looking over this record of the enormous development of the iron industry of the United States, I do not suppose anyone would presume to say that it is not largely, in fact almost entirely, due to the protective tariff that was adopted by the Government of that country. We remember the prophecies and criticisms that were made on this policy at that time. It was contended by many free traders and others that the United States Government were adopting a policy that would prove detrimental and eventually ruinous to the trade and industries of that country. But after an experience of 25 years we find American statesmen just as firmly wedded to the policy of protection as they were when

that period began. We find them to-day jealously guarding that policy. The fate of the Morrison Tariff Bill last year is fresh in the minds of us all. Mr. Morrison brought a Bill into Congress for the free admission of coal, and some other staple articles. We all know how that Bill was thrown out, and we also know that when Mr. Morrison went back to the people for re-election he was defeated; and one of the leading statesmen of the United States, who was interviewed as to the cause of his defeat, said that Mr. Morrison was down on the Tariff Bill, that the country was not prepared for any change in the tariff, that they were bound to hold to the policy of protection as they had done in the past. Under these circumstances, I do not see how the people of the United States can be commiserated as they have been by hon. gentlemen opposite on their protective policy, or how it can be said that they want to get rid of that policy. It is one of the things that have bound that country together, and it is holding them firmly together now. There is no country in the world so prosperous as the United States. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) held up the United States the other day as an example of great prosperity, telling us how rapidly they were paying off their debt; and yet some hon. gentlemen opposite to-day try to commiserate that country as being the victim of protection. Now, I will call the attention of the House to the progress that has been made in the development of the rolling mill industries of the United States. Previous to 1861 rolled iron of every description was nearly all imported, railroad bars exclusively so; but from the introduction of the tariff of 1861 onward, rolling mills multiplied in the United States. In 1873, 12 years after the introduction of the protective tariff, the rolling mills of that country numbered 310, with a capacity of 2,833 tons. In 1876 the number of mills was 330, with a capacity of 3,000,000 annual production. The actual production was in round numbers 2,000,000, valued at \$190,000,000. Now, Sir, these products consist of sheet iron, boiler plate iron, ship plates, rods, hoops, rails, bridging, &c. One of these mills deserves special mention as showing the extraordinarily rapid development of the rolling iron industries following the introduction of the protective tariff of 1861, and subsequent tariffs, that is, the Cambrian Iron Works, of Johnstown, Pa., which in 1879 employed 7,000 men and spent \$10,000,000 annually for wages and material. Of the 310 rolling mills in the United States in 1873, Pennsylvania headed the list with 118 mills. Then followed Ohio and New York in point of numbers. In these states, particularly in the first named, the coal and iron deposits lie in close proximity to each other, the precise condition of matters in relation to these greatest of wealth producing minerals in the Island of Cape Breton, where coal, iron, copper and limestone are found side by side. Had I more time I could go into statistics to show that the iron industry of the United States has so advanced that to-day it is the greatest iron producing country in the world owing to the protection afforded it by the Government of the country. We were told by the hon. Minister of Finance in his speech, and I was pleased to hear it, that America to-day takes the lead of all the iron producing countries in the world—that it regulates the prices of iron not only on this continent, but in Europe and elsewhere; and that is a fact that ought to encourage the Government of Canada in carrying out the policy they propose of protecting our iron industry. Now, let us consider the progress of steel manufactures in the United States. It was not until 1872, some ten years after the imposition of the American tariff that the manufacture of steel rails was begun in the United States. Up to that time whatever steel rails were used in that country were imported. During that year, however, 94,000 tons of Bessemer steel rails were made, and henceforth that branch of the iron industry went forward with wonderful rapidity. Thus, as just said, in the first year of operations, 1872, the production was 94,000

tons; in 1873, 129,000 tons, 1874; 145,000 tons; in 1875, 300,000 tons; in 1876, 400,000 tons; in 1877, 420,000 tons; and in 1878, so rapid and enormous was the increase of this industry that the production reached the enormous amount of 500,000 tons. Up to this last date the United States had been making steel rails for only eight years, whilst England which had for many years previous been engaged in this manufactory, with all her improved appliances of centuries of development in greatest iron works of the world, produced in the year 1878, only 200,000 tons of Bessemer steel rails in excess of that of the United States, that is to say, for Great Britain, a total of 700,000 tons, which is about the present production. But it is further most worthy of note that the United States added to the employment of their population and to the profitable employment of an enormous capital to this extent, but that they moreover saved to the nation and added to its wealth by largely reducing the price that would have been paid to foreign manufacturers in the absence of the home production. In 1872, at the commencement of the industry, the United States paid for their steel rails, all of which were imported, at the rate of \$115 per ton. But in 1878, in consequence of the increase of production and the greater facilities provided by an enormous demand, Bessemer steel rails sold at \$43 per ton. This is certainly a direct and emphatic contradiction of the theory that protection ruins industry and increases prices to the consumers. I merely state these facts, which I have very hurriedly culled from the trade returns of United States, to show that with proper protection we have every reason to hope that our iron industry may attain to the same great proportions, as far as population is concerned, as that of the United States. There is no reason why it should not. We have all the conditions and all the surroundings for making a success of this great industry. If you will allow me, Sir, I will refer for a few moments to the county which I have the honor to represent. In that county we have, on the authority of such men as Howe, Dawson, Gilpin and others, workable seams of very valuable iron ore. We have it on their authority that there are six or seven districts in our county,—in fact from its centre to its circumference—intersected with iron seams which can be utilised in the manufacture of iron. These seams vary in quantity and quality. We have the clay iron stone, the bog iron ore, magnelice iron ore, and the red hematite, all of which are good in their various qualities, more particularly the hematite, which, from analyses made by reliable persons, is found to be second to no other ore of the like nature in the world. We have these ores varying from 30 to 70 per cent. of pure metallic iron, and the seams vary from five to fifteen feet, lying at such angles that can be economically and profitably worked. Contiguous to those seams are the coal fields of the Sydney district, which have been written about by men whose reputation is beyond doubt. I might quote from the works of the late Mr. R. Brown, also from Dawson's *Acadian Geology* and from Gilpin's *Mineralogy of Nova Scotia*, and the reports of the Geological Survey of Canada, all of which go to prove that the coal fields of Sydney are unrivalled in extent, in quality of coal, and facilities for the successful operation of the same. We find this coal field extends along the eastern shore of Cape Breton for about thirty miles, that its average width is six miles, and that it contains six different seams with an aggregate thickness of solid coal of some 45 feet. We find this coal field contains an area of 200 square miles, and that the computation of the coal contained in it, reaches, not millions, but billions. I say this coal field is all in close proximity to the valuable iron ores I have been attempting to describe, and when we find that a radius of some ten miles from a given point in the peerless harbor of Sydney, which has been described by Admiral Bayfield

as being second to no other harbor in the world, as being fit to accommodate the merchant marine of the world, embraces the principal portion of this coal field and these valuable iron ores. What conclusion can any sensible man arrive at, but that we have all the accommodation necessary for the building up of one of the most successful iron industries the continent has ever seen? Owing to the light angle at which these coal seams lie, which in no case exceed an inclination of some five degrees, they can be economically worked and the coal delivered at the high waters of Sydney harbor at a price which will compare favorably with that of any coal shipped from any part of the world. There is no part of the world where coal can be more economically or profitably worked than at the harbor of Sydney. I am proud to say we have the resources within our own borders of making our country a great country. All that we want is the protection that our Government, I am happy to say, has, even at this late hour, been pleased to afford us. To show you what confidence the people in our own county have in our iron and coal deposits the municipal council of the county to which I belong, voted some few years ago, in order to encourage any company to embark in the iron enterprise, \$5,000 a year for twenty years out of the county's resources, as a bonus to any Company which would undertake to develop our iron industry. That shows our people have confidence in their own resources. We also offered to exempt the company from taxation, but owing to the want of communication, from which we suffered at that time, with the outside world, and owing to the high tariff in the United States and the low tariff in this country, it was difficult to persuade capitalists to embark in this enterprise. Another difficulty with which we had to contend in the development of our coal industry has been that during some three or four months of the year our coast is blocked up by ice, and we are shut out from all intercourse with the outside world; and I contend that in the developing of this iron industry we are going to afford an incomparable boon to the working class by enabling them to secure employment during what we call the close season, that is when navigation is impossible. If we are able to afford employment to our surplus population, if we are able to keep them in our own country and keep them from travelling to all parts of this continent, I say the Government of the country are affording an incalculable boon to the working class, and that in doing so they are going to add to the resources of our country. We are going to increase our population. I do not say that we are going to increase it by foreign immigration, for that I do not quite believe we have any need for; but for a number of years past we have been continually supplying the mines of the United States and British Columbia, and in fact of all the continent, with miners, and I am happy to be able to state that wherever Nova Scotians have gone they have been able to hold their own. We find them occupying positions of responsibilities and trust in every colony—I am safe in saying in every coal or iron work—where they have sought employment. This is one of the points that I maintain is going to be of immense advantage; this is one of the reasons why this protection to our coal industry is going to be of untold advantage to the mining population of our country; it is going to keep them within our borders, it is going to afford them employment in winter, and it is going to build up our industries. Our heritage is a valuable one, and if we only know how to appreciate it, to develop it, and to make the best use of it, there is no reason why we should not be able to occupy as proud a position in regard to the iron trade as our neighbors across the border. I have to express some little astonishment at the remarks which have been made by some of my hon. friends on the other side in regard to the policy of the Government in this matter. They must be sensible of the immense advantages which are likely to

Mr. McKEN.

accrue to Nova Scotia through this policy. But, perhaps, after all, their opposition may not amount to as much as we might expect. We know that, when the National Policy was first promulgated and brought down, it met with the most strenuous opposition from the gentlemen on the opposite side, and I believe that it is only right to give them credit for sincerity in their opposition. I think they believed it was going to ruin our country; anyway, they held to that opinion; they held to it during the elections of 1882 and subsequently; but I was pleased to see that, during the recent contest in my own county, the Liberal candidate modified his opinion very much in regard to the ruinous effects of the National Policy. He even went so far as to tell the electorate of our county that the hon. the leader of the Opposition had practically endorsed the National Policy. He gave his reasons, it is true, that the country was so involved in debt that it would be necessary to continue the National Policy; but they even went further, they went so far as to say that they upheld the duty on coal. You know that about a year ago when an hon. gentleman in his place in this House moved that the duty be taken off coal and off flour, if I mistake not, that resolution was spoken to by the leader of the Opposition. These hon. gentlemen in their places in this House characterised that duty as a barbarous duty, as a most iniquitous duty, as a duty that should be immediately taken off and that should not be upheld for a single hour; but yet we found, during our election contest, that the leading Liberal candidate stated publicly, when addressing large mining centres in our county, that the leader of the Opposition had publicly said that he did not intend, if returned to power, to take the duty off coal. I am not prepared to make any statement as to the genuineness of this assertion, as far as the leader of the Opposition is concerned, but the party in our county stated that they had letters purporting to have come not only from the leader of the Opposition but also from the hon. the senior member for the county of Halifax (Mr. Jones) the recognised exponent of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, stating that, under certain conditions, there was no doubt it would be necessary to modify their opinions in regard to the duty on coal, and possibly it might not be taken off. There were telegrams read on the hustings, and I presume they were not without some foundation. I heard them read and I must say, in credit to the senior member for Halifax, that they were rather ambiguous. At the same time they gave the impression that, if the Liberals were returned to power, the iniquitous and barbarous duty would not be removed from coal. In view of these facts, no matter how loud and emphatic may be the denunciations of the duty on iron, of the protection which the Government has seen fit to give to this industry possibly in less than five years we may see such modifications in the opinions of those hon. gentlemen as we have seen in their opinions on the coal duty, and on other leading points in the National Policy. I thank the House for listening to these remarks. I was unprepared to make a speech on this subject, but coming from a county which is largely interested in this industry, I felt it to be my duty to express not simply my opinion, but what I know to be the opinion of the intelligent electorate of my county on this subject.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not propose to detain the House at any length on this question at present, but I must express my surprise at the remarks which have fallen from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to-night. He has stated that it is only large vessels which we have provided shall have a drawback of the amount of duty which may be paid in their construction, and he would leave the House and the country to believe that this Order in Council, or this arrangement for the drawback of the duty, has been only made for the benefit of the large shipbuilder.

He referred specially to myself as a shipbuilder, and said that the smaller vessels had to pay the duty and bear the burden. The hon. gentleman, as a shipbuilder, as a merchant in the city of Halifax, I will not say does know better, but he ought to know better. He ought to know that every vessel built and registered—and the smallest vessel may be registered—is entitled to a drawback under the Order in Council of 1880. I will read it:

“By Order in Council of the 15th May, 1880, it was ordered that a drawback on materials actually used in the construction of any ship or vessel built or registered in Canada, or on any vessel built and exported from Canada under a Governor's pass for sale in a foreign country.”

Mr. JONES. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, the hon. gentleman says “hear, hear.” We provided not only that those built and registered in the country, held and owned in the country, and sold to men belonging to the country, but any vessel built and exported under a Governor's pass for sale in a foreign country, should be entitled to the drawback, no matter how small the tonnage might be, provided she were built and registered in the Dominion of Canada, and any vessels down to five or ten tons may be registered; there is no limit to the size for registry. The hon. gentleman should know also that, when it was claimed that the duties had been somewhat increased on the materials for ships in 1883, the amount of drawback per ton was also increased, in order that the shipping interest might have the full benefit of a drawback for all the duties paid. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman to-night lamenting that the shipping interest would have the appearance of having some tax imposed upon it. I remember that, when he was elected in 1874 and came to this House, and when the Government which he then supported brought down a tariff imposing larger duties, doubling the duties on shipping and shipping materials used in the country at that time, the hon. gentleman advocated that tariff and said that the shipping interest had as good a right to pay a portion of the taxation of the country as any other interest, and to-night he would lead the House and the country to believe that we have only provided for large vessels and the smaller vessels must pay the taxation. The hon. gentleman referred particularly to vessels that went to the banks fishing. Well, as a merchant living in the city of Halifax, engaged in the shipping and fishing trade, he should know that every vessel that goes to the banks is entitled to that drawback, and he knows that we have encouraged that industry by giving a bounty to every vessel registered and to every boat, even though she may not have been registered, to enable the owners to reap a larger profit. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to the iron works at Londonderry, and has said that under this National Policy they got into difficulties so great that they were almost closed. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the difficulties under which that company labors were created and existed before the National Policy was inaugurated, that large indebtedness was incurred by that company upon these works in 1876-77; and he complains that the Government has carried freight for that company at too low a rate. I tell the hon. gentleman that since the National Policy was inaugurated in 1880, that company has paid to the Government as freight on the Intercolonial Railway, \$745,253; that it has paid in wages \$1,989,000; and that the total disbursement for mining ore, for coal, limestone, for other expenses, have been \$4,873,000. I give these figures as some indication of the outlay for wages that may be expected under this policy which has been propounded by the Minister of Finance and which will give an impetus to the iron industry of the country. My hon. friend from Sydney has referred to the great growth of it in the United States and to the facilities we have for the manufacture in

Canada, and I have given these figures as some indication of what we may expect, not only in Nova Scotia, but throughout the Dominion. The Finance Minister the other day referred to the facilities for the manufacture of charcoal iron in every Province of the Dominion. I find on reference to the United States returns that in 23 States they are largely engaged in the manufacture of charcoal pig iron, that wherever they have forests or woods in abundance, there is a large industry in the manufacture of charcoal iron, extending over 23 States. I take this as an indication that not only in Nova Scotia, where they have coal and iron lying in close proximity, will this industry be developed, but in all the other Provinces of the Dominion wherever there are ore and wood, the manufacture of charcoal iron will be developed. The hon. member for Halifax made some reference to the sugar trade, he referred to the position it occupied under the Cartwright tariff and to the position it now occupies. I remember hearing a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman on the floor of this House in 1877 in which he stated that unless the Government—and this was the year before he became a member of that Government—unless the Government changed their policy in respect to the sugar duties, they would destroy the West India trade of the city of Halifax, which was worth from three to four millions a year. He stated that vessels went from Halifax with cargoes of fish, which they exchanged in the West Indies for sugar, which they carried to the United States where it was refined, and in twenty-four hours it was brought into the Dominion of Canada, and our people paid the Americans for refining that sugar. He went further; he warned the Government and the House that whenever the Americans, by giving a bounty and allowing their sugar to come in here, had succeeded in destroying the refining of sugar within the Dominion of Canada, then we would be at their mercy and we would pay whatever price they might exact from us. He warned the Government of that day, led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that unless the Government changed their policy, they would destroy the West India trade of the city of Halifax, which was worth three or four millions, and they would destroy the refining industry and put us at the mercy of the American refiners who would exact whatever price they might see fit. The hon. gentleman then wound up his speech by declaring his entire confidence in that Government, notwithstanding it was ruining the constituency he represented, ruining the refining industry of the country, and notwithstanding it was placing us at the mercy of the American refiners, and the next year, when there came a vacancy in the Cabinet, the hon. gentleman went into that Cabinet and said no more about the policy which was so disastrous to the interests of the city of Halifax and to the refining interests of the Dominion at large. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman complains to-night that last year we so changed the mode of collecting the duties, of estimating the value of sugar, that we get rather more revenue now than we would if the old system of collecting duties was in operation; and he complains that the poor man is taxed much more for his sugar now than he would be if the old mode of collection was in operation. The hon. gentleman does not go back quite far enough to see the effect upon the poor man of that system which he now so much admires. He does not go back to see that the higher the price of sugar the more the poor man was taxed; that the higher the price of sugar under an *ad valorem* duty, the more the poor man paid in duties. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that certain members of the Cabinet went down into Nova Scotia and made the statement—and he implied it was a false representation—that we were not collecting so much duty from the article of sugar as was collected in 1877-78 under the Cartwright tariff. That statement was made, and that

statement was correct. The hon. gentleman knows, if he has examined the return for 1877-78 under that tariff, that the amount of duty paid upon the number of pounds of sugar imported, gave an average of about \$2.27 per 100 lbs. He also knows that in 1885 it was a little more than one-half that amount per 100 lbs. and per lb. The statements of my colleagues in the Province of Nova Scotia were not misrepresentations, but were statements made to this effect: that if you took the importation of 1885 or 1886, and calculated upon it the same rate per pound paid in 1878, it would amount to a large sum, more than we actually paid into the Treasury in 1885 and 1886.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Well, then, the hon. gentleman ought to say that in 1885-86 we collected less from sugar than was paid in 1877-78, and during last year we raised under the polariscopic test a little more than we paid the year before, but an average of two or three years previously. That system has been working satisfactorily, and has given a fair revenue, and I believe it will give entire satisfaction to the people. But hon. gentlemen opposite must not rise in this House and declare that members of the Government went down to Nova Scotia and obtained election, and convinced the people by misrepresentations. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has heard something said here with respect to the state of public opinion in the various Provinces of the Dominion during the election. I will not weary the House to-night by quoting what has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, in Nova Scotia and other parts of the Dominion; but I repeat this: that I know of no statement made by my colleagues in the Government during their visit to Nova Scotia, no statement made by myself or by any member of the party but what was borne out by the facts, and which can be substantiated by the public records.

Mr. JONES. I have just one word to say with respect to the hon. member for Cape Breton. He referred to a communication, which he said I addressed to a gentleman running in the Liberal interest in Cape Breton during the last election, and he sought to lead the House to the conclusion that I, speaking for myself or for the party in Nova Scotia, had endeavored to lead the gentleman there to believe that we would go for removing the duty on coal. I happen to have by me a copy of the telegram which I addressed to Mr. Murray, the gentleman who ran the election in our interest at that time, and with the permission of the House, I will read it:

"Tories say Blake has accepted the National Policy tariff, which means duty on flour. If such is the case, and the duty on flour is retained, I would undertake to say that duty on coal will be retained also."

I make the hon. gentleman a present of all the capital he can make out of that. He was good enough to say that it was ambiguous. I know he is a very astute politician and he will understand it. With respect to the drawback on shipping, the hon. gentleman has said that all vessels are entitled to a drawback. So far as I am aware, and I have been engaged in building and running ships a great part of my life, I never received one cent of drawback. I never knew it applied to small ships. Nor do I know now it applies to them, because the Act says: "Vessels built and registered in Canada, or vessels built and exported from Canada for sale or registration in another country." It was only intended to apply to large vessels, and in actual practice small vessels have not had the advantage of it. Whatever was the intention, that was the practice. If hereafter small vessels and fishing vessels are to get the benefit of the drawback, I have gained something for them to-night in bringing this information to light. The hon. gentleman has told us that the party to which I belong imposed, in 1874, a duty on ships' material. That is quite true. We

Mr. McLELAN.

did impose a duty of five per cent. at that time, and it was a very modest imposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What did they propose?

Mr. JONES. They proposed 5 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg your pardon. They proposed a very heavy tariff, but they were prevented from carrying it out.

Mr. JONES. We proposed five per cent. The present Postmaster General was in the other building at that time, but the Minister of Finance, who was then in opposition, denounced it as a tax which would bear unfairly on an interest in Nova Scotia which could not afford to pay it. So the hon. gentleman cannot come here with any good grace and propose, as he has on previous occasions, to raise the duty on such articles to 12 and 15 per cent. We merely imposed a duty of five per cent., and the cordage which went into those ships has been put up since to 20 per cent. The hon. gentleman has said that, in 1877, I delivered a speech with regard to sugar. He has forgotten all the circumstances of the case. At that time there was a drawback in the United States of 3.5 per 100 pounds on sugar, and under the operation of that drawback or bounty system they were crushing our refinery in Montreal, and I took the ground that so long as the Americans by a heavy drawback or bounty inflicted that injury on any industry in this country—and I maintain it to-day—it should be met by a countervailing duty. That was all changed. We went so far in this direction that we immediately reduced the duty on raw sugar by Order in Council 25 cents per 100 pounds, which the Montreal refinery acknowledged to be a great boon, and that, with the change which was made in the drawback system of the United States, almost immediately following that, brought it down not quite to where it is at the present moment, but to about \$3, and it has since been reduced to \$2.75 or \$2.82 or about that figure, placing the whole question of sugar on a different footing. So the hon. gentleman will see that if he bears in mind the whole position of the question, all his argument goes for nothing, because the position was entirely affected by the large bounty.

Mr. BOWELL. How long did the Order in Council reducing the duty remain in force?

Mr. JONES. Until the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite came into power and increased it.

Mr. BOWELL. Until it was shown that there was no authority under the law to reduce it by Order in Council, and then you repealed it.

Mr. JONES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It was done the last Session, and the whole thing remained in that position.

Mr. BOWELL. You had no authority to do it.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman referred to my remarks with regard to their misrepresentations. I said before, and I repeat it, that their whole canvass was a system of misrepresentation. It was misrepresentation, because the hon. gentleman, in my presence, and in the presence of others, was heard and understood to say that the low price of sugar and cotton and other articles, at the present moment, was owing entirely to the National Policy, and that, I say here, was a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. It was not owing to the National Policy at all. In the case of sugar it was owing to the large crops which had been produced in other countries and the large decline from £20 to £10 a ton, so that consequently sugar, under any circumstances, would have been just that much cheaper. We always had to meet the argument that cotton and sugar were low. We admitted that they were lower than they were before, but we said, look at England, the United States and other

countries; they are so much lower there, and they would be that much lower here were it not for the National Policy which makes them that much dearer. These were the arguments which hon. gentlemen used, and I repeat again that they were misrepresentations and not facts, so that hon. gentlemen can see that this matter stands exactly where I put it in the first place. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from Cape Breton, and I shall sincerely rejoice if the iron industries there can be opened up, though I am not so sanguine as the Minister of Finance. The Postmaster General did not reply to the statements which I made with reference to the inducements he held out to his own people, that unless the Government were sustained the works would be closed up, but if they were sustained a company would be re-organised and the works would go on and flourish. That was the argument which the hon. gentleman made use of, and I say to that extent it was a misrepresentation, although the facts may bear out the position he took. As I said before, I hope that the industry will be successful and that they will do better in the future than they have done in the past, although I am not as sanguine on that subject as some people are.

Mr. KENNY. The senior member for Halifax, in the course of his remarks this evening, referred to the fact that when I introduced a Bill to incorporate the Londonderry Iron Company, it was a matter of arrangement. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant; but if he meant to convey the impression to this House that the fact that that Bill was introduced the day after the Minister of Finance introduced the tariff, imposing a duty on iron, was a matter of arrangement, he has certainly, to make use of an expression he has freely used this afternoon, made a great misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. JONES. A remarkable coincidence.

Mr. KENNY. Never mind that. The facts are, that the Bill was placed in my hands to be presented, and it so happened that the second reading of the Bill—for the first reading of the Bill had taken place some days before—took place on the day after the day on which the Finance Minister introduced his tariff, in which changes are made in the duties on iron. I am sorry, indeed, that my hon. friend had not some better argument than that to present to the House. I am sorry, also, to hear my hon. friend, in order to score against the Government of the day, speaking disparagingly of his native Province, and speaking slightly of the great iron industries of that Province. The fact is that my hon. friend's visits to Londonderry have always been political visits, and they have always been eminently unsuccessful.

Mr. JONES. Not always.

Mr. KENNY. And I think that he imagined that the ore was as scarce as votes for his candidate. The House will bear with me a few minutes while I read some remarks which were made recently in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, by a gentleman with whom my hon. friend is in thorough political accord. Let us see what that gentleman said as to the iron industries of Nova Scotia. The Attorney General of Nova Scotia said:

"I rise for the purpose of expressing the opinion that the development of the iron industries of the Province of Nova Scotia is a matter of the greatest importance, and one which this Legislature in the interests of the people of Nova Scotia would be justified in promoting. It is a fact, and a fact of which we often speak with pride when discussing the merits and advantages of this Province over others that it possesses vast mineral deposits."

There is no misgiving there, Sir, as to the value of the iron industries of Nova Scotia.

"We have coal and iron in abundance; but with these resources we have barely commenced making a respectable development of our mining industries. From the report of the commissioner of works and mines we learn that last year we put out one million and a half tons of coal.

That is a matter for great congratulation and jubilation to certain persons in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I have seen this fact alluded to as one of great importance. But, sir, in my opinion the output should not be a million and a half, but ten or twenty million tons per annum. We have, sir, in this Province an iron deposit of such vast extent that it is said that our coal deposits, vast as they are, are not sufficient to adequately work the iron deposit. And yet, with the exception of one attempt at Acadia Mines we have practically no development of our iron industry at all. Now, sir, I maintain that the vast mineral resources of the Province of Nova Scotia, by some means or other, should be developed. I believe, sir, that we are not reaping the advantages which belong to the mineral resources of the Province of Nova Scotia."

That is the opinion of the Attorney General of the Province, and I am reading from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* of 19th April, 1887, and I set his words against those of my hon. friend as to the value of the great mineral deposits of Nova Scotia. I think, Sir, you may have no misgivings as to the working of our great iron deposits, and I think the Government has done wisely in inaugurating this policy of protecting that great industry. We all know—the history of other nations shows—that no iron industry has been developed without protection, and we ought to be grateful to the Government instead of blaming them for inaugurating it in this Dominion of ours.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Finance made a statement some time ago upon which I think it is desirable that we should have further information. He said that in the construction of ships a drawback would be given, equal to the amount of the duty imposed on the iron used in those ships. I did not understand from the hon. gentleman whether that drawback would apply to native iron as well as to iron imported. Will the hon. gentleman say?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not. I said any increased duties which were paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I call attention to is that if iron is imported at all, it will be imported because it may be sold at the same price at which the native iron is being sold. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposes to allow a drawback equal to the duty upon the imported iron, then, clearly, native iron will never be used at all. Suppose \$200 worth of iron is employed in the building of a ship. If the shipbuilder employs foreign iron he will be entitled to a drawback of \$60, but if he employs native iron he will have to pay the full amount. I want to know whether it is the policy of the Government to give a premium for the use of foreign iron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have answered the question very distinctly. I stated that any increased duties on iron used in shipbuilding would be treated by the Government the same as they had treated the duties on all material used in shipbuilding, and that they would be provided for by the Government by Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not altogether answered my enquiry. The question is a perfectly simple one. Here is "A" engaged in shipbuilding using imported iron. There can be no doubt, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, that he will be entitled to a drawback equal to the amount of duty imposed on that iron. "B," his neighbor, also engaged in shipbuilding, arranges with some native producer for his iron, and buys it at the same price as the shipbuilder who uses foreign iron. What I ask the hon. gentleman is this: will everyone, irrespective of the origin of the iron, be entitled to the same drawback, or will the man who uses native iron be obliged to pay the full price, while the other receives a drawback? If that is the construction the hon. gentleman puts on the Order in Council, he must see that native iron will never be used in shipbuilding, because the man using the foreign iron would get it 45 or 50 per cent. cheaper.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have answered the hon. gentleman's question. You cannot get a drawback of duties unless the duties have been paid; and I told the hon. gentleman,

in answer to the statement that the increased duties would involve a greater cost to the shipbuilder, that it would not be so, because if he paid more duties on iron that went into the ship, it would be returned to him in the drawbacks. The hon. gentleman may make what he pleases of the argument or say it is not just to the native producer, but he must not say that I have not answered the question, for I have answered it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is perfectly clear now that the hon. gentleman's answer is that the drawback will apply to imported iron, but not to iron produced in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then we know what the Government's position is. If the foreign iron was the amount of the duty dearer than the native iron, it would not come into the country at all. Therefore, the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt the policy which must prevent native iron from being used in shipbuilding. So the hon. gentleman, while professing to adopt this tariff to encourage the production of iron in the country, adopts a policy which will prohibit the use of native iron in a particular industry. Then, there is another thing which I think has been pretty well brought out by the observations of the Minister of Finance, that is, that the duty imposed on the foreign product adds to the price, not only of that article, but of everything produced in the country that comes into competition with it. Although the hon. gentleman two or three years ago argued very stoutly that the imposition of the duty on coal did not add to the price of coal, yet now, when he is taking the duty off coal, he assumes that he is conferring a benefit on the manufacturer in diminishing the price of that article. I am not at this hour of the night going to further discuss this question. I wish simply to enunciate and emphasise this point in the policy of the Government.

Mr. JONES. The duty on iron must have the effect of increasing the price of iron in the market. That I suppose is the object of it. Then, if it increases the price of iron in the market and keeps out the foreign iron, we shall only have domestic iron. Therefore, if a fisherman or shipbuilder uses native iron, he will get no drawback.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if he were building a ship, and the price of iron were increased by this duty, he would not import iron for the ship and pay the duty and receive it back again? I do not think it would require any astute merchant or financier to come to the conclusion that if he were entitled to get back all he paid in duty, he could, under these circumstances, purchase iron as cheaply as the price he would pay in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell has established this to his own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the House. He has answered the senior member for Halifax already. He has proved to a demonstration, and he will tell you so if you ask him, that under this policy as enunciated to-night a complete immunity from increased duty has been secured to the shipbuilders. The senior member for Halifax started out with the claims of the fishermen and the shipbuilders, saying that under this policy those classes would be hardly dealt with by this increased duty on iron. The hon. member for Bothwell proved to the satisfaction of the House that nothing would be taken out of the fisherman or the shipbuilder, for the duties that entered into the construction of the ship would be given back, and therefore, he would be wise enough never to use domestic iron. When the hon. member for Halifax raised his question, he was met by the Order in Council, which as a politician of long standing, he ought to have known was in exist-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ence. Under this order, according to the argument of my hon. friend, nothing will be taken from the shipbuilder if he will use the imported iron and get the drawback of all duties. I rose to nail an assertion, which has been made several times, with reference to misrepresentations of which I have been accused, in common with my colleagues. I must say that so far as misrepresentations are concerned, the events of to-night have not shown that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is best calculated to deal in accusations against hon. members on this side. That hon. gentleman has been shown over and over again to have stated what is not exactly true.

Mr. JONES. What in? Where?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman. By implication, if not outright, the hon. gentleman laid the charge that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) had, by an arrangement, introduced a Bill into this House on the heels of the proposition of the hon. the Finance Minister.

Mr. JONES. He did introduce it.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman did not say he merely introduced it. He said that it bore the marks of an arrangement. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax has given his version. Will the hon. gentleman take that as true, or does he still persist in saying it was an arrangement?

Mr. JONES. It bears the marks of an arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman then go back a little further? If he will, he will find that for weeks before that Bill was introduced there was a notice in the public press that it would be introduced. In the face of that, is my hon. friend's statement that it bears the marks of an arrangement, a clean, square statement? or is there not in it a little of his machiavellian policy of misrepresentation? My hon. friend started out on his career in this Parliament with misrepresentation. I find here, on page 33 of the debates, in one of the first speeches which the hon. gentleman made—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the debate to which the hon. gentleman wishes to refer is not a debate on the same question as the present one, he has no right to refer to it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a debate virtually on the same question, that of false representation.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend will see that the discussion to-night is not precisely as to whether any or what misrepresentations have been made in this House. The subject-matter under discussion is the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish only to say that if I remember aright the hon. gentleman did state within the present year that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Interior, and the Minister of Marine went down to the Province of Nova Scotia just before the local elections, and tried to canvass that Province with reference to these local elections. When the hon. gentleman was reminded of his statement, he endeavored to cover it up by saying that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice spoke in Nova Scotia just before the local elections.

Mr. JONES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman stated that my colleagues and myself made misrepresentations in his Province, in speaking of the National Policy, by declaring outright that cotton and woollens and sugar were cheaper to-day, and that entirely because of the National Policy.

Mr. JONES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend state that? If he does state it, I say it is not the fact, so far as I am concerned, and I say that I was with my colleagues on one of these tours, and that it is not the fact, to my knowledge, as far as they are concerned. My own statement of the case, if I made any, would be this: that it was the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that the National Policy would perforce advance the prices of articles and, therefore, prove ruinous to the consumers; and I met that charge, as my colleagues did, by stating that the people to-day have these staple articles cheaper than they ever had them before. But I did not, nor did any of my colleagues, say that it was entirely because of the National Policy. I will say here, as I said there, that it was materially owing to the National Policy, but there were other causes as well. I have never tried to conceal that. My hon. friend said that I stated in Halifax, when speaking there in October, that I misrepresented the amount of the public debt. I challenge that statement.

Mr. JONES. You did not deny it the other night.

Mr. FOSTER. Several times the hon. gentleman has said that I did not deny it, but I deny it now. Was the hon. gentleman in Halifax when I spoke there in October? Does he know of his knowledge that I misrepresented the public debt by stating it was \$196,000,000 at that time? Did he get that from his own knowledge or by hearsay?

Mr. JONES. Did you not say so?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know if the hon. gentleman did not make the statement that the national debt was \$196,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend had as much patience as he has height he would have had the answer to his question without being under the necessity of exhibiting all the vigor he has shown. I want to say to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that when I spoke there I did not misrepresent the condition of the net debt of the Dominion. There are gentlemen here present who heard me on that night, and they will know whether or not my statement now tallies with my statement then. What I did in discussing the national debt, was to take the last Public Accounts we had, and I stated that by those Public Accounts, on the 1st July, 1885, the net debt of the Dominion was \$196,000,000. I said nothing else in Guelph, Halifax or any other place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman did not, then he must blame the organ of his party who sent a special reporter, I believe, along to report the hon. gentleman's utterances. I have his utterances as reported by that organ at Listowell, and as revised, I suppose, by himself. But in discussing the financial question he is reported to have said:

"Several Reform speakers have already spoken on this question and have given widely different estimates as to what the public debt was."

Therefore the natural inference is: I am going to give the exact thing, because these men have confused you. He goes on:

"Mr. Blake put the debt as averaging \$300 per family. According to the Public Accounts, the gross debt on the 30th June, 1885."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is what he said, and he followed it with these words:

"According to the Public Accounts, the gross debt on 30th June, 1885, the last official record."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). "Hear, hear." This statement was made on 26th November, 1886. Those members

of Parliament who were a little previous will know that the last official record ended on 30th June, 1886, some four months before, and, if the Minister of Marine did not know, he ought to have known, before he went out to instruct the public, what the last official record was, because it is an official record before it is published, and it is within his cognisance, and, if he did not know, he should have known that the net debt was, what we know from the published report, what he ought to have known and could have known weeks and months before he made the statement that it was \$196,400,000, that it was in fact \$223,000,000, so that he deceived the people to the extent of \$27,000,000, and in order to emphasise that he says: "I am giving you the last official record." He can deny that if he likes. As he did, so did the Minister of the Interior, so did the Minister of Justice give them to understand. These gentlemen were not in the position we were in. They had the official documents within their reach and could have known, and as an evidence that they not only could have known, but that they did know, I find that the Minister of the Interior on one occasion referred to the surplus which had accrued in the four months, not of the year 1886 that they pretended they did not know about, but in the four months of the year 1886-87. They knew about the surplus in 1886-87, but not about the net debt at the end of 1885-86. It will not do for them to say that they did not go through the country misleading the people. It is not too strong an expression to say that they did mislead the people, and that they designed to mislead the people. I put in contrast with the manner in which they mislead the people, the manner in which they were addressed, and the facts put before them by the leader of the Opposition. He had to work this out for himself, and he brought his common sense to bear and took facts which were known outside of the official record, and he found that the net debt, on the 30th June, 1886, four months before those gentlemen said it was \$196,000,000, must be \$220,000,000 at least. He was \$3,000,000 within the mark. These gentlemen were \$27,000,000 wrong. He was estimating; they knew, or ought to have known. It is not for the credit of these hon. gentlemen that they should have gone through the country, where as I said there are many who take their word and are disposed to believe them, and should have made such statements. It was their bounden duty to give to the people of the country a true record of how the finances of the country stood, and it will not do for the Minister of Marine to rise here in Parliament, where he is confronted with those who know the subject and endeavor to escape from the charge, when he was informing the people that the public debt was what it appeared sixteen months before and that that was the last official record, when he knew that there was an official document of a date twelve months later which showed the debt to be \$27,000,000 more. As he did, so did the others. I have extracts from the speeches delivered by them. I find that the Minister of Justice is reported to have said—and from him I would have perhaps expected better, but as it may be that it is a mistake, I do not wish to judge him harshly—he is reported to have said:

"Opposition speakers claim that the debt of Canada averaged \$140 per family. The Public Accounts show that the public debt only averaged \$65 per family."

What does that involve? It involves that if the net debt was \$223,000,000, as it was, we would have to have an average of 18 to each family. I do not know how many the Minister of Justice has in his family, but if he has 18, I trust every member of the family is in good health and prospering, but I do not think there is an average of 18 to a family. Why, if the debt were \$196,000,000, as stated by these hon. gentlemen, it would require 16 to a family. You find the Minister of the Interior quite as definite in reference to this matter, for in one place, speaking of it, he

said that the net debt had increased \$45,000,000 during the last eight years, and that took in the year 1886, a statement in which there is an amount of \$23,000,000 wrong. I put that before the House, and I put as a contrast the facts stated by the Hon. Mr. Blake, facts that he had to estimate, but showing how careful he is in giving facts and figures that may be relied upon, from which he inferred that the national debt was about \$220,000,000. In contrast to that, you have Ministers of the Crown, with the opportunity of knowing what statements were correct, endeavoring to make the people believe that at the time they spoke—for that was their evident design—the net debt was \$27,000,000 less than it was. I leave the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to state that this report as contained in the *Mail* newspaper is not correct. I have not the means of knowing. I have spoken of the utterances of these gentlemen as I find them in the *Mail*.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, I think my hon. friend will not set a newspaper report down as being an absolute and correct statement of what a public speaker utters upon a platform.

Mr. CASEY. Why did not you correct it then?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that a newspaper report is given very far from *in extenso*, and that newspaper reporters are not always infallible in reporting verbatim what a man says when he is talking to an audience. Therefore, I disclaim any newspaper report which I have not revised, and I have not revised any statements made in the *Mail* newspaper as being an absolutely verbatim report of what I have stated. In the second place, I wish to state that the people in an audience may be taken to be as intelligent, man for man, as the gentlemen who sit around these boards; and in discussing the public debt my colleagues and myself took the last published reports, stating that they came to the 30th June, 1885, and we argued that the debt—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did you know what it was in 1886?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the point.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we had taken the official statements obtained from the departmental officers down to the date of our discussions, and had gone on the public platform and had taken advantage of these, what would have been the cry hurled against us by gentlemen in the Opposition? That we were unfair, that we had access to information that they had not, and were using that information when they were not placed upon the same ground.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You did that in reference to the surplus.

Mr. McLELAN. That is published in the *Gazette* every month.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman would have been one of the first to say we took an unfair advantage in discussing this question. I discussed, and my colleagues discussed the question upon what the people had before them, upon the whole state of facts before the public in the last published record as it was before the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be very amusing to hon gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CASEY. It is, very.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes the truth, as they come across it so seldom, almost amuses them. Now, with reference to that statement I have made these remarks. They are true. My hon. friend went a little further than he should have done when he stated that we were deliberately misrepresenting the state of the public debt. If it is a misrepresentation

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

of the state of the public debt to take the last published accounts and tell your audience that you take them, those that are of access to the people, to take the conditions as laid down there, and discuss them in full before the people, then you may call it deliberate misrepresentation; if it is not, then I think the hon. gentleman went a little too far in using that term.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to say this in answer to the hon. gentleman, that everywhere he spoke in the Province of New Brunswick, he took up the debt as stated by the speakers upon our side, the debt that he claimed it to be then, and he professed with the greatest moderation, with the greatest fairness, to show that we were wrong, inasmuch as the debt was only \$196,000,000. It was true, Mr. Speaker, that he ingeniously referred to the fact that he was quoting the Public Accounts. We were discussing the public debt as we supposed the debt was at the time. Whenever the hon. gentleman came within the reach of my newspaper I published a request to him to state what the debt was, but he did not do it. I will not say here that he sought by, deliberate misrepresentation to deceive, but if I met him outside on the public platform, I would say that he deliberately misrepresented the public debt. He can look at his own organ in St. John, the *Sun*, and he will find that he is reported in about the same terms as in the speech referred to here from the *Mail*. The hon. gentleman may get out of it very nicely now, by saying he was very particular in referring to the Public Accounts, but the impression he conveyed to the public mind was an entirely incorrect one, and he must have known that he was doing so.

Mr. BOWELL. The virtuous indignation of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) in accusing my hon. colleague of having stated what he says was only a misrepresentation or an untruth, was based upon the declaration made by him that these accounts had been published some months previous to the speeches made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, every man in this House knows that the Public Accounts ending 30th June, 1886, were not published until this House met, and consequently the whole argument based upon that fact falls to the ground. I remember what was said by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in New Brunswick, and other members of the Cabinet, when I was present, and I remember what I said myself; and in no single instance did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries give the state of the public debt, except as it was based upon the Public Accounts as laid before Parliament, and which had been given to the world on the 30th June, 1885.

Mr. WELDON. You were not present at election time.

Mr. BOWELL. I was there before the election. The hon. gentleman stated that I had not heard him make speeches in New Brunswick. I must necessarily refer to the occasion on which I was present, and I say that in no instance did I hear him state what he has been charged with stating.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was at Newcastle, I suppose.

Mr. BOWELL. That was one place, and at Chatham and three or four other places, and in no single instance did he refer to the public debt, except as based upon the accounts which had been laid before Parliament, so that the charge that he or any other Minister made statements based upon accounts which had been published were not true, and certainly has no foundation. Now, I desire to set the hon. member for Halifax right in one or two remarks he made with reference to my own Department, and that is the principal reason which induced me to rise. He made a statement of the character of those which, I very much fear, he is in the habit of making upon all occasions, when speaking of his opponents; he stated that whenever a small industry in Nova Scotia was being injured by importations from

any part of the world, an Order in Council was at once issued raising the duty. Notwithstanding the fact I contradicted this statement at once, it was repeated over and over again. Now, the hon. gentleman has been a Privy Councillor, and he ought to know what the constitution of the country requires of us in that particular; he ought to know that no order can be issued by the Governor in Council imposing any tax, no matter how small it may be. There is power given in the law to take off a tax upon an article which is used in the manufacture of another article which is to be exported, or which may not be exported. That is the only power under the constitution that the Governor in Council has; but I suppose the hon. gentleman having, when he was in power, passed illegal orders in reference to duty upon sugar, thinks that those who succeeded him must have followed in the same practice. But he has forgotten that when the illegal act of his Government had been pointed out they were compelled to retrace their steps. I tell this House that the charge made repeatedly by certain portions of the press through the Dominion, and by politicians represented by the hon. member for Halifax to-night, that an Order in Council had been issued, or that rulings of the Customs Department had been made increasing the duties upon any article, is not correct; in fact, no such ruling has been made in reference to the article to which he referred. In reference to the duty upon tickets, it may be quite true there is a very large percentage, speaking *ad valorem*. I do not deny that fact, but when he says the duty was placed upon that article because the *Montreal Gazette* was doing such work, he had forgotten, I charitably believe, that the law imposing a duty upon tickets had been upon the Statute-book two or three years before this question arose in Halifax; and if he had taken the trouble to enquire he would have found that upon these very tickets there is a duty of 10 cents per pound, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*—I do not deny that it is a very high *ad valorem* duty upon the price of the articles imported from Great Britain—but when he said that the Customs Department had raised the duties for the purpose of protecting the *Montreal Gazette*, he stated that of which he certainly could not by any possibility have any knowledge. Nearly every one of the charges that have been made in reference to the rulings of the Customs Department have just as much foundation as that statement of the hon. member for Halifax. When questions are referred to the Department, those in authority there are obliged to rule in accordance with the provisions of the law as it is placed on the Statute-book. It may possibly be true—I know it is true—that in a great many ports articles have been imported and entered at a lower rate of duty than that which is provided by the statute; but just as soon as the attention of the Department is called to it—we rule strictly in accordance with the law, no matter who it hits or who suffers. I make this statement in justice to the Department over which I preside. When the sugar question comes up, as it will later, and the question as to the statements I made before the election, I shall be happy to attend to the compliments paid me by the hon. member for Brant. I do not propose to deal with that to night, but I challenge the hon. member for Brant, or any other member in this House, to point to a single utterance made by me during the elections that I am not prepared to prove by documentary evidence and by figures. I am speaking in defence of myself exclusively upon this matter. I referred to the public debt in the same manner that my colleagues did. I accepted the statement made by the leader of the Opposition, and I argued from these premises just as I did from those made before. I am quite sure my colleagues and myself who discussed the question—and I know the Minister of the Interior did, because I have read the statements he made and they will be found on record—treated the public debt in that way; we accepted the statement of the leader of the

Opposition and argued from it, and by comparison showed that the debt had not been increased so rapidly as when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

Mr. THOMPSON. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the discussion took its present turn, and I would not have said a word on the present occasion, except for a remark that fell from the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was speaking. My colleague having challenged one of the statements of that hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman threw the remark across the floor that the assertion had been made several times during the Session, and had not heretofore been contradicted. I suppose the inference which the hon. member for Halifax sought to draw from that was that inasmuch as prompt contradiction of the statement was not given upon the spot, the House might take as established and as truthful the utterance which he had made.

Mr. JONES. It was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Lest the hon. gentleman should either be under any misapprehension on this point, or seek to use against me in the future as an argument, a statement which I failed to correct on the spot, I beg to assure him in the most emphatic and parliamentary manner possible that he has not during the Session made any statement respecting myself that I am not capable of disproving in the most distinct and emphatic manner. I have failed on several occasions to correct the hon. gentleman's statements made in regard to myself, because the time was not opportune, and the remark not particularly appropriate to the subject under discussion; but when it is appropriate, and when the hon. gentleman will give me an opportunity, I will satisfy not him, perhaps, but those who heard him, that the statements were not to be taken as reliable because they were not contradicted on the spot. A few words with respect to what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) has said regarding meetings in Ontario which it was my privilege to address, and regarding which the hon. gentleman thought I made statements different from those he would have expected from me. I beg to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to the position in which this controversy, as regards the public debt, stood when we were making those addresses to the people of Ontario and the people of the Maritime Province. The basis of the whole contention which was put forward on both sides at that time was the question, whether the gross debt was the debt for which this Ministry was to be held responsible, or the net debt on 30th June, 1885? The former contention had been made to the electors whom we addressed, and those were the statements we endeavored to answer; and in taking up the statements of our friends of the Opposition, we found that they contended that the gross debt should be charged against us, amounting to \$274,000,000, for the Opposition had put before the country that as the gross debt on 30th June, 1885. My colleagues and myself, taking the figures of the same date, as we must do in order to make a comparison, said that was not a true standard to be taken, that it should not be taken to be \$274,000,000 or whatever the gross was, but that we should be held responsible for the net debt, amounting to \$196,000,000 at that date. That was the whole basis of the argument and discussion. Then the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), in disputing a calculation I made as to the distribution of the debt over the families of the Dominion, has said that according to the statement I made there were eighteen persons to every family. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his figures.

Mr. PATERSON. From the *Mail*.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not responsible for any statement of that kind which has appeared either in the *Mail* or

the *Globe*, or any other paper. In the course of the tour which I had the pleasure and privilege to make in company with the First Minister, we were sometimes misreported, we had no opportunity of correcting the press, and I did not feel myself bound or responsible for any report that appeared either in the *Mail* or the *Globe*. But I beg to assure the hon. gentleman that, wherever he got his figures and whether they bear out his impression of what I said or not, I made no calculation which would give any such result. In contesting the statement put forward by the Opposition as to what the debt amounted to on each family in the Dominion, I was disputing the statement put forward by the Opposition in two particulars: one was in regard to their claim that the gross debt should be distributed over the families of the Dominion, and the other was the contention as to what the population was. My calculation was based, not on eighteen to a family, but on five to a family, and every statement I made with reference to the debt, and every other assertion I made either in Ontario or the Maritime Provinces, I am satisfied to have investigated here, and to take the hon. gentleman's opinion and that of the House as to whether I merited his esteem or not for the accuracy of the statements I made there. On reviewing them I am not able to retract any statement as not being entirely authorised by the facts. It is quite true that in making speeches like that we sometimes, apart from mere questions of fact, undertake to state our views as to what the revenue of the country will be, and I remember on one occasion the leader of the Opposition challenged some calculations I made as to what the future revenue would be, and on recalling that I find that the leader of the Opposition was a good deal farther wrong than I was in the estimate of the revenue for the current year. At a subsequent period of the discussion, the leader of the Opposition came out with an entirely different statement. Leaving out the theory with respect to the gross debt on 30th June, 1885, the leader of the Opposition said: The Ministers have been going to and fro and they have contrasted the calculations we have put before the country based on the gross debt of 30th June, 1885, and they have pared that down to a debt of \$196,000,000; but they ought to have told the country that the debt has grown since then. And the leader of the Opposition put forward his calculation of the net debt as something like \$220,000,000. In meeting that statement, which was an entirely new one, I endeavored to show that, even taking \$220,000,000, we were entitled to credit for various items in connection with public works and for increases in allowances to the Provinces. We were contending, in the first place, that we were not responsible for the gross debt as being the whole debt of the country in 1885; and, subsequently, we accepted the statement of the leader of the Opposition and argued the question according to his basis that the debt was \$220,000,000. The press supporting the Opposition thereafter reported me as admitting that Mr. Blake's statement as to the increase of the debt since June, 1885, was correct, which is a proof that I was not denying the subsequent increase.

Mr. CASEY. One remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries deserves notice. The hon. gentleman said that if he, as a Minister of the Crown, had presumed to know more than had been already published to the country at large during the campaign, he would have been attacked for taking an unfair advantage of the Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I made no such statement.

Mr. CASEY. I beg his pardon; I heard him make a statement to that effect, though I do not vouch for the words. He was defending himself from the charge that he should have used his knowledge of what the public debt was at that time, and he stated in effect that, if he had so used that information, he would have been accused of taking an unfair

Mr. THOMPSON.

advantage of the Opposition. Now, Sir, before the election came on, though I think after the date of the particular speech to which reference has been made, the Government printed and distributed to all members of Parliament—and this is something which some new members may not know—what they called an abstract of the public statistics, which showed that the net debt of the country, on the 30th June, 1886, the period covered by the Public Accounts, which the Minister of Fisheries says were not published until after the House met—that on the 30th June the net debt was \$223,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite wrong.

Mr. CASEY. I say it is right. I have the book in my possession, though I have not got it here. It was sent to every member of Parliament.

Mr. MADILL. Produce the book.

Mr. CASEY. The book was sent to my house, and I used it in the campaign, but I have not got it here.

Mr. MADILL. I have the abstract here, and it shows that the net debt on the 30th June, 1885, was \$196,000,000.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking of the 30th June, 1886, and I tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the Government did tell the public, before the House met, through this publication, that the net debt on that date was \$223,000,000. Of course, that was not known to the audience and the general public; it was not known even to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Madill), because he was not then a member of this House, but it was known to all members of the House who had the abstract, so that that excuse is taken away from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If it was proper to publish it in January, it was proper to publish it in November, and it was proper to tell the audience before whom he spoke in November, that to his knowledge and according to the last official statement—which are the words attributed to him in a report in a friendly newspaper, a report which I have no doubt he revised, and in fact he did not deny it.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, he did.

Mr. CASEY. No, he did not; he denied its being a verbatim report, but he will not deny that he revised the figures, for he knows that the figures were revised by him, as every careful speaker revises the figures of a report published by a friendly newspaper. He allowed the \$196,000,000 to go to the country, leading the country to believe that those were the correct figures. The Minister says that the great question before the country was, whether the net debt or the gross debt should be taken. That was not the question. The leader of the Opposition constantly took the net debt, as estimated by himself, as the question upon which we should go before the country; and the hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the Opposition joined issue with him, not on the gross debt, but on the estimated net debt, and asked him to prove it. Now, Sir, the *Mail* at that time and still an independent supporter of the Government—although I admit it is really an independent paper—estimated the public debt, during the campaign, at \$225,000,000. The *Mail* was nearer right than the leader of the Opposition, who kept carefully within the limits in stating it to be \$220,000,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to tax the time of the House very long at this late hour.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would state that we propose to close in a very few minutes, and the subject will all come up to-morrow, as I am going to ask the House to go on with these resolutions to-morrow. It is nearly one o'clock, and I am extremely anxious to get away.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was very anxious to say something, but I will give way. What I have to say will keep.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to read a short extract bearing on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. To-morrow, to-morrow.

Mr. FISHER. I will read an extract from *Hansard* of 5th May, 1886. On that date the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) asked the Finance Minister the amount of the gross public debt of Canada, on the 1st May, and the amount of the net debt on the same date. The Finance Minister answered that the gross debt was \$284,000,000 and odd, and the net debt \$205,000,000 and odd. How the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could state the other thing I do not know.

Mowing machines, self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, &c., 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. gentleman had better let that item stand and take the others.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no change in that at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. But we want to talk about it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a large interest, and I think the fact that there is no change in the duty will warrant the Minister, as I suggested before, in making some explanation, as the proposed increase on the raw material is so large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will explain at once. I stated that the basis of this proposed tariff was that we adopted two-thirds of the American duty on pig iron, and that we applied that, not with mathematical exactness, but as nearly as we could to the various manufactures of iron in its different stages. But I found that, on applying that rule, the protection now given to agricultural implements gives two-thirds of the American tariff. Our tariff was relatively higher in regard to agricultural implements than upon the general scope of the various products of iron. So we left this as it is—first, because we applied the same principle of giving two-thirds of the duty on the basis of the pig iron; and, in the second place, because the industry is now so thoroughly established that we believe it will be quite sufficient, notwithstanding the slight increase in some of the iron that goes into these implements, to enable them to hold their own.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have not these men stated differently?

Mr. MITCHELL. If we are going to have this discussion, I claim my right to speak on the other question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will let it stand over then.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that is the better way.

Grape vines, costing 20 cents and less, 5 cents each.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to reduce that to three cents on vines costing 10 cents and less.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHINOOK BELT AND PEACE RIVER RAILWAY

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) moved :

That Bill (No. 34) entitled an Act to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company, be referred back to the Committee of Railways and Canals, for further consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants the Bill to be considered on some other point than the two points which were considered this morning, and therefore wishes the Bill referred back to the committee for that purpose. If so, I have no objection to this being done.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Dominion Oil Pipe Line Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 97) to authorise certain extensions of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway.—(Mr. Brown.)

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Government business shall have precedence every Thursday, during the present Session, after questions put by members. He said: The House will adjourn to-morrow night early, in all probability, and not meet until the following Wednesday; and I fancy that my hon. friends on both sides, when they get home and see how the season is advanced, and how flourishing their businesses are, will want to get away as soon as possible, and, therefore, I move this motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is very early for the hon. gentleman to propose to take a day off private members. The hon. gentleman knows that, by the arrangement which was made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, the Government have already taken time belonging to private members in discussing the tariff; they have taken Monday. We have a series of very important questions which we propose to submit to Parliament for consideration, and most of these questions have been deferred from time to time, at the request of the Government, to suit their convenience. There is the question of the franchise, there is the question of disallowance, there is the question of the constitution of the Senate, and there are other matters.

Mr. MITCHELL. Manhood suffrage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And manhood suffrage, a question introduced by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The proposition of the Government is practically a proposition to burk discussion on all these matters. Now, it seems to me there will be quite time enough for the Government to appropriate a day that belongs to private members, when the private members have had an opportunity of making a little more progress with the business in their hands. The hon. gentleman proposes to adjourn for a week. There will be no difficulty in giving notice after we return, and by that arrangement the hon. gentleman would only leave Thursday in the hands of the private members beyond the days which he proposes to take. So far from conceding to us a day which we were entitled to, by the understanding with the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman proposes even to take away those remaining to us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly do not desire in any way to limit the powers of hon. members of the House to move in any way whatever, or bring forward any measure. It is far from my wish to do so; on the contrary, I cheerfully admit that the Opposition has acted with great kindness, I may say, with respect to the Government measures, by aiding us as they have done. But, on looking at the Order paper, I find that the number of notices of motions and public bills and orders in the hands of members, not members of the Government, is unusually small for any Session since 1867; and I think there would be no difficulty in getting through with all those measures to which

the hon. gentleman has alluded. After the manner in which we have been treated we should be wanting in our duty in every way if we did not give every opportunity to discuss every one of the measures which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. The object of having two Government days consecutively, like Thursday and Friday, is obvious. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is an old Minister himself, and he must know that it is for the purpose of getting on with the various items, when we are in Committee of Supply. If we have only Tuesday and Friday, and we are in Supply, a discussion commences, it goes on upon an important item, we will say, and the debate on that item is adjourned. Then you have Wednesday and Thursday intervening, and on Friday the debate commences over again, just as if it were beginning anew. But if you have two days consecutively, the debate goes on until the time of adjournment, and it may consume that evening and go on the next day to a conclusion. It was with that object that I wished to get Thursday if possible. I would say at once, however, that those measures which the hon. gentleman mentioned will have every opportunity of being fully discussed, even if we have to give up any of our days in return for the manner we have been treated. The reason I move for it now is that we will not meet until Wednesday, but we might move on Wednesday and take it the following week. I am quite satisfied, as I said, that when hon. gentlemen go back to their homes they will be very anxious when they return to go on with Government business; and it was with a view of meeting what I am convinced is the feeling in the breasts of gentlemen on both sides that I ask to move the motion at this stage. However, I leave the matter to the House, and if it is really the desire of hon. gentlemen that I should postpone the motion, I shall do so cheerfully.

Mr. MITCHELL. The course which the right hon. gentleman is now adopting is one which has been pursued for the last two or three Sessions. It has been my duty—and, at times, I may say, it was a painful duty—to find fault with the Government for taking away the rights of private members. I have objected for the last three or four Sessions to this course. The reasons given by the right hon. gentleman are two-fold. First, he says that it is inconvenient to have a debate adjourned over and then resumed after intervening days—say from Friday until Tuesday. Well, he can obviate that difficulty by giving us Tuesday for private business, and taking Thursday and Friday together for Government business. The other reason for the motion, he says, is that, when hon. gentlemen go to their homes and find how late the season is, they will be glad to come back and get through with the business of the House, and get away again. Now, no one will be more pleased than I will to have the business of the Session concluded, but we have a duty to perform, and if there is any difficulty in that state of things, it lies at the door of the right hon. gentleman, who, instead of bringing on the elections in the fall, or in a suitable season, brought them on at a time the most unfavorable, when we were subjected to the dangers and troubles of an election contest, in the month of February, in the depths of one of the worst winters I have ever experienced. So that if there is any blame on that score it lies at the door of the Premier, who controls this Government. I do not think he can fairly put that forward as a reason. I am not going to oppose his taking Thursday, because I think it makes very little difference what we do. The country is a despotism now; it is ruled and controlled by the will of the hon. gentleman. All he has to do is to raise his finger, and he can carry any legislation he chooses in this House. It is true, he defers to this side of the House, but it is the soft tongue that speaks, and the iron hand is felt.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will gladly take all the blame that attaches to me, but the hon. gentleman says I am responsible for our having the worst winter that has been known for many years. The hon. gentleman says I rule this House, but I certainly do not command the power over the elements. He says it was my fault that the elections were brought on so late. The reason they were brought on so late was that until the voters' lists under the new franchise law were completed, it was impossible to carry out the spirit of the Legislature. We could not make up an electorate before having all those returns in.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about Chambly?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is an exceptional case, and the great objection that was made by the Opposition to that premature election so convinced the Government that they had better carry out the full constitutional principle, that they did carry it out.

Motion agreed to.

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY ACTS.

On the order for Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on which to found an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be graciously pleased to effectuate the altered policy stated to the House of Commons on the 5th February, 1884, and in pursuance thereof to leave to their operation any Acts of the Local Legislature, not otherwise objectionable, which have been or may be passed for the construction of railway lines within the original Province of Manitoba (Mr. Watson),

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman who has that motion in charge has kindly consented to carry out the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that we should go on *de die in diem* until we had concluded the tariff.

Mr. WATSON. With the arrangement that has been made between the leader of the Opposition and the Government I certainly have no objection, but I would like to have a day set for the discussion of this question. My hope was that it would have been disposed of long before this. I would move that this question be the first Order a week from Thursday, and that it then remain the first Order until disposed of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is Thursday, the 26th. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has no objection to that we will fix that day either for disallowance or for the franchise, just as he chooses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Disallowance.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed the further consideration of Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means May 13th.

Agricultural machines and implements, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the present tariff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. Minister know what increased cost will be entailed on the manufacturers of these goods by the increased iron duties?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it will be very considerable. There is no increase in the tariff on steel, and that, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a very important item in the manufacture of agricultural implements. As I explained to the House last night, the basis on which this tariff is constructed, not with mathematical exactness, but

as a general principle, is to impose two-thirds of the American tariff on pig iron, that is, \$4 instead of \$6, and to apply in a general way the same principle to all the various manufactures of iron up to the highest stage. I find that the application of that principle would not increase this amount, because the protection given to agricultural implements in the United States has not been relatively so great as it is in this country, and considering that the implement makers have practically the command of the market under the present tariff, that they are so thoroughly established, and that the excellence of their manufacture is so completely recognised, that it is impossible for any person from outside to come in and interfere with them, I think this duty may safely be left at its present figure without any person suffering.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman consider that it is necessary to leave the tariff on agricultural implements at its present high rate in order to protect the manufacturers of agricultural implements in this country? Does he think, in the advanced position of that industry, that 35 per cent. is necessary to protect it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find myself very much embarrassed between the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, and the hon. gentleman who preceded him. I understood the hon. member for South Brant to be anxious that we should encourage the makers of agricultural implements.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wanted the information as to what the increased cost on those articles would be?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I think the tendency of the question was to exhibit a certain amount of interest in the agricultural implement makers. I think on one side it is very desirable that that great industry should be sufficiently protected. I think it is sufficiently protected, and I do not think the protection given it has injured in any way the people who are obliged to purchase and use those implements. It has not, I believe, been found to increase the cost. The country has been furnished with very excellent agricultural implements, and at prices not exceeding those which were paid at the time this increased duty was levied. But I certainly would not like to go back and treat this industry exceptionally by reducing the amount of protection granted at a time when, as the hon. member for South Brant has said, the cost of iron which they used is naturally increased.

Mr. WATSON. I had hoped that this Session the Government would have seen fit, in making these changes in the tariff, to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. In 1883, when the duty on agricultural implements was 25 per cent., the manufacturers came to Ottawa and asked, not for an increase in the duty, but to have the raw material admitted free. This the Government refused. They maintained the duty on coal and iron, and to satisfy the manufacturers gave them 10 per cent. increase in the duty on manufactured goods. Now, the duty has been taken off anthracite coal, which is used largely by the manufacturers, as a set-off to the increased duties on iron. We find now he does admit that the duty imposed on iron is going to make it more expensive to the manufacturer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not understand me, I hope, to say, at any period of the discussion, I did not expect there would be any increase, in the first instance, in the cost of iron under the new arrangement.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always tried to make the House believe that the duty was not paid by the consumer. Now, we find it is the consumer that pays, and in every instance we bring the duty home to the farmer, who has to pay the extra duty imposed for

the purpose of building up a few industries of Canada. I think it would be perfectly in order for the Finance Minister to propose that the farmer should receive a bounty on growing wheat. If this system of protection and giving bounties is going to benefit the country, let it be carried out in its entirety. Let all classes benefit by it. The iron producers are to have a bounty and increased protection, and the farmers, who have to pay the increased duty on their implements, ought to receive a bounty on their growing wheat. In Manitoba we have no manufacturers of farming implements, and we feel there we have not only to pay the duty of 35 per cent. on the manufactured goods, but the duty on the raw material that goes into the manufacture of those goods. We find the duty is increased on iron, and the Minister of Finance admits now that it will increase the cost to the manufacturer. The result will be that, instead of the consumer of those articles having to pay 35 per cent. on the manufactured goods, he will have to pay the increased duty on the raw material as well, or, he will have to pay from 40 to 45, and in some cases, 50 per cent., in order to build up those manufactures. I must say that I regret the Minister of Finance has not taken the farming community into consideration. We were told by the hon. member for Cape Breton, that in Cape Breton there were the most valuable iron mines and coal mines in the world, in close proximity to cheap freight. Yet, with all these advantages, the Minister of Finance finds it necessary to protect iron at the rate of \$4 a ton and \$1.50 bounty. The production of grain, I hold, is of equal importance to this iron industry, and I contend the farmers should be considered in these tariff changes.

Mr. MADILL. I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance on his able Budget speech. With reference to the question of duty on agricultural implements, it is an undoubted fact that, notwithstanding the duty, agricultural implements are cheaper to-day than they were before the introduction of the National Policy. When we had no duty on agricultural implements, the manufacturers of the United States controlled the Canadian market, and we had to pay just what they demanded; but after we imposed a duty, the result was, not only did we get implements cheaper from the United States, but the capitalists of the United States came over to Canada and established industries here, employing our own labor to develop our own country, instead of as formerly, importing our labor to develop the United States. Another matter discussed last night, to which I may refer, was the charge of misrepresentation on the part of the Ministers of the Crown during the last election, with reference to the public debt. Our opponents, during that campaign, declared that the country was being ruined by misgovernment, and that our public debt was more than we could bear. Last night hon. gentlemen opposite made the charge that Ministers of the Crown and their supporters had actually stated before the people the amount of the public debt as it stood on the 30th June, 1885, for that on the 30th June, 1886. I had the pleasure of listening to several Ministers of the Crown during the elections, and I know that, in reference to the public debt, they based their calculations on the last Public Accounts published in 1886, and gave the amount of public debt on the 30th June, 1885, as \$196,407,692. I hold in my hand the statement published by the Government, giving the amount of public debt on that occasion, and hon. members on the other side, particularly the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), acknowledged they had this document in their possession during the campaign. This document gives the amount of the public debt on the 30th June, 1885, the net debt of the Dominion of Canada, as \$196,000,000, and this was the statement of the debt made by Ministers of the Crown.

Ontario, to my knowledge. In reference to the public debt, I made up my mind that, if there was one member more than another on the Reform side of the House who has studied the exact position of our public debt, it was the ex-Finance Minister of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He placed the gross amount of public debt at \$280,000,000. We quoted the amount of the public debt of Canada on 30th June, 1855, as \$284,000,000, giving the hon. gentleman the benefit of \$4,000,000. The hon. gentleman forgot the amount of \$20,000,000 received by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the amount of the loan which had been granted to them some years ago. Hon. gentlemen claimed this was a gift, that it would never be repaid, and were, therefore, unwilling to tell the people that their prophecies were false; but deducting this \$20,000,000 you reduce the amount of our debt to \$264,000,000. Then, the Dominion Government had assets bearing interest to the extent of \$68,000,000, deducting which you have the net debt of the Dominion on the 30th June, 1855, \$196,000,000. Since Confederation, there were paid to the different Provinces \$106,000,000. This was not for debt incurred by the present Dominion Government under the present Premier, or under the leadership of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie.) They were amounts raised by the various Provinces since Confederation, and assumed by the Dominion Government, and deducting these from the \$196,000,000 you have \$90,000,000. Then you will find a published statement of the hon. Mr. Blake that the Reform Government, during the five years they were in power, were responsible for \$42,500,000 of that. Take it at \$40,000,000 in round numbers, and you find that the Reform Government, in five years, increased the public debt at the rate of \$8,000,000 a year. Then, the Government led by the right hon. gentleman is responsible for \$50,000,000. That Government has been in power for fourteen years, so that it has increased the public debt by about \$4,000,000 a year. Notwithstanding the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the burdens which have been placed on the people, and as to the increase of the public debt, it is clear that they increased the public debt at double the rate it has been increased by the Government of the right hon. gentleman. Now, taking the gross amount of the debt, as stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other day, after the delivery of the Budget speech, you find that he agrees that the gross debt now is \$225,000,000. According to the same calculation, we find that out of this the Reform Government was responsible for \$40,000,000, or \$8,000,000 a year during the five years it was in office, and the Government of the present leader of the House is responsible for \$79,000,000 during fifteen years, or \$5,265,000 a year, against the \$8,000,000 of our opponents. So much for the public debt. Then our friends opposite speak in doleful tones about the amount of the taxation, about the increase of the burdens of the people under this National Policy. I thought, after the Malvern speech of the leader of the Opposition, we would not have any longer to defend the principles of the National Policy. We have there the swallowing of the National Policy sword, according to Mr. Grip, and, according to that paper, we have the hon. member for South Oxford standing by and saying "the sword is a real sword, and the swaller is a real swaller." We thought, after that, when our Reform friends, during the last election, had taken back all they had said against the National Policy during the eight years previously, that it would not be necessary for us any more to defend the National Policy. They speak about the question of taxation. We know that the price of all agricultural implements, notwithstanding the taxation, is lower than it was before the introduction of the National Policy. You have heard in this House yesterday, that the duty charged on all the lower grades of

Mr. MADILL.

sugar is lower under this tariff than it was under the Cartwright policy, so that the sugar which is used by the workingmen of this country is lower in price than it was before the adoption of the National Policy; therefore, if the articles we use, if the necessaries of life are cheaper to-day than before the National Policy was introduced, where does the taxation affect the workingmen of this country? It is true there are higher duties on luxuries, because the people who use them are supposed to be able to pay for them, but the necessaries of life are lower in price to-day than they were before the introduction of the National Policy. There are some articles, of course, on which the duties are much higher. There are some articles in regard to which it is optional with hon. gentlemen opposite whether they contribute to the revenue or not. There is an amount of \$3,500,000 raised by duties on spirits, there is an amount of \$400,000 raised by the duties upon malt and malt liquors, there is \$700,000 raised upon cigars, and \$1,610,000 upon tobacco. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that it is optional with them whether they will contribute one cent towards this large sum of \$6,210,000 which goes into the revenue. If they do not desire to contribute to the revenue in this respect, I ask them not to drink whiskey, not to drink malt liquors, and not to smoke; but if they drink whiskey or malt liquors, or if they smoke tobacco or cigars, they are contributing to that amount of revenue by the duties which are levied upon whiskey, malt liquors, cigars and tobacco. They need not contribute one cent of this unless they desire, but, if they do, they cannot blame the Government for raising that amount by the imposition of a duty upon liquors and cigars. I have discussed the amount of the public debt and have shown the amount which is due to hon. gentlemen opposite, as compared with that which is due to the Government supported by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But the people naturally ask what have we received for the amount of public debt which has been incurred by the respective Governments? What have we got under the Government which preceded the present Premier? What public works have they established in the interests of the people of Canada in return for the amount of money which they added to the public debt? We have, according to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), as reported in the *Globe* newspaper, an increase of the public debt during the five years of that régime amounting to \$42,500,000. I ask members of the opposite side of the House what public works we have to show for this large addition to the public debt? We have the Kaministiquia works, the St. Francis locks, and the Neebing Hotel, which is standing—at least I do not know whether it is standing or not—but which is there in the wilderness, a monument of Reform extravagance in this country. Then we have \$79,000,000 added to the debt during the fifteen years the present Premier has been in power, or \$5,260,000 a year. We have, in addition to that, the sums which have been expended in the construction of public works from year to year out of the ordinary revenue of the country, amounting to \$34,000,000 over and above what is charged to the public debt. What have we to show for that expenditure? We have the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, binding the Maritime Provinces together, which were isolated before; we have the opening up of the highways of the Dominion; we have the widening and deepening of the canals; we have the light-houses established in order to open up the highways of the country, and we have the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—a band of iron stretching from ocean to ocean, and binding all the Provinces of this Confederation in one bond of union under the régime of the present leader of the Government. And we must remember that that railway, built by five millions of people, in the short time of its construction has won the admiration of the people of the whole world. If the leader of the present Government had done

nothing else during his long *régimé* than to accomplish the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he would have earned the eternal gratitude of the people of this country. Our friends on the other side take the ground that that railway has been built too soon. We have to-day, as a result of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Canada, a standing army of 40,000 employes, earning at the rate of \$250,000 a month in wages, which would not now accrue to the people of this country had the policy of the Opposition been carried out in respect to the rapid construction of that road. Now, we have every evidence of the prosperity of our country under the National Policy, and I say the House and the country should congratulate the Finance Minister upon the cheerful and hopeful tone of the speech, as regards the future of this country, which he was able to deliver to this House as a result of the National Policy. In reference to the public debt, I know that during the last elections, Grit orators attempted to make the people believe that they would be called upon, the day after the elections, to pay \$45 or \$50 for every man, woman and child in this Dominion, as their share of the public debt; and they went so far as to calculate how many waggons it would take to carry this sum in gold or silver which represents the public debt. Sir, I think the action of the Government in reference to the public debt may be compared to a prudent man who purchases an unimproved farm for, we will say, \$1,000, and not having the money on hand, he borrows that sum at a higher rate of interest than he otherwise would, because he cannot give good security; he spends that sum in addition to his own labor in clearing, draining, fencing and improving the farm, and erecting buildings thereon. When the time comes to repay that \$1,000, having spent it on his farm, he is not able to do so, and he borrows that sum, but this time at a lower rate of interest, because he was able to give a better security. The first \$1,000 that he spent on the farm, made his security better, and he can now borrow money at a lower rate of interest, and when the time comes for the repayment of the second sum, he has been able to save enough money to pay it all. That is the principle upon which our Government have borrowed money, and it is on the very same principle that the credit of our Government stands so high in the financial market of the world, since the introduction of the National Policy, since they are now able to borrow money cheaper than they could before the introduction of that policy, and we are now able to pay the loans made by our opponents at a higher rate of interest, and thus make a saving to the people of this country in the difference between the rates of interest. Another illustration of the prosperity of the country is the amount of deposits in the savings banks and the chartered banks of this Dominion. In 1868, the amount deposited in the savings banks of the Dominion was \$4,363,000; in 1878, the amount had increased to \$14,222,000. According to the last financial statement given in the Budget speech the other day, there are now deposited of the hard-earned money of the workmen and mechanics of this country, \$45,072,818. But an hon. gentleman opposite complained the other day that the Government allowed four per cent. interest on savings bank deposits, which is a higher rate than is allowed in the banks. Now, let us take the deposits in the banks at three per cent. interest, and see what the increase has been. We find that in 1868, the amount deposited in the chartered banks was \$32,808,000; in the last year of the financial administration of the Dominion, by the hon. gentleman opposite, in 1878, the deposits amounted to \$66,503,757. What, according to the financial statements of the hon. Minister the other day, is the present amount of deposits in these banks under a three per cent. rate of interest? It is no less a sum than \$103,583,260. Now, while we find these evidences of the prosperity of the country, we find at the same

time that the necessaries of life are cheaper to-day than they were before the introduction of the National Policy; we find that the taxation is placed upon luxuries, while it rests very lightly on the poor man. Therefore, I say, in face of all these evidences of prosperity in this Dominion, the hon. Minister of Finance is to be congratulated by this House that his hopeful views of the future are so well warranted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman from North Ontario (Mr. Madill) —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to make a suggestion before he proceeds? Of course, I did not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman from North Ontario, who was addressing the House with so much ability for the first time; but it appears to me that it would be better to continue to take up the remaining portion of the tariff and deal with it, and postpone the general discussion of the tariff to another stage. It was understood, at the outset, that during the whole discussion upon the Bill, and at every stage of it, there would be the amplest opportunity of discussing the whole question. I would suggest to my hon. friend opposite, whether it would not be desirable to confine the discussion to-day until we have gone through with the tariff, and then at a future stage deal with those questions that are opened up by the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quite willing to concede that the proposition made by the Minister of Finance is a reasonable one. Some positions were advanced by the hon. member for North Ontario, and I felt called upon upon to reply in respect to one or two points merely. With the hon. Finance Minister's permission, I will refer to two points only, and very briefly. I understood the hon. gentleman to attempt to relieve the Ministry from the charge of having concealed from the country, during the last general elections, the state of the public debt. Now, Sir, I think the Ministry were guilty beyond all question of concealing the actual condition of the finances of this country. They must have been aware of the amount of the net public debt on the 30th June last. Last Session questions were asked in the House of Commons every month as to the condition of the debt, as to the amount of net debt and the gross debt upon the first of each month, and each question was answered in this House, except the question with regard to the net debt on the first day of June. The last answer given to this question was on the 5th of May, when we were informed that the net debt on the first of May was \$205,569,000. Now, whatever may be true as to the politicians in the country, whatever may be true as to the majority of the members of this House, I am not willing to believe that the occupants of the Treasury benches were so ignorant as not to be aware that these questions were asked, and as not to be aware, from the answers, what the condition of the public debt was on each occasion. Now, we had published last year the amount of the deficit on the 30th June; that was given in the *Toronto Mail*. That journal stated that the amount of expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund was something over \$39,000,000. We had various items of information that are contained in the annual statements made in the Public Accounts, bringing the year down to the 30th June; but we did not have a statement of the amount of the public debt, and I believe that the reason was that the Ministry designed to conceal, and purposely did conceal, the condition of the finances as regards the public debt. They went about the country quoting the public debt, not according to the last official statement made in this House, but giving the amount on 30th June, 1885, \$196,000,000, when they knew, by a statement made in this House, it had reached \$205,569,000 on 1st May, and when each one must have known that it was \$223,000,000 on 30th June. So much for the question as to whether the Ministry concealed from the people the condition of the finances as regards the

amount of the public debt. One word more as to the statement made by the hon. gentleman with respect to the increase of the public debt during the various Administrations. He took the position that under the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) the net public debt of Canada increased as rapidly as during any other term, and that the Reform Administration was equally culpable with other Administrations for the rapid and enormous increase of the public debt. Now, the public debt, it is true, did increase under the Administration of the hon. member for East York. I think the increase during his Administration was in round numbers \$32,000,000, between \$32,000,000 and \$34,000,000—I do not pretend to speak with absolute accuracy, but it did not exceed \$34,000,000. The question is with respect to the responsibility of the hon. gentleman; what proportion of that increase was due to his policy, and what proportion was caused by his carrying out obligations entered into by his predecessor, which rested upon him as administrator of public affairs? That is the question, and when we come to examine it in that light we find that not \$100,000 of that total increase of debt amounting to nearly \$34,000,000 is strictly chargeable to the Administration of my hon. friend. He had to carry out the Government's obligations with respect to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with respect to the enlargement of the canals; he had to carry out contracts made with reference to public buildings in this city, and in carrying out those obligations placed upon the country by his predecessors, and which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was compelled to discharge, the entire amount of the increase of the public debt was caused.

Mr. MADILL. Why did the hon. gentleman not cancel contracts made by the previous Government?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Intercolonial Railway was half built. Was it to be supposed that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) would proceed to cancel the contracts and throw away money already expended, when the country had determined on engaging in the construction of that work. Then there were the contracts for enlarging the canals; and was it to be supposed that the works were to be abandoned and the money expended to be wasted in order to cease the accumulation of debt. It is not to be supposed that such a course could be adopted. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) simply proceeded to carry out the obligations entered into by his predecessor a great number of which he had opposed, but which it was his duty, as leader of the Administration, to discharge. He proceeded to do so, and he did so, and in doing so the amount of the public debt accumulated under his Administration. I wished to meet these two points: first, to show that the Ministry designedly concealed the actual condition of the public debt when they went into the election contest in February last, to the extent of over \$27,000,000; and second, to show that the increase of the public debt which took place under the Administration of my hon. friend was due to measures for the inception of which he was not responsible, but which were obligations incurred by his predecessor.

Mr. FREEMAN. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman who has just sat down a question or two with respect to the public debt. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power from 1874 to 1878.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was present when I made the suggestion that we should adjourn this discussion until we had gone through the tariff resolutions, that we should confine ourselves to the tariff, and at a further stage resume the debate on the general question.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Some of the speeches made have reminded me very much of speeches made on the
Mr. CHARLTON.

motion with respect to Ireland by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and others: there was a good deal of electioneering about them. I feel, however, that the country is pretty safe, notwithstanding the lamentations uttered by several hon. gentlemen. The leader of the Opposition is out of his place, having gone home to the bosom of his family, I suppose. The hon. gentleman who acts as his first assistant, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is also absent, and when a question of such importance to the country is being discussed I think those hon. gentlemen, if there was any great danger, would be at their posts.

Mr. MILLS. I would just say that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is attending his mother's funeral.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I am very sorry to hear of the hon. gentleman's loss. I do not agree with the views advanced by several members with respect to free trade. I am opposed to free trade; I am in favor of the National Policy, and have always been so. I believe the National Policy has done more to advance the material and commercial interests of Canada than any other legislation passed by this Parliament. Believing, as I do, that the National Policy is of great importance, still, I think there should be a limit to its bounds. When this policy was first introduced a duty of 25 per cent. was imposed on agricultural implements. I thought that was quite sufficient to encourage the manufacturers of Ontario and enable them to compete successfully with any rivals. But next year the manufacturers asked for an additional duty, thus showing conclusively that the duty had at least cost the farmers 10 per cent. It is claimed that the duty has been the means of lowering the price of implements, and that they are now made cheaper in Canada than before. No doubt it has had that effect to some extent; but when Parliament was asked to add 10 per cent. additional to the 25 per cent. it is positive proof that such an imposition of duties is against the interests of the farmers. I claim that agriculture is the greatest industry of Canada. The husbandmen of the country are referred to in every speech delivered at the opening of Parliament, and it is a matter of very great importance that every assistance should be given to the agricultural industry, and it should be the duty of the Government to be as lenient as possible in imposing taxation on implements for the use of farmers. This is a matter in which the whole community is interested. Cheap living is one great source of wealth to a nation, and if taxes are high they must to some extent tend to increase the price of living. We in the North-West Territories are entirely, I may say, an agricultural community; we are far off from Ontario, and if it were not for the National Policy we could get our implements from Minneapolis and other places in the United States, a great deal cheaper. I do not ask that the duty shall be taken off, but I know of my own knowledge that the manufacturers of Ontario have formed a combination by which binders and other implements shall not be sold below a certain price. They were not satisfied with the protection of 35 per cent. which was given them, but they combined to prevent a free competition among themselves, by arranging that these implements should not be sold for less than a certain price. I hold that 25 per cent. would be a sufficient duty, as they would then either have to sell them cheaper or get reduced rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, so I think that 35 per cent. duty on agricultural implements is an injustice to the people of the North-West. I believe that the Government are willing to arrange this tariff to suit the best interests of the country. It has been said to me that Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and the other older Provinces bought the North-West, and that, therefore, they have a right to the markets of that country. Well, it is true that to a certain extent they did make the negotia-

tions for the purchase of that country many years ago, but they have been well repaid for their investment. We have enabled them to give 25,000,000 acres of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway at the rate of \$2.50 per acre. It does not matter if the land is not worth a dollar, or even 2½d. per acre, it has answered its purpose, as part of the terms of payment to the railway, under the contract with the company. This cry about buying the North-West is largely a delusion, because, as I have said, we have contributed all that land, and it is nearly all in the district I represent. Hon. gentlemen may think this is a strong statement, but it is, nevertheless, a true one. Our western country is a large country, so large that in many of our ranches there, some of these eastern Provinces about which they are making so much noise, would hardly make a calf-pasture for us. To make that country prosperous and thriving, nothing would be a greater advantage to us than to encourage agricultural industry, and no better way of doing that can be found than by making the implements which are used to till the soil a little cheaper than they are to-day. There is no doubt that when this matter comes up again the Minister of Finance will see the justice of reducing the duty on these implements from 35 to 25 per cent. I believe the existence of that high duty is a hindrance to immigration, because when people tell their friends about the high duties which they pay, and how they are at the mercy of a few manufacturers, I believe it works greater injury to the country than the railway monopoly.

Mr. DALY. I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia East (Mr. Perley), to pass without saying a few words in reply to him. I was rather startled to hear him making these remarks, in face of the fact that I stood on the same platform with him during his election contest, and heard him make statements directly contrary to those which he has uttered to-day. I totally deny the statement of the hon. gentleman that the increased duty upon these articles affects the price to the farmers. I discussed this question among my constituents very fully during the last election, and they were thoroughly satisfied that the result of this duty has been to reduce the price of these implements to a lower rate than before that duty was imposed. We have also the proud satisfaction of knowing that, to-day, the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West are not using the American implements to which the hon. gentleman referred, but are using implements of Canadian manufacture—implements made out of Canadian material, on Canadian soil, by Canadian workmen. If you take the article of binders, you can to-day buy the steel binder of the Massey Manufacturing Company in Brandon, for \$190 in cash. The same article was sold, three or four years ago, for from \$240 to \$300; the decrease being due to the fact that the increased duty has created competition, which has in turn lowered the price. If you take the implements made by the Massey Company, Harris & Son, Elliott & Co., and others, you will find that they are giving the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West just as good an article as you can get in Dakota or Minnesota. This all-steel binder of the Massey Company is made from the latest American patterns, and not only has the price of these Canadian implements been reduced to the North-West farmers, but the competition has had the effect of reducing the price of the American implements to the same extent to those who choose to buy them, just because the American manufacturers found that they could not meet the competition unless they brought down the price. More than that, we have the satisfaction of knowing that there are very few people in Manitoba who wish to use these American implements; the best evidence that such people are in the minority is the fact that they have sent four representatives to support the right hon. gentleman and his policy. It is not that the people of Manitoba are ignorant

of this question; we discussed it on every platform throughout the length and breadth of the country. They knew then, as they know now, that the National Policy was not affecting them in the manner indicated by the last speaker; if they had not thought so they would not have sent four members to support the Government, but would have elected representatives of the same stripe as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I heard the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) speak about taking off the duty on flour and lumber.

Mr. MITCHELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I never mentioned anything about taking the duty off lumber.

Mr. DALY. I understood him to say flour and lumber.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, coal and cornmeal.

Mr. DALY. The effect of taking the duty off flour would be that the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories would not have the market for their flour which they have at the present time. I have friends who come from the same part of the country as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and they tell me that the price of flour has not increased there since the National Policy was introduced; but that, instead of those people down by the sea using American flour, they are now using Canadian flour ground out of the hard Fyfe wheat which we raise in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Besides this duty has enabled our millers, such as Ogilvie & Co., McMillan & Co., and others, to send their flour into the British Columbia market and compete with the millers of Oregon, so that, as far as the duty on flour is concerned, the people of the North-West Territories are being benefited, because it has enabled them to increase the market for their produce. With regard to the duty on lumber, instead of our people in Manitoba using American lumber, as they did three or four years ago, they are using Canadian lumber, at a reduction in price of from 35 or 40 per cent. In connection with this, I will give you a few figures showing the difference there is in these prices. First quality American siding is now delivered at Brandon at \$48.25 per thousand; Canadian lumber from Rat Portage, of the same quality, sells for \$39.30, or a difference in favor of the Canadian lumber of \$8.95. In the second grade the difference is \$10.20 in favor of the Canadian; and on the third, \$8.95; on the fourth, \$6.70, and so on down. In every grade of lumber the farmers of Manitoba are using the Canadian article, at prices much lower than those they were obliged to pay before the Canadian Pacific Railway connected them with Rat Portage. Not only so, but we are able to foster those industries which have been established along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, east of Winnipeg. More than that, the gentleman who writes to me states that if railway rates are maintained at their present figure there is a possibility in the near future of the British Columbia market being able to compete with Rat Portage in the supply of lumber for Manitoba. So that, so far as the building of houses and barns and other buildings in Manitoba is concerned, the question of cheap lumber has been solved. Then, we come to the question of canned goods. I heard a great deal during my election of the sufferings of the farmers with regard to canned goods; but we find that almost all the canned goods used in Manitoba to-day are of Canadian manufacture. I mention this, because I have heard gentlemen from Ontario say that the farmers are suffering from the National Policy. I would ask hon. gentlemen, and especially the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whose county raises fruit, to see how many desiccated and dried apple and fruit canning establishments have been started since the National Policy was inaugurated; and where is the market for these goods? It is in the Province of Manitoba and North-West Territories. But for the National Policy, instead of our dealing exclusively in Canadian canned goods, we would be using Ameri-

can canned goods. Take the article of peaches. You can buy canned peaches—

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. If I understood aright it was arranged across the House that we should confine ourselves strictly to the item of the tariff at the time under discussion, and that afterwards general questions of this kind could be discussed. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance if he did not request the hon. member for North Norfolk to cut his remarks short, and confine himself simply to the item in question. If we are going to proceed in this way we had better open up the whole question, but if we are going to confine ourselves to the various questions as they come up, we had better do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say the understanding was, and it is entirely in the judgment of the House to take any course it is disposed to take—that we should confine ourselves to the discussion of the particular subject under consideration. But, of course, both speeches, that of the hon. member for East Assiniboia, and that of the hon. gentleman who has just been speaking, have been entirely on the question of agricultural implements, and there is no desire to limit the discussion on the item before the House. But I should be extremely glad, until these items are disposed of, that the discussion should be confined to them. After that the wider question can be taken up.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that flour and corn meal and canned fruits are not agricultural implements.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am strictly in order, and I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that unless they conduct themselves with more courtesy to gentlemen on this side of the House, they will be here a great deal longer than they anticipate. We have tolerated this sort of discourtesy until it has become intolerable. We are anxious, in good faith, in order to promote the public business, to meet the wishes of the Minister of Finance, but I am sorry to say the supporters of the hon. gentleman persist in a line of discussion altogether at variance with the understanding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Flour and lumber are subjects very close to agricultural implements.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was just calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the discussion on flour and corn meal and peaches and lumber are far away from the subject of agricultural implements.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I rise to a point of order. I should like to ask whether any hon. member of this House can make a threat to a body of gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was not a threat. It was merely a statement of fact.

Mr. DALY. According to the wish of the Minister of Finance, I will confine myself to the subject of agricultural implements. I regret very much that the arguments I was using have fallen so hot on gentlemen on the other side of the House. I can tell the hon. member for Bothwell that he need not throw any threats across the floor, because we can attend to him on the question of fruits when we come to that question. With regard to agricultural implements, I started by saying that all kinds of implements could be bought in Manitoba to-day at lower prices than they could be got for before the duty was raised. More than that, I stated, and facts will bear me out, that the eastern manufacturers, having the market in Manitoba for agricultural implements, have been able to increase their production. I find, looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the total duties paid in Manitoba on agricultural implements last year, was \$11,383.63, a most infinitesimal sum when

Mr. DALY.

you take into consideration that the total Customs duties in the Province for the last fiscal year amounted to \$467,212. More than that, I find, by returns made by the Board of Trade of Brandon, that agricultural implements to the amount of \$400,000 were sold in that city alone last year. So that, so far as agricultural implements are concerned, I do not agree with the hon. member for East Assiniboia, or with the hon. member for Marquette, that the duty on them is injuring the farmers of that country. On the contrary, they are getting a better article on better terms of payment, and they know it is of Canadian manufacture, and that to many of them is a greater satisfaction than it would be to get American implements at even half the price.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I am not an opponent of the National Policy, but I contend that 25 per cent. is sufficient duty, and I think the argument of my hon. friend that American implements are imported is an argument in my favor, for if they are imported under a tariff of 35 per cent., it is no more effective in keeping them out than would be a tariff of 25 per cent. I am as strong an advocate of the National Policy as my hon. friend is, but I think there is a bound for it, and when we go beyond that bound we injure the country. I am here to tell how the matter is affecting the constituents I represent, and I tell you there is a strong feeling in the North-West against this duty on agricultural implements. If the manufacturers cannot manufacture under a 25 per cent tariff, I think it shows that we are paying something in consideration of the duty.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not intend to say anything on this subject, but as the North-West has been brought into the discussion I wish to say that I entirely endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). My hon. friend's arguments are sound, and his facts are undoubted. In western Assiniboia, which I have the honor to represent, and, with the leave of my hon. friend behind me, I will add eastern Assiniboia, which I know well, the general feeling is one, as it is throughout the entire North-West, in support of the National Policy; and there is not a man in Canada, however influential he might be, or whatever local or other influences he might bring to bear, who could be elected for any one of these constituencies if he were not a supporter of the Government and of the National Policy. My hon. friend from eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) is, no doubt, deeply interested in the welfare of his constituents, but I am perfectly certain he misapprehends their sentiments on this head, and misapprehends the meaning of the alternate tariffs which he has discussed. Why, I have here the amount of duty paid in the North-West on agricultural implements during the last year; it amounts to \$3,946. If you divide that by the population you get a sum that is entirely insignificant.

Mr. PLATT. What has that to do with it?

Mr. DAVIN. It shows that very few of those implements have been brought in from the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. Because the duties are so high.

Mr. DAVIN. That is one of the objects aimed at by the National Policy. I could give you, Sir, analogous figures—but I will not delay the House—to those brought forward by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and I could show you that Regina, Medicine Hat, and Calgary use Canadian implements made in London and Toronto, and get them at much cheaper prices than, and of as good a quality as, according to the testimony of farmers, they could the implements it appears my hon. and patriotic friend behind me would like to see brought in wholesale. In 1879 I saw in Winnipeg, ploughs, harrows, binders, agricultural implements of all sorts, made in the United States, costing something like 45 and 50 per cent. more than like agricul-

tural implements cost to-day, and each had the saucy American flag sticking over it, and that saucy little flag indicated what would be the effect on our great country in the west if we had pursued a policy different to that which has been pursued by a wise, far-seeing and patriotic Government.

Mr. WATSON. In conformity with the request of the Minister of Finance, I will not take up much time, but I must say, with reference to the remark made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), that his speech fell so hot on members on this side that we could not listen to him, that the matters mentioned by him have been discussed here before and in the Province of Manitoba. I am satisfied the people of Manitoba do not agree with the sentiments of the hon. gentleman. I will not follow him in his reference to a large number of articles, such as lumber, canned goods, agricultural implements, fence wire and binding twine, for all these matters have been discussed in this House before. He says the best evidence to show the sentiment of the people of the North-West is the fact that they have sent down four members to support this Government. If I were to enter into the reasons why four members were sent here to support the Government, I would probably excite another such discussion as was opened up by the senior and junior members for Halifax, and that would not be interesting to the House. With reference to the question of binders, the hon. gentleman has stated that he could buy field binders in Brandon for \$190. But what can he buy them for south of the international boundary? There he can buy the same steel binder for \$140.

Mr. HICKEY. You cannot do that in this country where the chances are greater.

Mr. WATSON. No, you cannot with 35 per cent. protection.

Mr. HICKEY. No, nor with 30 per cent.

Mr. WATSON. The duty has told heavily on the settlement of the North-West. The only difference between the hon. member for West Assiniboia, the hon. member for Selkirk, the hon. member for East Assiniboia and myself is that the two former are lawyers, and do not speak from the standpoint of farmers. The hon. member for East Assiniboia and myself spoke as practical farmers, men who buy the implements and use them. No argument can be used in favor of a high duty on agricultural implements, more especially from the standpoint of a representative from Manitoba or the North-West. The manufacturers of Canada and Ontario may have some excuse for supporting this duty, but no reasonable man from the east can say that a man from the west is acting in the interests of the west when he says 35 per cent. should be charged on implements used by every settler. This, along with other matters which may be discussed at a future day—the high tariff and the monopoly in railways—have been the cause of the statements being placed before us, that only 95,000 people are settled in Manitoba to-day. I would urge, with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley), that the Government should reduce this duty from 35 to 25 per cent. We are told that practically no American implements are sold to-day in the North-West. That is evidence that the duty of 35 per cent. is prohibitory. We have learned also that the manufacturers of the east charge every cent they possibly can to the consumer in the west, and form combinations to keep up the prices of their goods. This shows clearly that the monopolies encouraged by the present Administration are exacting every cent they can out of the farmer, and I do not speak particularly of the farmer in the North-West, because I know a large number of the farmers in Ontario to-day who buy American implements. I know of men who have left Manitoba, and have given as their reason for going, the

high tariff placed on the necessaries used by the settler. If time would permit me, I could show that in 1883, when you offered a free homestead to the settler in Manitoba, he had to pay in the first 12 months, on the necessaries he required to set himself up as a homesteader, \$1 a homestead in duty. This question interests the people of Manitoba and the North-West more than any other portions of the Dominion. I am surprised to find the hon. member for Selkirk, (Mr. Daly) said he believed this duty of 35 per cent. and the duty on lumber were all right. The only reason I can give for his making that statement is that he is a lawyer and not a practical farmer, and does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. DALY. I may be a lawyer, I am a lawyer, I do not deny it; but I tell the hon. gentleman that I come more in contact with farmers than he does, even if he is a farmer, and I am inclined to deny that he is.

Mr. WATSON. What am I?

Mr. DALY. Well, that is what I have been trying to find out for a long time. I may say that, upon every platform on which the hon. gentleman's political friends appeared at a meeting during my election, this question was discussed. In fact it was discussed on every platform in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and, if the hon. gentleman cannot rise and say that my argument was not good, that the subject was not discussed, and the people of Manitoba and the people of the North-West Territories had not given their verdict upon this question by sending four members from Manitoba and four members from the North-West Territories to support the right hon. gentleman, then I think the House will see that the question has been fully discussed and acted upon by those people. I assert that the people in Manitoba to-day are not paying a dollar more upon agricultural implements than they were before the introduction of the National Policy. More than that, I deny that you can buy a steel binder south of the line for \$150. The price in Fargo, Dakota, is \$190, the same price for which he can buy it in Brandon. I obtained that information from Fargo, Dakota, and used it in my election and I repeat that here. I regret that we cannot go further into the discussion of this matter.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman has been trying, he states, to find out what I was. I have been trying to make my living in Manitoba by farming for the past four years. I must admit that it is a very hard living. I believe lawyers' business is a little better than farming in the North-West.

Mr. LISTER. There is no tariff on it, is there?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know whether there is or not. I heard the hon. gentleman make a statement on a platform in a farming community in which he informed the people that, on account of the high rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people could not complain. He admitted that the rates were high on wheat, but he said: "You do not need to ship your wheat, you can make pork out of your wheat; feed it to your hogs and it will get into a smaller commodity." He said: "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not know whether you people know it or not, but you can get three cents a pound on green pork in Brandon to-day." That statement did not take very well with the farmers. They did not believe they could get three cents a pound for their pork. But I came to the conclusion then, as I do now, that the hon. gentleman knows little or nothing about farming, and cannot speak as a practical man of the operation of this duty on the farmers.

Mr. DALY. What I said at the meeting the hon. gentleman refers to was—and I got the laugh on the hon. gentleman—that the farmers were only getting 15 cents a bushel

for their frozen wheat, and were therefore feeding it to their hogs.

Mr. WATSON. It was last fall.

Mr. DALY. And consequently they were making money out of their frozen wheat. The hon. gentleman discussed this question of the tariff throughout Eastern Assiniboia; and he was asked at one meeting as to the duty on tea; and he said the duty upon tea was grinding the people down.

Mr. WATSON. No; I did not.

Mr. DALY. He was asked what the duty upon tea was; and he said: "I do not know much about tea; I am a farmer; but I think the duty is 17½ cents, or something of that kind." That shows how much the hon. gentleman knows about the National Policy, when the audience were able to tell him that there had not been any duty upon tea for some years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid we are getting away from agricultural implements.

Mr. WATSON. I am afraid we will get into a similar discussion to that which the senior and junior members for Halifax have been in for the last two or three weeks, and I for one do not wish to continue it; but the particular meeting to which the hon. gentleman refers and to which I referred was held last fall during the local campaign, when we had not a bushel of frozen wheat in the country.

Ferro-manganese, ferro-silicon, speigel, steel bloom ends and crop ends of steel rails, for the manufacture of steel, \$2 per ton.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we are now entering upon a very important industry, and I think it is the duty of the Finance Minister to explain in general terms, and in particular terms too, the grounds upon which the Government have made the very important changes they have. This industry affects almost every other industry in the country, and I think that before we pass these items, one after the other, we ought to have an exhaustive statement, to use the term of my hon. friend, in reference to the items we are asked to pass and in which everyone in the country has so deep an interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman had been in his place when I concluded my statement the other day, I think he would have considered it an exhaustive statement, and I was in hopes that would have avoided the necessity for inflicting a repetition of it upon the House. I stated to the House that this change in the tariff was intended to establish iron industries throughout Canada, by which we could make available the inexhaustible stores which we have of iron ore and coal, and the necessary fluxes for the production of iron under the most economical and favorable circumstances; that I knew that, in order to bring the necessary capital into this country for the purpose, it would be necessary, in the first instance, to impose much higher duties upon iron in almost all its phases than at present existed; that the result of that would be to build up great industries in Canada, giving employment to a vast number of people, and sustaining a greatly increased population in happiness and comfort; that I proposed to re-construct the iron tariff as it now existed, and as it certainly existed in a most unscientific form, on our Statute-book at present, and to adopt as the foundation of the proposed system to a large extent the American tariff, which had proved to be so eminently successful in the United States, that I had no doubt the same results would follow and that those results were that they were not only enabled to build up great and profitable industries all over the country, but that steadily the increased cost of iron, produced by the necessity of applying capital to that industry, would decrease until at no distant date the same thing would happen which happened

Mr. DALY.

in regard to the other industries which we had built up in Canada, the cotton industry, the woollen industry, and various other industries, in which, under the fostering protection of the tariff which was provided, capital was furnished, competition took place, and that competition resulted in bringing into those industries a much greater amount of skill than previously existed, with the effect at the same time of bringing those articles down to as low a price as ever existed in this country.

Mr. JONES. What amount of increased duty does the hon. gentleman expect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come to that in a moment. I took as a basis the American tariff, which was \$6 a ton upon pig iron. I propose in this tariff to increase the duty upon pig iron from \$2, as it is now, to \$4 a ton, that is two-thirds of the American duty. The Americans had given great attention to this subject, it had occupied their attention from year to year and they had appointed scientific and most elaborate commissions to go over the country and take testimonies, and investigate as to just how the duty could be so arranged as to weigh most equitably upon all classes of the people and upon the various productions of iron. I propose to take the two-thirds of their tariff as a sufficient increase of the duty upon pig iron especially in connection with the fact that we give a bounty of \$1.50 a ton which continues until 1889. I propose to take two-thirds of their tariff, and then to construct the duty, not with mathematical exactness, but on general principles, and carrying out the principles that underlies the tariff, and that is, giving to the labor an equal proportion of protection in regard to all the manufactures of iron. While the Canadian tariff gave the protection it does now, taking the bounty into consideration of \$3.50 a ton on pig iron, the puddled bar, which is an infinitely higher product of iron, which involves an enormously increased amount of labor, had only a protection under our present tariff of \$1.70 a ton at the outside. It was impossible under these circumstances to hope for the establishment of an iron industry in Canada, notwithstanding the very admirable position we occupy in the possession of raw material to any extent. While, as I say, I have not carried that out with mathematical exactness, still, as a general principle, that is the mode in which this tariff has been placed.

Mr. JONES. Taking the bounty and the duty together, what protection would that give, what percentage?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It gives a protection of \$5.50 on pig iron?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the duty *ad valorem* of pig iron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That would depend, of course, upon the value per ton of pig iron, which varies considerably. It would range, I should say from 20 to 30 per cent. according to value of the article itself. But as I said before, that is the principle that underlies this tariff. Then, I am asked by the hon. member for Halifax at what amount I estimate the increased revenue this will give. Well, of course, that is not a very easy question to answer, as the hon. gentleman will see, because a very considerable increase in the duty upon iron will very likely check considerably its importation for the first year, especially. I may say in general terms that the result of the increased duty would give, assuming that the importation continued about the same, and that there was none manufactured in the country, would give in the first year, according to the best calculation I can make, something like \$700,000 over the present duty. But, I expect, owing to the circumstances I have mentioned, that this large increase on the tariff will naturally check importation for the first

year. I do not rely upon over half a million as the increase in the amount received in the first year, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, it will involve the expenditure of a very large amount of capital, and it will take a considerable period of time to develop the industry. Provided I am right in anticipating, as I do, that capital will at once flow into the country for the purpose of developing this industry, it will still require considerable time, and no great advance could be made in that direction during the first year. I assume that during the first year we shall get an increased revenue from this additional impost upon iron of \$500 000 in round numbers, or perhaps a little more than that, but I do not expect more than that the first year. Then as capital comes into the country, as these iron industries are developed, as I have no doubt they will be under this policy, developed as rapidly as it is possible for an industry of that kind, involving so much labor and expense in placing it in a position to do business, of course the revenue will decrease in the second year, and probably we shall not have over a quarter of a million increased revenue from that source. So there will be a steady decrease in the amount received from the first year, until at the end of a few years it will be a comparatively small amount. If the policy be as successful as I expect, we shall steadily dispense with the necessity of importing a considerable quantity of iron. As I mentioned the other evening to the House, the consumption of iron by the people of Canada is now very great, is in a much greater ratio than the average consumption of other countries, and I anticipate that we not only will be able to provide almost all the iron that is demanded by the people of Canada, but that we shall be able steadily to reduce the cost of its production until not only we supply the entire country with an article of our own production, by our own people, developing our own resources, giving employment to a very largely increased population, but we shall also steadily reduce the cost of iron, until it will be produced in this country as cheaply as it can now be imported. These remarks, in general terms, I hope will satisfy my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) as a general outline, without wearying the House too much, of the position in which I regard this question.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Finance Minister tells us that he hopes this duty will produce the same result in this country that the duty on pig iron did in the United States. I certainly hope the hon. gentleman will be mistaken, that his hope will not be realised. The result of the imposition of duty upon pig iron in the United States was to give an undue stimulus to the iron business of that country, and the investments in blast furnaces were made to such an extent that 100 millions of useless capital was invested and is largely lying idle and unprofitable to-day, and has been for years. The profits, of course, were large for a time, so large as to bring an undue embarkation of capital in the business, resulting, as I said, in locking 100 millions in useless blast furnaces that were not wanted in the country and are standing idle. If the duty produces the same result here, as I dare say it will, we will get the same result in over-production. This duty of \$4 a ton added to the bounty of \$1.50 amounts to an *ad valorem* duty of almost 50 per cent. The price of pig iron is somewhat less than \$13 per ton. Here is a duty of \$5.50 upon an article costing \$13, which, roughly speaking, is about 45 per cent. protection. We have been adopting this policy, that while we protect the producer of pig iron, we at the same time increase the cost of what is the raw material for at least 30 manufacturers, for pig iron, which is the finished production of the blast furnace, is the raw material of nearly every other iron industry—of the stove founder, of every founder in the country. And thus while we are benefiting one we are injuring thirty people. So it is with respect to all the duties on iron—duties on bar iron, on puddled iron and on steel;

a duty on steel, while it benefits one producer of steel, affects disastrously at least forty manufacturers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are not increasing the duties on steel.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am dealing with the general features of the hon. gentleman's policy in regard to duties on iron, in advancing the duty on pig iron, on bar iron, on puddled iron; and I think I will show when I reach steel that the hon. gentleman is imposing 45 per cent. on steel, which is an enormous tax, and that while it will benefit very few producers it will act disastrously on the interests of many. While this policy is adopted for the purpose of building up possibly three or four blast furnaces in this country for the benefit of a few producers of iron, it will injuriously affect the great mass of manufacturers, every manufacturer of agricultural implements, every maker of stoves, every founder in the Dominion; in fact this policy will benefit one at the expense of forty, fifty or sixty. Now I ask the hon. gentleman what he has attempted to do to benefit the people who will be most injured by this taxation, namely, the farmers? Is the hon. gentleman proposing to grant any compensatory advantage for the additional burdens which are to be placed upon them, because this additional duty on iron must act as a heavy burthen on the agricultural class. It is true the farmers have had protective duties on grain, butter and products of which this country raises a surplus, but they are duties which have not benefited the farmers in the slightest degree, and have not raised the price of the articles the farmer produces to the extent of one cent; and yet the policy of the Government is to go on piling tax upon tax, burthen upon burthen, impost upon impost, all of which react upon the farmer and must be paid ultimately by him. Every dollar of these duties which it is proposed to levy for the benefit of a few producers of iron will be paid ultimately by the farming community and the producing classes, and yet the hon. gentleman offers them no compensation. He does not surely pretend to offer them compensation by adopting this policy which necessarily increases these duties, not in the interest but contrary to the interests of the masses of the people, a course of action for which he deserves the condemnation of the farmers, and I believe they will slowly awake and are slowly awakening to the actual character of this policy propounded by the hon. gentleman. With respect to the operation of the duties which it was said would benefit the farmers, I defy the hon. gentleman to point out any day since the policy went into operation in 1879 when the farmers derived one cent of advantage from any duty imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite on any article in that list, except the single article of Indian corn. They never received one farthing of benefit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And even that advantage the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) proposes to take away from them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am willing he should do it. It has never benefited the farmers at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You admitted that Indian corn had.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made an exception in regard to that article, because it might be an open question as to whether it did benefit or not. I am prepared to maintain that it has not benefited the farmer. In those parts of Ontario where it is grown, the price has been lower than before the duty; and generally I would say that the National Policy has conferred on the farmer no advantage in any respect whatever in connection with the duties levied with a view to give him protection. Notwithstanding the fact the agricultural community is to be called upon to submit to additional burthens, in the shape of burthens placed upon all raw

materials, which must enhance the cost of manufactures. As a representative of a farming constituency I protest against these advances in duties upon iron, duties that will bear directly upon the agricultural class in this country more than any other proposal which the hon. gentleman has submitted to this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Finance Minister has chosen to refer to an opinion I have expressed, that the duties which it was supposed would benefit the farmers in the shape of duties on cereals and the products of cereals has resulted otherwise than beneficially. Certainly they have not been beneficial. Representing, as I do, a farming, lumbering and fishing community, because the great classes of the population of the country I have the honor to represent, are composed of those three classes, I may say that I have been a National Policy man from the first. I supported hon. gentlemen opposite in introducing that policy in 1878, when I knew it would not specially benefit my county; but I believed that if Canada could not obtain commercial intercourse with the United States on a fair business basis, that at least we should endeavor to keep the market of Canada for the people of Canada. I supported that policy in 1878, and I fell with it, because the people of my county felt that while the general interests of Canada might be promoted, that policy was not in the interest of a county like Northumberland or the counties in the Maritime Provinces, and I suffered by advocating it. I did not however, change my opinion in the least; but when my friends returned to power in 1878 I was not in a place where I could exercise any influence towards controlling and directing the extent to which that National Policy should be carried. I found that the course they pursued in taxing the food and fuel of the people was one that was largely condemned in most of those agricultural districts, and in all the lumbering districts of the eastern Provinces. I want to warn hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this National Policy. I say that the National Policy was adopted by this country not as a principle but as a necessity against the course pursued by the United States when they refused to longer continue reciprocal commercial relations between the two countries; and when it was adopted by Canada, it was adopted not because we desired to adopt it, for such was not the feeling of the country, but as a necessity, as the only measure of self-protection which Canada and Canadian statesmen could exercise in order to keep the markets of Canada for our own people. What has been done since 1878? Not one Session has elapsed since that date that suffering has not been intensified by the addition year after year of increased duties and increased burthens upon the people. What do we raise in the eastern Provinces? I will illustrate the point best by taking the county I know most about, the county I have the honor to represent, and I take the great industries there and the sources of the means for paying for the imports required to be brought into the county, and I find them to be the fishing and lumbering interests. What are the facts in regard to the fishing interests? Do they benefit by the National Policy? No. They are directly taxed to retain the National Policy, for the United States is the only market they have. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) spoke about the great market which the North-West Territories, with its population of 105,000, offered for canned goods, but even that market is occupied, because British Columbia possesses greater facilities for sending in fish and also obtains lower rates than do the eastern Provinces. Look at the condition of the lumbering interests of the eastern Provinces. I venture to predict that there was never a time in the last twenty years when those interests were so depressed, and there was less hope for the people engaged in them to make a livelihood and pay their debts. I look with dread upon the coming season,

Mr. CHARLTON.

upon the people of these eastern Provinces, who depend upon their trade in the export of spruce deals into other markets. They have not there, as they have in the Ottawa lumber districts and the western lumber districts generally, a valuable market for their pine in the United States. We cannot find a market for spruce, and we have no pine that we can export; we cannot send this spruce into the United States because we are met with a prohibitory duty, so we have to send it a long expensive freight voyage, along the coast of Nova Scotia, and the result is that scarcely a cargo is sent from the county which I have the honor to represent, to the American market, in the course of the twelve months. Then, if we send it to Europe what do we find there? I appeal to men who are engaged in the trade, some of whom are listening to me at this moment, if they do not find that in the markets of Europe, which, for years had been the market for the produce of our forests, the pine of the Baltic has driven them from the market, so that they are all either broken down entirely or so paralysed in their business that they are unable to produce the article for export, and therefore the country and its trade have become paralysed. What is the state of things in the city of St. John? Our leading merchants failing with immense liabilities, our banks going to the wall, and when you look at the condition of our country, you find that every branch of trade and business dependent on our two great staple industries of fish and lumber are suffering to an enormous extent. It is true that we have a large fresh fish industry, notwithstanding the heavy duty on that article since the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty, and considerable business has been done in that branch of fishing during the winter season. But the canning business of our country is entirely closed, scarcely anything is done in it except in the one article of lobster canning, and those who come from that country, and are listening to me at this moment, know that what I say is true. I am a National Policy man, but I believe only in National Policy on fair and just principles, I am like the hon. member for eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Perley), a National Policy man to a certain extent—to a reasonable amount of protection. What I believe in, as I stated in 1878, is a tariff not higher than 25 per cent.; I would make that the maximum. I have been a National Policy man, and when my hon. friends opposite came into power, and when unfortunately—because I believe it was unfortunate—I lost my place in this House, I would have resisted to the utmost of my power hon. gentlemen opposite, whom I had helped to bring into power, when they attempted, to bring their tariff up to a figure so much beyond 25 per cent. From that day to this, at every Session of the Legislature, at every opportunity that offered, these hon. gentlemen have come forward with their tariff, increasing it item after item, and creating heavy burdens on the people they represent until these burdens have become almost unbearable. They put a tax on the food of the people whom I represent, 50 cents a barrel on flour and 40 cents a barrel on corn meal, notwithstanding that, Session after Session, for six years, I have been endeavoring to impress on them the necessity of giving our people some relief. They positively refused time and again to remove what I believe to be a gross outrage upon a people situated as the people in the eastern Provinces are. Was it for the sake of the National Policy that they imposed a duty on corn meal? There are not more than one or two counties in this Dominion where corn can be grown, and even in these it can be grown only to a very limited extent. It cannot be said to be grown in Canada as an article of commerce, and that tax is not one which in principle is any part of a true National Policy; it is a tax for revenue purposes—a sop given to the farmers of Ontario. And what have they ever given to the poor people down in the eastern Provinces? Is there a single manufacturing industry in my own county which is benefited by the National

Policy? Down there we are all consumers, hewers of wood and drawers of water, and as consumers we have to pay a tax which has been levied for the benefit of a few manufacturers in the west. I am not opposed to giving a reasonable amount of protection, but I protest as a representative of the people, as one who has come fresh from the people and who, therefore, knows their views and sentiments. I protest in the name of the distressed people of my county where business has been prostrated, where a worse state of things has not existed for the last twenty years than is to be found there to-day, and where there is but little hope that they will improve for the future. I protest against a duty which increases the cost of almost every article that enters into the daily use and consumption of those people, into everything connected with the carrying on of their business—the food they eat and the clothes they wear. I protest against these increased charges as outrages against these people that should not be allowed to continue. And let me warn hon. gentlemen opposite. They talk about the great benefit which will result from their change of policy on the great iron industry. I admit the importance of the iron industry to any country. It is a natural source of wealth without which we cannot exist and enjoy the benefits of civilised society. But, Sir, while it is desirable to protect that great industry, it is an industry in which every farmer in the land is interested that requires his horse to be shod, his plough to be made, his cart to be built, his shovel to be handled. It is an industry in which every lumberman is interested, in the traces he uses, the sled he shoes, and the axe that he handles. Every fisherman requires that article in the outlay for his boats, and every article that enters into his ordinary occupation, and the manner in which this policy has borne upon these classes already will be intensified by the policy which the hon. gentleman is pursuing, of attempting to build up these large establishments for the benefit of a few, irrespective of the interests of the many. Let me warn hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that, while I have been a National Policy man, a National Policy run into the ground may make me something else. I tell you that the time has arrived when the string has been tightened to the fullest extent, and if these things are to go on, Session after Session; if a powerful Government can come down and dictate the legislation of this country to this Parliament, heaping tax after tax on the shoulders of the people, what will this thing come to, and what will be the effect of it? Why, Sir, only last night I heard for the first time that by one little change in the sugar tariff last year the country gave to the revenues of the Government between five and six hundred thousand dollars. It passed last year. We could not ascertain then what it was going to realise; and though questions were put across the floor of the House, nobody seemed to know anything about it. I am glad to see that this year we will have a little more information, and I hope before we get through we will fully understand it, because that information, dropped by accident last night, showed, as I have said, that this slight change made in the sugar duties had been the means of imposing an increased taxation, and of putting into the revenue between five and six hundred thousand dollars. The hon. gentleman states that under this tariff, on the single item of iron alone, he will get another half million. I believe there have been some five hundred and sixty odd changes in the National Policy since 1878—most of them increases; and if these two articles of sugar and iron give an increase of one million, what will be the total increase of the burdens of the whole people by these five hundred and sixty changes. It would be curious and interesting if we could have, among the other statements which have been laid before us, a table showing how the taxes have been gradually increasing year

by year, and how they are still likely to increase, until it is impossible to say where it will all end. I have to caution hon. gentlemen that this state of things will not be permitted to be continued by the people of this country. They are fixing burdens on the people—burdens which I am sorry to say, through a mistaken National Policy, I have helped them to impose—burdens which I am afraid they can scarcely get rid of. While I believe, and still believe, that, with the Americans close to our borders, we should endeavor to keep our own markets for the Canadian people if we cannot participate in theirs, I think it is time, if these charges are to be heaped up when it may be a matter for the consideration of men who are responsible to their constituents, whether this policy shall stop and whether perhaps some other steps may have to be taken. Sir, I warn hon. gentlemen, that while they and their side of the House have been fostering and encouraging what the right hon. Premier is pleased to call the federation of the Empire, the people who are struggling for food to-day, and the men who represent them in this House may perhaps be compelled to look for relief to some commercial relations between this country and the country to the south of us. That, Sir, is what is coming up, and I warn hon. gentlemen again that if this kind of thing is continued, if these charges year after year are to be heaped upon us, it may become necessary for some of us to change our attitude and consider whether we have not gone as far as the people can bear, and whether we cannot promote the prosperity of Canada by looking to a commercial union with the United States, in the hope to equalise the prosperity that exists in some portions of Canada, while poverty exists in other portions. Sir, there is a feeling growing up on the south side of the border that such an arrangement might possibly be made. I have not encouraged this feeling, nor have I considered the matter as fully as I ought perhaps, as a public man, to have considered it; but I can tell hon. gentlemen that my faith in the National Policy has been shaken by the course the Government has pursued in taxing the food of the people to such an extent as they have done, and in inordinately increasing the duties under the pretence of fostering that policy. While the manufacturers are getting bounties and encouragements the laboring classes of my county, as well as other non-manufacturing counties, are paying 50 cents a barrel on flour and 40 cents on corn meal, and the tax on sugar was increased last year by half a million dollars. I felt it my duty to make these remarks, and I tell my hon. friends that while it may a slight thing to them what course the member for Northumberland may take, this running of the National Policy into the ground is sapping what I believe to be the correctness of my course in the past in sustaining them.

Mr. COCKBURN. I did not intend, Sir, to say a word this evening; but I feel so affected by the deep sympathies displayed by the Opposition for the condition into which our unfortunate Dominion has been dragged, that I think it right to say a few words, which I hope may prove to be words of sympathy and comfort to my hon. friend who has just sat down. During the last few days and nights I have sat here patiently hour after hour and listened to a wail from the opposite side of the House, so deep that a tone of lamentation could be perceived in the words of those hon. gentlemen as they proceeded from their mouths. I thought, if the country is in so terrible a plight, that the ex-Minister of Finance, in the absence of the leader of the Opposition, feels himself obliged to consider whether the whole system of Confederation must be abandoned, whether it is worth while to continue under the form of government that exists, and when I hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down say that he is looking towards Washington, and considering whether he ought not to join hands with his brother reformer and help him to break up our Confederation, it is

time for us to consider what are the actual conditions that have brought about this state of mind. I have taken the trouble to look over some of the speeches made in this House during the last few days. We have had this debt of \$215,000,000 flaunted before us as something terrible to bear; and their denunciations of it fell from the mouths of our opponents with a kind of unctious or glee, or with a kind of desire to get their hands on it. But when I considered what this debt of \$215,000,000 really amounts to, I confess that the fears that at first filled my mind were considerably dissipated. I found that the whole charge for the railroads, the canals, the lighthouses, the Government buildings and the public works amounts to \$50,000,000, the interest on which has only increased the individual annual charge since 1878 from \$1.58 to \$1.63. We have had the United States brought before us as an example, and we have been told what a poor people we are in comparison. I think, when we look to the United States we shall find that the debt of that country is not so very small as it has been represented to us. On the 1st of January, 1887, the United States debt amounted to \$1,714,033,636, and it is this debt which has been taken as a contrast with the debt of Canada, while these hon. gentlemen have been careful not to speak of the various States' debts, amounting to no less than \$243,708,439 (a sum greater than our whole Dominion debt), making a grand total of \$1,957,742,075, or about \$40 per head of the population. While I am willing to accord to our neighbors to the south every praise for the manner in which they have developed that country, I want to see what facts we have to justify the terrible wail of hon. gentlemen opposite. I look to the bank deposits of the Dominion, and I find that the deposits in the chartered banks and the savings banks increased from 1878 to 1886 by \$67,931,005. This does not look as if the country were on the verge of ruin. The discounts in the banks for the same period have increased by \$40,156,056. Our imports during the same period have gone up by \$11,342,774, and I am not aware that the merchants in any country are in the habit of trusting people with that extent of value unless they have something to pay for it. At the same time our exports have shown an increase of \$5,927,647, which is comparatively small, inasmuch as we have been able by the National Policy to manufacture many articles which we formerly imported. At the same time our shipping and coasting tonnage has been enlarged by 7,235,939 tons, and we have built 5,475 miles of railway, which, at an average cost of say \$20,000 per mile, represents an investment of \$109,500,000. In the same way I find that the people have been so well off that they have been able to increase their life insurance by \$86,557,651, and fire insurance by \$201,894,778. I further find that in 1878 there were 56,347 traders, and that the business failures amounted to \$23,908,000, while in 1886 there were no less than 72,680 traders, but the liabilities of those who failed reached only \$10,387,000, or \$13,521,000 less. Our consumption of coal during the same period has risen 2,049,955 tons. Our bank note circulation has gone up \$18,400,000, and the securities of Canada to-day stand 13 per cent. higher than they stood in 1878, and for the first time in the history of the country Canadian 3½ per cent. securities are quoted at par. I am not making these statements to annoy the Opposition. I am simply quoting the calm, incontrovertible statements of various business men and the official returns of the Dominion. But it is more particularly with reference to Ontario that I want to speak, inasmuch as I represent a constituency which forms part of the capital of that Province. We have been told that Ontario is being depopulated, that the rural population, if not rapidly decreasing, is in many parts stationary. The ground that has been taken, as one of the proofs of this statement, is that there has been a remarkable decrease in the number of registered children in attendance at the public

Mr. COCKBURN.

schools. It seemed to me this was a far-fetched argument, but I determined to test it, and I took the statistics of school attendance in the population of the United States, from the report of the Board of the Commissioners of Education, and I found the following remarkable results given, to which I call the attention of the House, in the years between 1870 and 1880:—

States.	Increase of Population.	Years.	Decrease in School Attendance.
1875-81 Connecticut.....	51,000	6	108
1878-81 Illinois.....	161,400	3	9,238
1881-82 Tennessee.....	56,800	2	25,785
1876-82 Indiana.....	178,800	6	26,106
1878-82 Iowa.....	129,000	3	24,370
1878-82 Louisiana.....	106,509	5	22,630
1870-80 Maine.....	22,000	10	11,581
1879-81 Maryland.....	30,800	2	6,577
1875-79 Michigan.....	181,200	4	1,832
1874-77 Mississippi.....	96,900	3	52,000
1880-82 Nevada.....	4,000	2	887
1870-80 New Hampshire.....	28,700	10	5,781
1870-80 New York.....	700,000	10	6,829
1879-82 North Carolina.....	36,000	3	678
1878-81 Pennsylvania.....	258,000	3	5,041
Increase.....	2,035,100	Decrease.....	199,933

Thus we find that in fifteen states, while there was an increase of population of 2,035,100 there was a decrease in school attendance of 199,933. Yet, will hon. gentlemen opposite tell me that because there has been a decrease in the registered school attendance in these fifteen states, their population has also diminished. I say, therefore, judging by this statement, that the criterion or test applied by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is no test at all; it is a fallacious test. It is not for me to state where the fallacy lies; I simply give the undoubted fact, that with an increasing population in fifteen states, there has been a decrease in the registered school attendance. At the same time we are told that Ontario is being depleted, that the farmers are groaning under the burdens imposed upon them and can scarcely eke out an existence. What do the Ontario statistics prove on this point? According to those statistics, the value of farm property in Ontario in 1886 was \$999,547,911, and in 1882 it was \$882,624,610, showing an increase in these four years in value of \$106,923,301. And this is an increase in the value of property of a people who have been trodden under foot, and are no longer able to bear the burdens imposed upon them. These figures are borne out by the fact that in every year of the last ten years, there has been an increase of \$10,000,000 in the value of farm buildings in Ontario. But we are told by the ex-Finance Minister that there are mortgages on the property amounting to probably \$120,000,000. When we find, however, that in four years alone there has been an increase in their value of nearly \$107,000,000, I do not think, even if he were correct in his statement, it is so very appalling. We know it to be a fact, on the authority of gentlemen connected with loan societies, that it is difficult for these societies to secure what they would call a decent, respectable, solid loan, because when the farmers cannot meet their difficulties from their own accumulated profits and capital, they, to a large extent, borrow from their brother farmers, who lend them the money a half or a quarter per cent. lower than the loan societies' rates. This does not look like as if the farmers were so much indebted, and so much in need of our assistance that their condition should bring tears to the eyes of the hon. gentlemen opposite. While speaking of Ontario, which the ex-Minister of Finance says bears so large a proportion of taxation, \$25,000,000 out of \$37,000,000, I may point to the fact that in the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Lindsay, Chatham, Windsor, Victoria and Winnipeg, show an increase since 1880 of assessments of \$72,000,000 as shown by the following statements:—

Montreal assessment.....	1880	\$64,500,000	1886	\$75,000,000
Toronto ".....	1878	49,000,000	1887	83,500,000
Hamilton ".....	1878	15,200,000	1886	20,750,000
Ottawa ".....	1880	10,300,000	1886	12,800,000
London ".....	1876	8,480,000	1886	11,300,000
Chatham ".....	1876	1,270,000	1885	3,150,000
Windsor ".....	1876	1,795,000	1885	3,750,000
Victoria ".....	1882	2,682,000	1886	5,178,000
Winnipeg ".....	1881	9,196,435	1886	19,286,405
Total.....		\$162,423,435		\$234,714,405
				162,423,435
Increase.....				\$72,290,870

In face of these facts, how useless it is to say that in our country the farming interest is weighted down with taxation. My hon. friend has mentioned the duty on corn. That has been made a great plank in the platform in the recent contest. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his memorable speech, was so particular in dealing with this subject that he says:

"I speak now, as the leader of the party, expounding, on all questions of principle, not merely my individual views, but the common sense as I understand it, of the great body of the party—the general lines upon which the party, as a whole, would act if entrusted, as they will be soon, with power."

Then again:

"What I have said, and am about to say, on questions of principle, you may then take as authoritative to whatever extent a leader has authority; and so far from there being divergence, I can assure you that there is, in my belief, a general concurrence of sentiment between us, including Sir Richard Cartwright."

It was a very extraordinary thing that these gentlemen; members of a Cabinet which they had already formed at the time, some of them going the length even of passing across their tea tables to their admiring wives and daughters, their names with the hon. prefixes of the Minister of Agriculture and so forth; it is rather odd I say, that in this Cabinet, formed by the hon. member for West Durham, and which included the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. member for West Durham should be obliged to specially name as agreeing with him a member of his own Cabinet. We were not behind the scenes, and could not know the domestic squabbles that might have occurred; but it is in this grand pompous way that this great leader of the Opposition ushers in the declaration of policy of the new Administration:

"It is no part of the duty of a man in Opposition, to frame the details of a tariff, and if I depart even a little from that line for a moment, and express an opinion on one detail. * * * My personal opinion is that we should, at all risks, dispense with the odious and heavy tax on corn flour."

Here is a man who has been cogitating for eight years what policy he should adopt, who during all that time has been making bitter opposition to the National Policy; but who now, at the eleventh hour, confesses himself so far converted, that while he is not prepared to abolish the tax on flour and coal, there is one tax which, *coute qui coute*, he is bound to sweep away, and that is the tax on cornmeal. Far be it from me to interrupt the oozing of affection welling out from the nature of this great hearted man. Here is a statesman who has arisen with a policy, who is determined to show the country what he can do to relieve it; so I set to work to find out what this great relief was going to be, and I found that the tax on corn-meal amounted to less than \$50,000 a year. \$50,000 a year, we are to be saved. Let us divide it among ourselves fairly; it is one cent a piece. Well, Sir, their political offspring was a poor, puny, sick child, and it was soon hurried to an untimely grave; but still it was after twelve years of hard labor that it was brought forth, and in that sickly child you could trace the features, the philosophic features, of the philosopher of Bothwell, the sturdy look of the gallant knight of South Oxford, and the demure regard of the hon. member for West Durham. It was not much to be proud of to be sure, but recollect it was their only child, the only issue of twelve

years of labor, ushered into this world by a grand Caesarian operation, an operation necessitated by the rapid approach of the Dominion elections. I can excuse them for the honest and grand way in which their tiny offspring, bearing the images of these three great political benefactors, was introduced to the audience at Malvern, when the confuting assurance was vouchsafed to them, as soon as we get into power, as soon as we are in our places, you shall have this great reduction made, a reduction by which you shall have one Johnny cake apiece a year, and if you continue us in power for a few years longer, I believe we shall be able to provide you with a dab of butter or molasses in addition.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made the statement, as I took it down, that one hundred millions of money was invested in blast furnaces and unproductive in the United States. I have before me the authentic report of the American iron and steel trade. The production of all kinds of pig iron in 1882 was 5,178,122 tons, in 1883 it was 5,146,972 tons, in 1884 it was 4,589,613 tons, in 1885 it 4,529,869 tons and in 1886 it had reached the large weight of 6,365,328 tons. It seems a singular thing that the hon. gentleman should say that a hundred millions of money was lying unproductive in the blast furnaces of the United States, when we have the statement of the iron trade there, showing that the output is enormously increasing. Not only so, but to show that the hon. gentleman must have been misinformed in the statements he made to the House, there are a large number of blast furnaces now being erected all over the United States, in almost every State of the Union, and in almost all parts of each State, showing that the output of iron is gradually increasing. It is right and proper that the House should be put in possession of this authentic information, because this statement in reference to the iron industries of the United States, which the hon. gentleman wished this House to take warning by, will, perhaps, be similar to the warning which the hon. gentleman gave to the House in relation to the National Policy, in years gone by, when he warned the House to beware of the policy they were endeavoring to pass at the time, a policy which he said would rob the farmer, would rob the lumberman, would rob the fisherman, would rob the laborer, would rob the shipowner, would rob every man who earned a salary, and would enable the manufacturers to play into each others' hands, and he threatened the most terrible disasters which were to befall the country in consequence; he said it threatened Imperial connection, it threatened our national prosperity, and it was a policy which the people of this country would repudiate when next they had a chance to express their opinions upon it at the polls. Well, Sir, it has not threatened our national prosperity, it has not threatened our Imperial connection, and the fact has been established at the polls more than once that the hon. gentleman's predictions as to the action of the people in regard to it have not been verified. If his statement in regard to the hundred millions of unproductive capital invested in iron in the United States, is no more correct than his statement in relation to the result of the adoption of the National Policy, I think the House and the country will know what value to place upon the statement he has made while endeavoring to thwart the iron policy now before the House. On the 1st of April, there were 363 iron furnaces in blast in the United States, having a weekly capacity of 137,523 tons, compared with 1st April, 1886, when there were 279 furnaces in blast, with a weekly capacity of 106,802 tons; in other words, there is an increase in the output of iron of 30,721 tons. The capa-

city of the iron furnaces of the country is larger than at any time in the history of the iron industry, and the output is nearer to the capacity. A continuation of the present rate of output will give a production for 1887 of nearly 1,000,000 tons more than in 1886. So much for the statement of the hon. gentleman from Norfolk in regard to the languishing of the blast furnaces of the United States. The record shows the very opposite to be the case, and I hope hon. members will take due note of it. A word with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) before I sit down. That hon. gentleman asked what this policy had ever done for the farmers, and what it had ever done for the fishermen. It has done everything for both the farmer and the fisherman. Every statement made in this House to-day, and ever since this policy has been talked of in this House, has shown clearly and conclusively that the man who is most benefited by the National Policy is the farmer. In consequence of the National Policy he is given a market at his own door, and, notwithstanding all that hon. gentlemen on the other side may say, the farmer knows it well, and he is not going to be taken by the sophistry of anyone who undertakes to tell him differently. If you tell the farmer he does not know his own business, you will soon find out that he knows more about it than hon. gentlemen who seek to teach him. What have we done for the fishermen, for whom the hon. member for Northumberland has so much sympathy? Owing to the National Policy, we have surpluses instead of deficits, and in consequence of our policy in that direction, a bounty of \$150,000 is given to the fishermen, and that is what the National Policy has done for them. The hon. member for Northumberland asks, what is all this taxation to lead to? I do not call it taxation, but I will tell him what this policy will lead to, not to what he predicted but to national prosperity. I only rose to place before the House the statement in relation to the iron industries of the United States, but I think it well to say that those who are connected with the iron industries of the country are the best judges as to whether the policy propounded by the Finance Minister is likely to be for the good of the country or not. I am one of those who, in appearing before the electors of the country, and in Hamilton, took the stand that the duty of a member of Parliament was to take a broad and comprehensive view of every question that came before the House, and not seek to legislate simply for his own little village or his own town, but for the common good of the common country. He only who will take a broad grasp of the questions of the day, is fit to be in the halls of Parliament, he alone who will take a view beyond that of his own narrow and particular interests is fitted to be a legislator. I am proud to say that I represent a city in which there are large industries in iron, and, while some connected with them have objected to certain features of the tariff, because it interfered, perhaps, with some little arrangements of their own, in the city which I represent, there is one of the largest concerns in the rolling mill business in Canada. I may be permitted to read to you an extract from a letter I have received from the Ontario Rolling Mill Company, and when I mention that name, I may also mention the Hamilton Bridge Company, the Hamilton Pipe Company, and others in that city. This is the letter:

"Your telegram received. We wired you this morning: 'We think changes made in the tariff will be found satisfactory and will, as intended, rapidly develop the iron business.' We are surprised to know the decided stand made by the Government upon the tariff, the same arguments having been offered before and no result came. We had feared that the matter would be left as before, especially as such strong protests are made by prominent parties. The action of the Government in taking this firm and comprehensive stand will, before long, entitle them to the praise of all who take an interest in the development of this country. Increased wealth and population are sure to follow. Every ton of the ore and coal, that now lies worthless in the ground, that is manufactured adds so much to the wealth of this country."

Mr. BROWN.

This bold and courageous policy adopted by the Government, I do not hesitate to say is the cap stone of the National Policy, the policy which goes to the whole root of the matter, which seeks to elevate labor and not degrade it; which seeks to put this duty upon the article itself, and on the articles made out of it, and protects the labor that is employed to produce the articles. If that has been forgotten in the past, we now, at all events, know that what must be done is the protection of the article and the actual labor, and not the individual industry. The policy which has been adopted by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches is one which commends itself to every man of common sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." I hope that they will get some sense knocked into them before long, that they will see this in a proper light. They do see it, Mr. Speaker. The wriggling way in which they have gone through the question to-day shows that they see it. Here and there some of them try the circus trick, riding on the backs of two horses, free trade here and National Policy somewhere else. At the same time they feel that the country is so sound on the question of the National Policy that they dare not come out openly and speak against it. This change in the tariff, I believe, will secure for the National Policy a position which it has never had before, because it strikes at the root of the whole matter. It protects the labor that is required to produce the article. I make these statements, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the iron question, because the statement is boldly made by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that everything is going to pot in the United States, that blast furnaces there are being shut up. A few years ago, we must remember, there was a depression in the iron trade in the United States, and many blast furnaces ceased operation, but it is probably right to say that to-day they are in a very different position. The member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) made a great ado about the bounty. Let me say to the hon. gentleman from Halifax that the bounty has nothing to do with the question under discussion. The bounty is a temporary matter, intended to expedite and to help the erection of blast furnaces so that we can get quicker returns from the ore. In making any kind of comparison on the question of duty throughout the whole scheme, the duty alone is to be considered and not the bounty.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the National Policy. If we are to have at some future time a field day to discuss that question on its merits, then I may make some further observations. I rise now for the purpose of reading a quotation from a newspaper in which hon. gentlemen opposite have confidence. I read in the *Globe* that the prediction of the Finance Minister is about to be verified, and I would suggest to hon. gentlemen that they had better not lose any more time in discussing the iron question, but proceed at once to pass the resolutions. I will read from the *Globe* of this evening the following:—

"WATERTOWN, N. Y., May 16.—A party of New York capitalists arrived here this morning in a special car. They were on their way to Kingston, Ont., from which place they will make an excursion up the Kingston and Pembroke Railroad, which runs through the richest iron region in Canada. The object of the trip is to organise a mining company with \$5,000,000 capital to develop this region. The company will be organised in Kingston to-morrow and the officers likely to be elected are Henry Seibert, of New York."

Going on to name a number of other gentlemen. Then the correspondent of the *Globe* at Kingston telegraphed their arrival at that place, as follows:—

"KINGSTON, May 16.—At noon to-day a large party of Americans, interested in the development of the iron mines along the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, arrived here and proceeded to Glendower, to inspect the Zanecville mine. The party left New York last night in a special car. To-night they hold a meeting for organisation, and to-morrow inspect all the company's property on the line of the railway. Endeavors will

be made for the establishment of iron smelting works here, in view of the present high protection afforded iron men. A citizen, writing to the local press, suggests the granting of a bonus of \$100,000 by the city towards the new industry."

Now, the *Globe* states just what the Finance Minister stated a few days ago, that capital would flow into the country, that this industry would at once be developed. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite should now withdraw their opposition. If they want to meet the National Policy squarely in the face, let some hon. gentleman rise and move to repeal it, and we will see the same state of affairs exhibited that we saw last year when the hon. member for Northumberland moved to take the duty off flour. We saw the coat tails of a number of them going out into the lobbies when this question was put. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, representing as I do, an agricultural district, are not prepared to vote to repeal the National Policy. The farmers of this country know that the National Policy is to their interest, consequently hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to face the question and repeal it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Finance Minister does not seem to have had very good success in controlling his own followers and keeping them to the tacit arrangement that was made a short time since, that we should confine ourselves strictly to the question. I feel called upon to make a few remarks in answer to some criticisms indulged in with regard to my own remarks and my own position. I will first of all congratulate my hon. friend, the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the result of this increase to the iron duties seems to be likely to foster a few American monopolies in this country. We are to tax the farmer, the fisherman and the lumberman, the producing classes of this country, to the extent of one million dollars, more or less, for the benefit of this party who came up in palace cars from New York to establish iron works at Kingston, and others like them. That is to be the outcome of this policy, and it matters very little whether those trade nabobs are Americans, or to whatever nationality they belong, the result of the policy is to tax the many for the benefit of the few, to impose enormous duties for the benefit of a few iron masters, to be paid by the great mass of the manufacturers and by them assessed upon the producing classes. The member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) disputes the statement I made before dinner, that the result of a sudden advance of iron duties in the United States in 1861 was to cause an unnatural development of the iron interests so as to leave them in 1870 with \$100,000,000 invested in blast furnaces unemployed and out of blast. Whether he disputes the statement or not, it is true. The result of a policy similar to that introduced by the Finance Minister now was, first, to enable blast furnace owners to realise enormous profits; second, to induce too many men to engage in the business; third, to overdo the business and leave it in stagnation with \$100,000,000 of useless capital invested. The hon. member for Hamilton, as a proof that I was incorrect as regards the United States iron industry, says that a large number of blast furnaces are being erected; and he stultifies himself and disproves his position a moment later by saying that he knows a smaller number of furnaces were in operation than previously.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But with a larger output.

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. The hon. gentleman said, first, that a large number were being erected, and, second, that there was a smaller number of furnaces in operation.

Mr. BROWN. I said that last year there were a few furnaces less in operation than the year before and the output was greater; and that now a very great number of furnaces are being erected, and a great many more are contracted for and are to be erected. The hon. gentleman cannot wriggle round the post in that way.

Mr. CHARLTON. The truth with respect to the iron industry of the United States is simply this: lately a new iron region has been developed in northern Alabama, in the vicinity of Birmingham and Chattanooga. Iron ore and limestone and coal lie contiguous, and a ton of pig iron can be produced with less labor than at any other point in the world. The iron deposits are more easily reached than are those of the iron mines of Pennsylvania, and furnaces have been erected at Birmingham and Chattanooga; but the growth of the business is at the expense of the trade in other parts of the United States, and where one blast furnace is being erected at those new points it displaces one in Pennsylvania or elsewhere. It is true the production of iron is increasing with the growth of the country. This will probably be a very favorable year in the United States for the iron industry, because 21,000 miles of railway are to be built. But that does not interfere with my statement, that the result of the high duties in the United States was to force the growth of the business, so that no less than \$100,000,000 were invested in blast furnaces that were out of blast in 1870. Then the hon. gentleman says I predicted that one of the results of this policy would be that one class of manufacturers would prey upon another. We see that prediction fulfilled to-day. It is one of the characteristics of protection that what is one manufacturer's finished product is another manufacturer's raw material, and it is impossible to impose protective duties for the purpose of protecting one manufacturer that will not prove detrimental to some other manufacturer. If the hon. Finance Minister imposes a protective duty on pig iron to foster that industry, every manufacturer of agricultural implements, every stove maker and the manufacturer of every article made from pig iron, will be injuriously affected. And so it is with respect to a duty on bar iron and on steel, in fact with respect to any duty imposed to afford protection on iron, which is used in so many industries as the raw material. I repeat that we see the realisation of that prophecy - that under that policy we were to see one class of manufacturers preying upon another class. Then the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) tells us that the farmers know that the National Policy benefits them, and that in consequence of that policy they have a market at home. I presume the hon. member for Hamilton, who says we have not common sense enough on this side to comprehend the bearings of the question, has common sense and knowledge enough to have become aware of the fact that we have gone on increasing our exports of food, and are further and further away from realising that the National Policy gives our farmers a home market. We have not a home market, and our farmers realise it. Of our cheese, wheat, oats, barley, and the crops we grow on the soil, the surplus is sold abroad, and the market price is fixed by the price abroad; and while the National Policy imposes additional burdens, and while these one hundred and twenty changes are calculated to impose still greater burdens, the farmer has not received one iota of advantage. He still goes on exporting his surplus productions, and receiving prices fixed by the quotations in the foreign markets. I do not know but that my hon. friend from Hamilton, who possesses such a large amount of common sense and acquired knowledge, is aware of the fact that the operation of the protective policy in America has led to the placing of agricultural labor upon a footing of equality with the coolie labor of India, in the production of wheat. Our own policy has not had, perhaps, so much influence in that direction as that of the United States, but it has had a tendency in that direction. England purchased her food supply from America until she was shut out by the protective policy from making that country a market for her wares. She could not continue to buy produce and pay gold, for she must exchange her products with a people with whom she could trade. It is

true that England purchased her food from the United States and paid an immense amount in gold, the balance against her being \$100,000,000 in one year, a condition of things that could not continue without ruin to one of the parties. What did England do? In 1870, there were something like 3,000 miles of railway in India. Now there are about 13,000, with 3,000 miles under course of construction this year. England at once pushed the railway system to the wheat-growing regions of that country in the vicinity of the sources of the Ganges and Indus, and she is now receiving from thirty to forty millions of bushels of wheat from India annually. She is paying for that supply by the productions of her looms, her mills and factories. Her ships go out with full cargoes of goods for Bombay, and they return with food supplies. This is doing a natural trade, in cultivating the agricultural interest of India and receiving a large proportion of food from that country in exchange for her manufactured products. She has been driven to this course by the protective policies of the United States and Canada, and the direct result has been to reduce the agricultural labor of this continent to the level of the coolie labor of India. That is the benefit which the farmer has received from protection—it has been a curse in every respect. It has placed unjust burthens on the farmer and it has diminished the profits of what he raises. He has been like Issachar, a strong ass bound down between two burthens: the burthen of higher prices on all goods he has to buy, and lower prices on all goods he has to sell. That has been the result of the National Policy so far as the farmer is concerned. I can safely defy the Minister of Finance or any other hon. gentleman to take the market quotations and show me any day since 1879, when the National Policy was adopted and put in force, when the price of grain in the markets of the United States and the corresponding markets of Canada would admit of the importation of that grain without a duty being placed in the way. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show any date on which the duty has exercised any favorable influence on the price of grain so far as the farmers of Canada are concerned. Now, if we take the quotations of Saturday last—and I have compiled these quotations, I presume a hundred times in addressing public meetings in this country, and they have always told the same story—we find that No. 2 spring wheat was worth on that day, 86 cents in Chicago, 90 cents in Buffalo, and 89 cents in Toronto. Now, there is no margin which will permit of the purchase of wheat in Chicago at 86 cents for sale in Toronto at 89 cents; the difference will not pay the freight. Buffalo is the corresponding market to Toronto, and wheat was worth there one cent more than it was worth in Toronto. Taking oats, 32 pounds of oats were worth in Chicago 26½ cents; in Milwaukee 30½ cents; in Detroit 32½ cents, and in Buffalo 35 cents; while 34 pounds of oats were worth in Toronto 32 cents. 34 pounds cost less in Toronto than 32 pounds cost in Buffalo and Detroit. No. 2 barley was worth 57 cents in Chicago; No. 1 barley, 71 cents in Buffalo; and in Toronto the highest price was 50 cents; 7 cents less than in Chicago and 21 cents less than in Buffalo. Upon that date field peas were worth in Buffalo 70 to 90 cents; in Toronto, 52 to 57 cents. Upon that day rye was worth in Chicago 56½ cents; in Milwaukee, 57½ cents, and in Toronto, 50 cents. Now this range of prices shows conclusively that in not one of these articles can a purchaser make a purchase in the United States and import to Canada without loss; that in all those cases grain was relatively higher in the United States than in Canada, and that consequently in every instance a duty for the purpose of excluding grain from our market for the benefit of Canadian agriculturists was entirely worthless. So much for the assertion made by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) that the farmer of Canada knows that the National Policy is a benefit, as it gives him a home market.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Then he says that those interested in the iron duties know best whether the policy now introduced by the Finance Minister will do good or not. A greater absurdity could not be stated. Men interested in the iron duties are the very men whose advice should not be taken, because they are giving it from interested motives; they are asking the Government to impose duties, governed not by a desire to protect the interests of the country, but by a selfish desire to promote their own interests, and therefore it is their own interests, and their own interests alone, which will be promoted by the imposition of these largely increased duties in iron and steel. The hon. gentleman tells us also that we have attempted to ride two horses. Sir, the position we have taken in this matter is simply this: we recognise that great burdens rest upon the country, that a heavy revenue must be raised, and that, in consequence of that, we cannot construct a tariff on theoretical principles, but we must be governed by practical necessities, and for that reason we have all held that the return to low duties was impossible in consequence of the revenue wants of the country. And whether that is the case or not, we are not committed to the absurdity of perpetually tinkering our tariff to an adjustment of the duties every Session, so that 570 new changes in the tariff have been made since it went into operation. In the United States I think there was not a single tariff change since the tariff went into operation in 1861 down to 1884. They very well understood the deleterious influence which would be exerted by this perpetual tinkering of the tariff. Here we have had 570 changes, every one of them for the worse, and whatever may be our position as to the necessity of raising a large revenue, and to raise a large revenue it is necessary to impose heavy duties, we protest against these absurd changes, and this preying of one class upon another, in the unnecessary manner exhibited by the iron duties which have been submitted to this House.

I wish to say a few words with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) before dinner. If the ideas which that hon. gentleman brought forth had been in proportion to his physical exertions, they would have been very important ones. I presume that he thinks that Providence has been very kind to my hon. friends the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in taking them away from this place, when he demolished them so effectually as probably he imagined he did to-night. While he was wildly waving his hands he evidently seemed to be grasping for something, but I do not think he succeeded in grasping it. He seemed to be wrestling vigorously with some difficulty or other, but I hardly think it was the weight of his own argument; what it was I could hardly say. I suppose that the hon. gentleman is a professor of mathematics, at least he knows something about teaching that science, and he has given us a specimen of his ability in that line, which is somewhat remarkable in some of its features. I must beg my hon. friend's pardon for entering into the debt question; I shall do so briefly, and I should not have touched upon it at all, had it not been that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), referred to it. He took the liberty of making a comparison between the *per capita* charges of this country and the United States, and he informed us that the debt of the United States was one thousand seven hundred and fourteen millions. Now, I have in my hands a statement of the public debt of the United States for the month of March, issued by the Treasury Department, and I find that the Secretary of the Treasury and my hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto differ somewhat in their calculations. I find that the Secretary of the Treasury states that the debt on the first day of May was \$1,305,170,000, in round numbers. The population of the United States

at the present moment is estimated to be somewhat in excess of sixty millions; based upon the ratio of increase in the last decade, it is sixty millions seven hundred and fifty thousand. We will say sixty millions, and taking the net debt at \$1,305,170,000 the *per capita* charge was \$21.70. But they have assets in the United States which we deduct from the gross debt to arrive at the net debt, as we do here. These assets consist of Pacific Railway bonds, amounting to \$115,651,000, and deducting these assets from the gross debt it leaves the net debt at \$1,190,000,000, in round numbers, or a *per capita* charge of \$19.84. Now, if we take the amount of the state debts, which my hon. friend stated to be \$243,000,000, and add them—though it is not proper to do so for the purpose of making a comparison—if we add the state debts to the national debt, we have a combined amount representing a *per capita* charge of \$23.84. According to the statement of my hon. friend our net debt is \$225,000,000. I estimate the white population of this country to be at the present time 4,637,000, based on the ratio of increase from 1871 to 1881. In this case we have a *per capita* charge of \$48.25, against a *per capita* charge in the United States of \$23.84, counting in the state debts, or a *per capita* charge in this country considerably higher than as much again as that of the United States. Now, this comparison, which would not be pertinent to this discussion, I am free to admit, if it had not been called forth by the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), shows that our position, relative to that of the United States, is financially not a favorable one. I think the deduction we may draw from this is that the imposition of the burdens contemplated by these tariff resolutions, which bear so heavily on the producing classes of this country, is not advisable, and ought to be condemned. I again protest against this policy, which, as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) admits, is intended to benefit a few American capitalists, and to build up a few large manufacturing rings, who, in consequence of these duties on iron, are to realise large profits at the expense of the great majority of the manufacturers of this country, and at the expense of the entire producing class of this country. I protest against this policy as being unscientific as a protective policy, as being not in the interest of the country, but in the interest of a few individuals who will reap the whole advantage that is to be derived from the hon. gentleman's resolutions.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to say to my hon. friend that I could not take exception to what was said on the opposite side of the House if the same course is to be pursued on this side. It is of the greatest importance to the Government, and especially to myself, that we should get through with these resolutions, and I trust my hon. friend will allow us to proceed.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to answer him on the wheat question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask my hon. friend to allow us to proceed, as a special favor to myself.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I cannot allow this opportunity to pass, after so much has been said about the benefits the farmers of Canada are to derive from this National Policy, without saying something on the subject, because I claim to be one of the oldest farmers in this country to-day. I came to this country in 1843, and I have been steadily engaged in farming from that time to the present. I came to the conclusion, when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) was speaking, that his knowledge of the needs of the farmers was very limited indeed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to say to my hon. friend that the Minister of Finance has stopped gentlemen

on that side of the House from discussing anything else than the iron duties that are now before us, and he promised us a full opportunity for a general discussion of the tariff afterwards. That being the case, I would ask my hon. friend not to enter upon a discussion of this question at this moment.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As a farmer I would just say that it is impossible that the increased duty on iron can have any other but an injurious effect on the agriculturists of the country. All our farming implements are composed of iron, and the duty is very heavy indeed. I find that the duty on pig iron amounts to about 29 per cent., and it is impossible that our manufacturers can pay that duty and turn out their goods without increasing the cost to the farmers. In 1883, when a duty of 35 per cent. was imposed on agricultural implements, we were paying \$300 for self-binders. What was the reason? The reason was simply that the manufacturers had entered into a combination, and bound themselves by signing a solemn compact, that any manufacturer or manufacturer's agent who would sell an implement under a certain price was to be fined in a heavy sum of money. They met year after year in Toronto and by adhering to this compact they kept up the price. But after a while they came to the conclusion that they could not keep the price at that figure, and brought it down to \$250, and the next year to \$220. It was only by such a combination that the large sums we pay for agricultural implements have been extracted from the farmers. And yet we are told that goods are as cheap as they would be if we had not the National Policy. I heard a gentleman say this afternoon that binders were sold in Manitoba to-day at \$190, which is cheaper than they were at the time the National Policy was imposed. I have not the least doubt that the same kind of binders, which cost us \$180 in 1883 can be bought in Ontario to-day for \$150, and I have been informed that if it were not for the protective duty upon those machines, we would be able to get them for \$130 or \$120. That combination still exists, and it imposes such conditions on the agents that they cannot go to a farmer and sell him a machine and take a horse or an old machine of any kind in part payment without incurring a certain fine at the hands of the combination. That is what the National Policy imposes on the farmers, and I would like to know what benefit the farmers will derive from it. But as I will have another opportunity to speak on this subject, I will attempt to show that the farmers as a class have been more imposed upon by the National Policy and less benefited by it than any other class of the community—that instead of its giving us a home market and a better market, we export more to-day than we did when the National Policy was first put in force, and that, compared with the prices prevailing in the United States, we get lower prices for our produce than we did before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are a few points on which I would like the Minister of Finance to give us a little information. I have read his speech and his reply to the hon. member for Halifax, and I am unable to find where he got the figures of 250,000 tons as being our yearly consumption. I have looked through the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find our imports of pig iron last year amount to 45,648 tons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I spoke of the whole consumption of iron in the country. I took the average of four years from 1881 to 1884, which amounted to 250,000 tons, and reduced bar iron to the equivalent of pig. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a large loss in making wrought iron from pig.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister's words led me astray a little. His words are:

"Our present consumption is 250,000 tons of pig leaving steel rails out of the question altogether."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is, it would take 250,000 tons of pig iron to furnish us with the supply of iron we consume.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would not be able to make that calculation off hand, and could not tell. I judged by the answer of the hon. Minister of Customs as to the amount of bounty paid, that it was on 6,000 tons, making altogether 51,648 tons of pig iron. The Finance Minister fixed the average at 250,000 tons, made up of iron in other shapes, which he included under the general term of pig iron. There is another point on which I would ask a little information. What are the expectations of the Minister with reference to overtaking the consumptive demand of the country by home production? Is he aware of manufacturing factories that are likely to be established? And how soon they may be expected to come into operation? How soon may relief be expected from the higher prices which will ensue upon the imposition of the duty? Does he hope to give that relief by home production? A gentleman read the statement to-night of some capitalists going to Kingston in order to open up the iron industry there. But we remember that, in 1882, a former Finance Minister told us he was sure that after the general elections, if the Government were sustained, there was in one case \$5,000,000 ready to be invested in iron and in another case \$2,500,000. These expectations were not realised. Would the hon. Minister inform us whether he has reason to believe that there will be more success attained on this occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no reason to doubt that the effects of this policy will be to bring all the capital into the country required to develop this industry as rapidly as it is possible for capital to develop it. My hon. friend did not take any exception to the statement that already a large amount of American capital, and very prominent American capitalists, had come into Canada for the purpose of taking up this industry. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), however, took exception to these gentlemen being Americans. I do not sympathise with that objection. I welcome to Canada capital and capitalists from any part of the world, and I hope every American that is induced to come into Canada for the purpose of developing our industries, will be abundantly successful and have no reason to regret that they brought their capital into Canada. I go further. I say that at present in the great lumber industry, we have notable examples of capital being brought from the United States and being used here with eminent success, and we have had further the gratification of finding many of the American gentlemen who thus used their capital becoming exceedingly good Canadians after they had been here a short time. I believe one of the great objects of the National Policy is to draw population and capital into the country, and I welcome both from wherever they may come. Of course it is impossible for me to say more than to judge from the effect that the policy is naturally calculated to produce. We have all the evidence with regard to this iron industry that we had when we propounded, in the National Policy in 1879, with regard to the cotton, woollen and sugar industries which that policy was to develop. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been no lack of capital and no lack of competition in these industries, and he knows that they have been fully developed. We have in this case the same reason to anticipate that capital will be brought into the Dominion to be invested all over the country. I do not know a Province, except Prince Edward Island, that may not anticipate an early influx of capital to develop its great iron industry. We have evidence of this in the fact that already, before the Bill has passed, before Parliament has sanctioned the policy, these American capitalists, these nabobs, as the hon. member for North Norfolk calls them, are taking the pal-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

ace car for Canada and rushing over the iron districts of Ontario for the purpose of being first in the field to seize the opportunity of developing Canadian industries. I hope that will be considered by my hon. friend sufficient, and as much as he can expect me to give in relation as to what is likely to be the result of this policy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Cast iron scrap is included in this item. The hon. gentleman, I think, has had representations made to him with reference to the effect of that duty, by over 50 very large firms. Could he state what decision he has come to?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have, but that question comes in on the next item.

Iron in pigs, iron kentlage and cast scrap iron, \$4 per ton.

Mr. JONES. Will not that be very heavy on the foundries? The hon. gentleman referred to the large foundry at New Glasgow the other night, where, he said, \$400,000 had been expended. Will not this duty be very hard on it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be found that corresponding protection will be given in the articles they produce, which will quite meet that. I regard it, I do not hesitate to say, as a blot on this policy that scrap iron is allowed to come in at \$2 a ton. Wrought scrap iron is more valuable, is a higher condition of production than pig iron, and it ought to have in this tariff, as it has in that of the United States, the same protection. In the United States, the duty on scrap iron is \$6 a ton, the same as that on pig iron. We have placed it at only \$2 a ton, because it was felt in making this sudden change it was necessary not to go beyond that figure, as it would make less difficulty in furnishing some of these enterprises with the material which they use so largely; but so far as cast scrap iron is concerned the hon. gentleman is aware that scrap iron being free, as it has been under the tariff for the last two years—two years ago there was a duty of \$2 a ton on scrap iron, the same as that now imposed, but it was removed, and the result was, pig iron having to pay a duty of \$2 a ton while scrap iron was free, that instead of running the iron into pig it was run into flat surfaces and shipped out as scrap iron. To avoid this we put cast scrap iron in at the same position as iron in pig. But the wrought scrap iron, which is so valuable and important to many of these industries, is still allowed to come in at \$2 a ton, as it is at present.

Mr. JONES. I understood that the hon. gentleman had a meeting with the people who were connected with that industry in Halifax when he was there, and that representatives from New Brunswick and from all parts of Nova Scotia were at that gathering, and that they were all opposed to the view of the hon. gentleman as shown in this tariff, the only people in favor of it being those who represented the Londonderry Iron Works; so I thought it was very hard on industries there which have been already established on the understanding that scrap iron would be duty free.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right. A great objection was taken by the rolling mills to the imposition of a duty on scrap iron, but it was not at all contemplated by those gentlemen that so radical a change in the whole tariff would take place, so the objections which they took this present proposition will practically remove.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have, under my hand, a representation of some fifty large firms, scattered throughout Ontario, that to obtain satisfactory workmanship on certain classes of their manufactures they find it necessary to use cast scrap iron with the pig iron proper, and they say that the scrap does not to any appreciable extent enter into competition with pig iron of Canadian manufacture,

but rather facilitates the use of that pig iron by the necessity of the admixture. Of course, I do not know anything about it, but it is a representation made by about fifty leading firms scattered throughout the cities and towns of Ontario. I have also a statement, referring to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, as to the evading of the duty on pig iron by entering it as scrap iron. These people think that is a mistake altogether, that the labor which would be involved in that would amount to more than the duty. I think the Minister of Finance has had these representations under his own consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, they have been very fully considered.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the Minister satisfied the gentlemen who remonstrated with him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I have removed to a large extent the objections they had. I would draw the attention of my hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) to page 89 of a very valuable work of Mr. Bartlett's on Iron, Steel and Coal in the Dominion of Canada, and he will there find the authority for the basis of my calculation as to the quantity of pig iron that would be represented by the consumption of iron in Canada. The total consumption in 1884 was less than it was in 1883. The consumption was 328,000 tons in 1883 and 273,000 tons in 1884, and that represents a very much larger amount of pig iron than has been stated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. Minister know whether there is more than one blast furnace turning out pig iron during the past year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is but one blast furnace, so far as I am aware, turning out pig iron during the past year—that is, pig iron made from coal; but there has been charcoal pig iron made in addition to that during the past year in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. To what extent has charcoal iron been manufactured?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The manufacture of charcoal iron was some years ago one of the great industries of Ontario and Quebec, and, although I am not a prophet, I undertake to say that, under the policy which is contained in these resolutions, if they receive the sanction of this House, the manufacture of charcoal iron will become again, and at an early day, a great industry in both those Provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. But can the Minister state to what extent charcoal iron was turned out last year? I am aware that it was an industry a good many years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was produced only to a comparatively small extent last year. It is quite impossible to maintain an industry of that kind under the circumstances in which we were placed.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman can judge by the amount of bounty paid, and I presume they made claims for all the charcoal iron they manufactured. The amount paid to Donald McGiffin, of Montreal, was \$5,359, and to Hall Bros., of Quebec, \$217. That is for charcoal iron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister know whether the Londonderry works—assuming those to be the works to which he refers—worked all the year—if that was their total capacity? The Minister will understand that I am not asking these questions at all in a captious spirit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that quite well.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I figured out, by the amount of bounty which was paid, dividing it by the \$1.50, that they produced 26,900 tons in the year. I wanted to know if the works were running their full capacity, in order to

produce that quantity. I desire simply to arrive at some conclusion, as to how many blast furnaces we would require to produce the quantity of which the Minister speaks.

Mr. McDOUGALD. The iron works in Londonderry were not running their full capacity last year. There are two blast furnaces there capable of producing fifty thousand tons a year. The product of last year was only about twenty thousand tons, and there is a capacity not now utilised of thirty thousand tons more. In addition to that, and it is a thing which will prevent some friction in the working of the duties on iron, there is a large rolling mill capacity in the Dominion of Canada at the present time, which could be utilised in the production of bar iron by the erection of puddling furnaces. These puddling furnaces can be erected in a very short time, in two or three months, and, by the importation temporarily of pig iron from abroad, and converting that into puddle bars, a large production of finished iron from our own rolling mills can be obtained pending the erection of blast furnaces in this country. It takes a considerable time to erect blast furnaces, perhaps two years, and I think the present capacity of the rolling mills, if applied to bar iron alone, is sufficient almost to produce the quantity of bar iron imported last year, 28,000 tons. The rolling mills are situated, one at New Glasgow, one at Londonderry, one in Halifax, three in St. John, N.B., four in Montreal, and one in Hamilton.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Londonderry furnace could produce about 60,000 tons if running its full capacity?

Mr. McDOUGALD. Yes.

Bar iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flat not less than one inch wide nor less than three-eighths of one inch thick, \$11 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change this clause so as to read:

Bar iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats, rounds, and squares, and bars and shapes of rolled iron not elsewhere specified, \$13 per ton.

And I propose to strike out the three following clauses, numbered 76, 77 and 78, as this clause will embrace the whole.

Mr. CHARLTON. You consolidate the four clauses in one and make the duty \$13?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and that change is the result of a discussion I had with a large number of gentlemen yesterday from Montreal and from Hamilton, and especially of the anxiety expressed by Mr. Thomas Workman, who is well known as a former member of this House, who thought it would greatly simplify the tariff by consolidating these clauses and embodying them under an average tariff.

Mr. JONES. That is a very great improvement. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made that alteration, because, under the original proposal, it would have been very embarrassing in respect to the different sizes and grades. They all cost the same, as the hon. gentleman is aware. The class of iron to which this clause applies costs £4 17s. 6d. to £5 per ton, and the present duty of 17½ per cent. is \$3.50 per ton of 2,240 pounds. By the alteration the Minister of Finance proposes to consolidate those three under the one, which will make the duty at \$13, 65 per cent. on the present value in England. It seems a very heavy duty, and seems hardly required to develop an iron industry that was started with a protection of 5 per cent. As has been said before, it will bear very hardly on those people engaged in all these industries which are affected by it, and those other industries which may be affected by it hereafter. I feel it my duty to say here that I find I was under a misapprehension last night, with reference to the drawback on iron as applied to small vessels, which mistake arose from

the fact that the drawback is paid to the builder of a vessel, and not to the purchaser. I feel it my duty frankly to make that explanation, but that will not apply in the future, if the object of the hon. gentleman's tariff is carried out. I was thinking of foreign iron, but whatever quantity of iron is produced in the country, no duty will be paid on it, but the price is so much enhanced, the shipbuilders and fishermen requiring this iron would have to pay just that much more for it and get no return. The hon. gentleman suggested that in that case they could use imported iron and get the drawback, but he will see that for a man building a small vessel, it would be impossible for him to send to England and get the small quantity of iron he might require. Moreover, the whole system of drawbacks only applied to the vessel's first outfit, and that only lasts three or four or five years, as the case may be; whereas from that time everything a vessel requires has to be purchased under the increased duty and no drawback is allowed. Moreover, a very large share of our shore fisheries is conducted in what are called whalers, or in boats which are not registered, and the fishermen who use that class of boats in the shore fisheries, which are amongst our most valuable fisheries, will have to pay this duty on iron and get no drawback under any circumstances, and everything that enters into the construction of their boats will be enhanced to them in price while no drawback will be allowed. Therefore, the hon. gentleman will see that the increased duty on iron bears exceptionally hard on a class of people that can very ill afford it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman make this statement, because I have always had a great respect for his opinion as a merchant, but he begins to shake my confidence in him by the statements he has just made to the House. He must know, that under this policy, assuming that it is adopted by the House, it will be years before the iron industry is developed to such an extent as to do away with the importation of iron. I have told him that I expect very little change in the importation of iron during the first and second years. Now, however high the duties are that are paid on iron until it ceases to be imported in consequence of the full development of this policy, the shipbuilders will have the means of getting the full advantage of importations, notwithstanding this tariff, just as he has now for everything that enters into his ships. A boat of five tons may be registered.

Mr. JONES. That is not usually done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing to prevent the registry of a boat of five tons. In the next place, the hon. gentleman is quite wrong, in my judgment, in his estimate of the effects of this duty. I have not had time to make the calculations upon this clause as it now stands, but I will read to the House a calculation I have made upon the four clauses that are embodied in this one. First, the present duty is $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on a value of \$25 a ton, which was the average value in 1885-86; that would be \$4.37 a ton. Then $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value of 1879-80, of \$33.50 per ton is equal to \$5.86. Now, in that first item which proposes to put a duty of \$11 a ton on a fair value of, say, \$27.50 per ton, it would be equal to 40 per cent., not 60 per cent. as the hon. gentleman stated. Then take the next item. The \$13 on a fair average value of, say, \$32.50 per ton, would also pay 40 per cent. In item, 77, \$15 per ton on a fair average value of \$37.50 per ton, would be 40 per cent. Consequently that is the highest duty which was imposed under any of these items, and I have combined them together and taken the average as \$13 a ton; so I am quite certain if the hon. gentleman works out that calculation accurately he will find that there is no duty imposed under it over an *ad valorem* duty of 40 per cent. on an average at a fair valuation.

Mr. JONES. The hon. gentleman seems to think that I was in error with respect to the percentage under the

Mr. JONES.

item now before the House. He gave us to understand at the commencement that the change which he had made in the resolutions was made at the suggestion of a gentleman who had been engaged very largely in that business; and I may say that my authority is the same. In previous years that gentleman computed that a specific duty of \$11, \$13 and \$15 for 2,000 lbs. was equal to $57\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the first, 65 per cent. for the second, 75 per cent. for the third. I do not pretend to be familiar with the matter, but it is an authority which the hon. gentleman has recognised as good, and I am disposed to think it is a pretty good one still.

Mr. MALLORY. Even if you take the percentage as given by the Finance Minister we now begin to realise to a certain extent what the increase of the duty on the iron used by our blacksmiths, carriage makers and agricultural implement makers really is to be. We have been endeavoring thus far in the discussion to find as nearly as possible what rate of percentage we would have to pay on iron duties, and it is only now that we are beginning to realise the extent to which those duties will bear on the users of this class of metal. Even taking the percentages given by the Minister of Finance, which I believe he will find upon a close examination to be much too low, and that the calculation based upon the figures of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to be more nearly the truth, we are now beginning to come to a realisation of the extent of the enormity about to be perpetrated on this country by the imposition of such heavy duties on iron. When we do realise, as we will do, this fact, we will see how very heavy those duties will bear upon the agricultural community, because the hon. gentleman will find that the class of iron, the duties on which we are now discussing, belongs to that particular class which enters into the manufacture of agricultural implements, carriages and iron such as is generally used by blacksmiths. The Finance Minister will find not only that the hardware merchants are complaining against the increased duties placed on those articles for the benefit of comparatively few people, but that the consumers of iron will also complain as soon as they fully realise the extent of the additional duties.

Mr. McDUGALD (Pictou). With respect to the increase of duties referred to by the last speaker, it would simplify his calculation if he reduced the duty from an *ad valorem* basis to dollars and cents. In short, the duty is this: on pig iron used for castings the increase will be one-tenth of a cent per pound, on wrought iron the increase will be about three-eighths of a cent per pound.

Mr. MILLS. I should like the Minister to state what were the amounts of revenue he expected to derive from resolutions 74, 75, 76 and 77 as originally drawn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is exceedingly difficult to make a calculation, for the reason that there is no corresponding data to go upon. Bar iron, which in these three resolutions was put at \$11, \$13, and \$15, and which I now group together as \$13 on an average, 28,759 tons were imported in 1885-86, of the value of \$728,208, on which we collected a duty of \$127,413 or thereabouts. The present tariff applied to the same quantity would give \$373,867.

Mr. JONES. What is the whole increase of the iron duties?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If applied to the same importation the increase will be about \$700,000. I estimate the increased receipts this year at about half a million.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I cannot understand how that conclusion is arrived at, for I think the amount will be more like a million, and perhaps nearer a million and a-half. I would be inside the mark if I took \$8 as the advance on a ton, and according to the hon. gentleman's calculations, taking the consumption of iron at 250,000 tons, and deduct-

ing the quantity of pig iron, there would still be left 150,000 tons of wrought iron, and if you multiply that by \$3 a ton, it will give you \$1,400,000 without the pig iron at all, if the others are in proportion to this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find that they are almost all included here, when he comes to the subsequent items.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There were 250,000 tons consumed—75,000 of pig iron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not of the bar iron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, altogether. 75,000 tons of pig iron leaves it 175,000 tons for all other kinds. Now, if I have followed the hon. gentleman's statement correctly, we are advancing \$8 a ton on this iron, which would make \$1,400,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to place the next item—and the hon. gentleman will be greatly relieved to hear it—on the free list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it manufactured in the country now?

Mr. CHARLTON. Does it cover the wire used in wire fences?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the object of striking it out?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is imported by wire manufacturers for use in manufacture, and it is not made in the country, or likely to be made.

Iron and steel wire, galvanized or not, smaller than number five gauge and not smaller than number fifteen gauge, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to substitute for the words "fifteen gauge" the words "fourteen gauge." That leaves the tariff on these articles as at present.

Wire of spring steel, coppered or tinned, number nine gauge or smaller, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that by making it read: "wire of steel spring, coppered or tinned, No. 9 gauge or smaller, not elsewhere specified, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*."

Mr. JONES. What is the reason of the increase?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The article was formerly on the free list, but it is now manufactured, and, therefore, I propose to put it at 20 per cent. Tinned wire was 20 per cent., and coppered was free, and I found on enquiry that there was no reason for placing them on a different footing, as it was really the same thing except for the coating.

Mr. MALLORY. Is it manufactured in the country now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MALLORY. At a profit?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say that, but I hope so.

Mr. MALLORY. So that there has been a profit on the manufacture of it already, and now we are to add 20 per cent. more to those profits?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the coppered was free and the tinned was not, and consequently I am putting them both on the same footing, at the moderate duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. MALLORY. My argument then remains the same, so far as one article is concerned.

Boiler or other plate iron, sheared or unsheared, skelp iron, sheared or rolled in grooves, and sheet iron, common or black, not thinner than number twenty gauge, not elsewhere specified, \$10 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to make the duty \$14 instead of \$10.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that boiler plate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, that is dealt with in the next item.

Sheet iron, common or black, smoothed or polished, and coated or galvanized, thinner than number twenty gauge Canada plates and boiler plate of iron or steel not less than 30 inches wide and valued at not less than one and a-half cents per pound, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that also by adding after the word "boiler" in the third line the words "or bridge," and to strike out the words "valued at not less than 1½ cents per pound," and insert "not less than ¼ inch in thickness."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the plate that is used by steam engine builders?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And the duty remains the same?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this used by bridge builders?

Mr. BOWELL. No; that comes in a special class.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What amount of revenue do you expect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With regard to bridge material?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With regard to the whole of the items in this class as amended.

Hoop or band or scroll or other iron, eight inches or less in width and not thinner than number twenty gauge, \$13 per ton.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How was this before?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was 17½ per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What difference will this change make?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will increase it about 40 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. What additional revenue does the hon. gentleman expect from this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase will be about from \$8,035 to \$18,270.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are the kinds of sheet iron mentioned in item 83, manufactured in the country?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, and therefore the duty is unchanged.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And will the hon. gentleman say to what extent the hoop or band or scroll iron mentioned in item 84 is manufactured in the country, and what percentage is consumed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any mill that makes iron can make these classes. They will all be made in the country under this tariff.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I am anxious to know is what is the total amount consumed which is yet manufactured in Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to say that. All I am able to give him is the quantity imported in 1885-86, namely, 1,827 tons.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Because it may be that this tariff is adding a very small percentage to the actual production.

Iron railway bars, steel T rails weighing not over 25 pounds per lineal yard, iron or steel flat rails punched and iron or steel railway fish plates, \$9 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to strike out every thing except railway fish plates, and to make the duty \$12 a ton, and I will bring in the other items in another place. All railway fish plates, whether iron or steel, it is proposed shall pay that duty. Railway fish plates are manufactured in the country, and can all be manufactured in the country, and I propose to give compensation to the railways by putting steel tires, which now pay a duty, on the free list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us the value of the fish plates produced now, so that we may be in a position to compare their cost with the cost of iron, because there is very little cost in the manufacture of fish plates, and there should be some relation between the ordinary duty on iron and the duty on fish plates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The quantity of fish plates imported in 1885-86 was 1,808 tons, which includes frogs. The duty on those was \$3,696.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may tell my hon. friend that he is wrong in supposing that there is not much manufacture on fish plates. The modern fish plates, which are universally adopted, have a good deal of manufacture on them. They take the bevel of the rail, and are consequently much more expensive than ordinary fish plates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no means of arriving at how many tons of fish plates were imported, because the frogs were included, and they were brought in at 17½ per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. Minister found it necessary to make this advance in the duty on account of the manufacturer having found his raw material out of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt that was a reason.

Rolled channels and angled and T-iron, and rolled eye bar blanks made by the Kloman process, when imported by manufacturers of bridges for use exclusively in their own manufactures, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that clause to read :

Iron or steel beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, special sections, rolled eye bar blanks made by the Kloman process of all forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, \$16 a ton, but when imported by manufacturers of bridges for use exclusively in their manufacture, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can the hon. gentleman state the amount of duty he expects to receive from this, and the rate as far as ascertained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in the duty except on the Kloman bars which were formerly 20 per cent., but are now 12½ per cent. for bridge purposes, so that this is a reduction instead of an increase, and for all other purposes except for bridges, the duty on shapes of iron amounts to 40 per cent. on an average value of \$40 per ton, which is an increase; but taking the clause as a whole the increase is not large.

Iron bridges and structural iron work, \$25 per ton or not less than 30 per cent.

I propose to change that clause also, and to make the duty 1½ cents per lb., instead of \$25 a ton, which leaves the duty the same, but it was thought it would be better understood abroad where there is competition for bridge work in this country, because our ton is 2,000 lbs., while in the United States it is 2,240 lbs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. CHARLTON. In the present price of iron, what would be the *ad valorem* duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 30 per cent.

Mr. SCRIVER. What increase is this on the existing duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 5 per cent.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is unfortunate, in the existing state of things, that any increase should be imposed on this particular article. A great many iron bridges are being built throughout the country, the constantly recurring freshets we suffer from, in the Province of Quebec at all events, necessitates the building of a great many, and a good many of our municipal corporations have decided to construct them of iron. This is virtually giving the bridge building companies of the Dominion a monopoly. We can have no competition under this tariff, as we had very little under the past tariff from the bridge builders of the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying there has been no competition on the part of the Americans, for most of the iron bridges constructed on the Canada Southern and the western section of the Grand Trunk Railway and Western, and also the bridge across the Chaudière, were constructed by Americans from Buffalo. The thing came under my notice, as three or four of the bridges were seized for under valuation, and the parties who made the Chaudière Bridge had to pay an additional duty of \$30,000.

Mr. SCRIVER. The ordinary traffic bridges, in the part of the country I live in, have been built by Canadian companies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There were only 112 tons of iron bridges imported last year.

Mr. SCRIVER. That bears out what I say.

Mr. MILLS. That only confirms the observations of my hon. friend. Throughout Ontario iron bridges are being erected by the municipalities, and of course this duty will add very largely to the taxation. If the hon. gentleman were to impose a moderate tax for bridge construction the Government would get that moderate tax, wherever the material was imported, but when the hon. gentleman imposes a very high tax, of course the Government gets little or nothing, and the municipalities have to pay, while the tax goes into the pockets of the bridge-builder.

Forgings of iron and steel, or forged iron of whatever shape or in whatever stage of manufacture, not elsewhere specified, \$30 per ton, provided that the duty shall not be less than 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CHARLTON. The same objection applies to this that applied before. There may be misinterpretation as to whether it is a long or a short ton, why not make it one and a-half cents per pound.

Mr. MILLS. That would make it uniform.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be happy to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for Bothwell, and make it one cent and a-half per pound.

Mr. MILLS. I may inform the hon. gentleman that I will not recommend such a tax, but the Minister having made up his mind to impose this extraordinary amount of taxation, I say it is better it should be enacted so that every body will understand it.

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, by whatever process made, billets and bars, bands, hoops, strips and sheets of all gauges and widths, all of above classes of steel not elsewhere provided for, valued at four cents or less per pound, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, but not less than \$10 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to alter this by substituting for the word "\$10" in the last line \$12, and

add to the item "except clogged ingots, blooms and slabs, upon which the specific duty shall be not less than \$ 1 a ton."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What quantity was imported, and what amount was collected under the old tariff?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The duty on steel ingots was \$3 per ton and 10 per cent.; steel sheets, two kinds, 1½ per cent. and \$3 per ton, and steel rods \$3 per ton and 10 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought, perhaps, you had a statement of the tons of all these combined and the combined amount of duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not that. The total value of steel was \$380,539, and the duty collected was \$60,883.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many tons does that represent?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 8,448.

Provided that on all iron or steel bars, rods, strips or steel sheets, of whatever shape, and on all iron or steel bars of irregular shape or section, cold rolled, cold hammered or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-sixth of one cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the said materials.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like the hon. gentleman to explain the exact meaning of this. What is the present amount of the tax, and what additions will this make to the taxation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no estimate of that. It is very small. We have not the material to make an estimate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be more intelligible to the trade if the hon. gentleman had stated absolutely, instead of in this supplementary kind of way, what the taxation really is. It will be very difficult to say what the taxation is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is difficult.

Provided further, that all metal produced from iron or its ores, which is cast and malleable, of whatever description of form, without regard to the percentage of carbon contained therein, whether produced by cementation, or converted, cast, or made from iron or its ores by the crucible, Bessemer, pneumatic, Thomas Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin or open hearth process, or by the equivalent of either, or by the combination of two or more of the processes, or their equivalents, or by any fusion or other process which produces from iron or its ores, a metal either granulous or fibrous in structure, which is cast and malleable, except what is known as malleable iron castings, shall be classed and denominated as steel.

And provided further that all articles rated as iron or manufacture of iron, shall be chargeable with the same rate of duty if made of steel, or of steel and iron combined, unless otherwise specially provided for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is merely explanatory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not properly comprehend the last part of this. Have we not enacted different duties for steel and for iron? Which duty is to apply? Is it the steel rate or the iron rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to provide that all articles rated as iron and manufactures of iron, although they may be made of steel, or of steel and iron combined, shall be charged with the same rate of duty as if made of iron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But what is the rate of duty there mentioned? Is it the rate of duty on iron or on steel?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The rate of duty on the article, whatever it is, which is specified in this tariff. It is merely explanatory.

Malleable iron castings, and steel castings not elsewhere specified, \$25 per ton, provided the duty shall not be less than 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman state what the amount of tonnage is which is now imported?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The value of malleable iron castings imported was \$20,474, and the duty collected was \$5,118.

Mr. CASEY. How many tons?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement I have does not give the tons.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What was the old rate of taxation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister should have given the weight.

Mr. ROWELL. As the duty was *ad valorem*, and not according to weight, the invoices would not enable us to give the information which the hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. CASEY. In all the other cases, the weight was given as well as the value.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was in most cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that we cannot tell what is the rate of taxation by the information given. It might be 100 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister of Customs know about the value of a ton of malleable castings?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I do not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That would depend altogether upon the size of the articles. The small size would be much more expensive than the large.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister himself apparently does not know how heavy the tax will be. He provides that it shall not be less than 30 per cent. but he cannot tell how high it will go.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I cannot tell.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Minister any information as to the price of malleable castings, either large or small? We are moving here entirely in the dark. The hon. Finance Minister himself has no idea, apparently, what the *ad valorem* tax will be at \$25 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make enquiry and furnish that information.

Cast iron vessels, plates, stone plates and irons, sad irons, hatters' irons, tailors' irons, and castings of iron not elsewhere specified, \$16 per ton, provided the duty shall not be less than 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman were to state the amount he expects to realise on each item, that would save a good many questions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am unable to do that. There is no separate return, and I have not the information.

Cast iron pipes, of every description, \$12 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to add the words: "Provided that the duty shall not be less than 35 per cent. *ad valorem*."

Mr. MILLS. So that if the \$12 a ton amounts to 35 per cent., then the duty will be increased to 35 per cent?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the object. This is expected to make the average about 25 per cent.

Iron or steel axles, parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks or forgings for axles, without reference to the stage of manufacture, \$30 per ton, but not less than 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that section by saying :

Iron or steel car axles, parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks or forgings for axles, and car springs of all kinds, and all other springs, not elsewhere specified, without reference to the stage of manufacture, \$30 per ton, but not less than 25 per cent. *ad valorem*

Locomotives and other steam engines, boilers and machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, not elsewhere specified, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to add to that: "Provided that any locomotive which, with its tender, weighs 30 tons or over, shall pay a duty of not less than \$2,000." The former duty was 25 per cent., and it is increased about 5 per cent. A 30 ton locomotive is supposed to be worth about \$7,000 to \$8,000.

Mr. MILLS. Will not that embrace, by far, the greater number of locomotives used in the country?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will embrace the larger ones; but it will enable second-hand locomotives, or small locomotives for a small road, or anything of that kind, to come in at a lower figure.

Mr. MILLS. Do not a great majority of the locomotives weigh over the limit fixed by the hon. gentleman?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. So that by far the greater number of locomotives that come in would pay \$2,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At least \$2,000; most of them will pay more.

Mr. MILLS. What about locomotives in transit through the country for foreign countries?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not touch that question at all.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Suppose you bring engines without the tender?

Mr. CASEY. The object is, practically, to value every locomotive as high as \$7,000, no matter how cheaply it may be produced. The Minister evidently thinks, or rather the gentlemen for whom he is arranging this tariff must have advised him, that there is some danger of locomotives of 30 tons and over being made at a cheaper rate than heretofore and imported, and therefore he proposes to avoid any chance of their coming in at less, by saying that they must be valued practically at \$7,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I may say frankly to my hon. friend that the object is to prevent cheap and worthless locomotives, painted up, second-hand things that are really of no practical value, being brought in at a low rate of duty, which are much better kept out. By fixing the weight in this way you provide that the duty shall be only a fair and legitimate one. Of course the object is to protect the manufacturer of locomotives within our own country, and this is the mode of doing it, because by undervaluation, by sending in second-hand locomotives at a cheap rate, and small locomotives—

Mr. CASEY. A small one would not weigh 30 tons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A small one would not be excluded. The reason the weight is fixed here is to favor the bringing in of locomotives for small roads, but for large railways, a locomotive and tender would require to weigh 30 tons. This leaves the door open for bringing in at a cheaper rate small locomotives.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's statements are contradictory; he says that the purpose is to exclude small and worthless locomotives. Well, it appears this item will let

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

small locomotives come in. Then, he says, it is to exclude worthless locomotives, second-hand stuff. Now, I think the hon. gentleman, in his paternal care for the people, might leave it for the purchaser to decide whether it pays him better to bring in a cheap or an expensive locomotive. If the object is to exclude a cheap locomotive, and if the hon. gentleman's assumption that everything that is cheap must be poor is correct, he is all right. But if that assumption is all wrong, and if it is a ridiculous impertinence on the part of any Government to say to the people, you shall not import cheap things, because we know those things are poor, and we know you are better without them; better leave them alone and buy something dearer at home, then such a statement is, as I say, a ridiculous impertinence on the part of this Government, and I am afraid my hon. friend is involved in the same condemnation. But he has admitted exactly what I stated with regard to the matter of fact. This clause practically means that every locomotive of 30 tons, no matter how cheaply it may be produced, no matter what improvements may occur in the manufacture of locomotives elsewhere, no matter how cheaply they may be produced abroad, is to be valued at such a price as will make the duty on it amount to \$2,000 at 30 per cent. That is practically the meaning of the item, and the object is certainly not the protection of the man who is being injured by buying a cheap article. The object is to create a monopoly in the manufacture of locomotives in Canada. There is no doubt about it. There is only one private corporation that I know of, apart from the railway companies, which makes locomotives in Canada. I am quite aware that that corporation has been in very deep water already under the National Policy, and this is, of course, an attempt to give it a lift upward.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken about there being only one manufactory in the country. Locomotives are manufactured at Moncton, St. John, N.B., Cobourg—

Mr. CASEY. By private companies?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, by private companies.

Mr. CASEY. So there are two or three factories instead of one, and at all events the business is a very close corporation.

Mr. MITCHELL. The real object, I fancy, is what the Finance Minister has explained, and I can quite understand it. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) did not appear to quite comprehend what that explanation was. There are certain railway companies in the United States which use their rolling stock for a certain time, and then, under a provision of the State authorities obtain new stock selling that formerly in use. As the Minister has explained this rolling stock is often painted and repaired and sent out of the country, and a considerable quantity of it has come into Canada. Some of the locomotives are very good, but a great many are the reverse.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are very poor.

Mr. MITCHELL. At all events, are not so good as those made in the country? I quite approve of the manner in which this clause has been drawn, for it will keep this class of rolling stock out of the country, and that is correct if we are to have a National Policy we are to keep our trade for our own manufacturers. Having said this much in favor of the policy of the Finance Minister, I would like to ask the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), who is a director of one of the leading locomotive factories in the country, whether he is satisfied, whether his company has received sufficient protection for their works, and if he is satisfied, I am.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am not satisfied. I am not connected with the practical part of the company's operations, but the managing director of the works writes me to say that the increased duty on the raw material will largely take away any increase in the advance of duty on locomotives, and he thinks they should be placed at 35 per cent. in order to keep the works going. The works were closed for two years, and during that time over thirty locomotives were imported into the country, and there is no reason why that large factory should not go on giving employment to 400 men, just in the same way as other establishments of the kind. Of course we have to submit to the changes in the tariff considered desirable by the Government, and I am ready to submit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to enquire the number of locomotives brought into the country. I am aware there are roads on which locomotives, such as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has described, are in use. All the rolling stock on the Huron and Erie Railway is old stock from the Michigan Central road. No doubt this accommodates the public very well, and much interference in the way of regulation might tend to seriously conflict with the interests of the people of that district. I give that road as an instance, and no doubt there are other tributary roads in the same position. It cost them very little for the rolling stock, but it suits the public convenience; and if the Finance Minister were to insist on their being equipped in first class style, I am much afraid the public would suffer in consequence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am unable to give the number of locomotives imported, but the value in 1885-86 was \$176,356 and the duty paid was \$43,334. I am informed that the number of locomotives was over 30.

Portable steam engines, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in this duty.

Mr. CASEY. I observe there is no change. That is what manufacturers will complain of. The manufacturers of these machines and engines are incapable of obtaining increased protection because there is no importation worth speaking of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only \$20,000.

Mr. CASEY. So an increase of duty would not give them any increased protection. This is an instance of the manner in which the hon. gentleman's tax on raw material bears very heavily, not on the consumer in this instance, but on the manufacturer. The manufacturers are not even offered increased protection, and yet the cost of raw material is very considerably increased.

Mr. MITCHELL. They had enough protection before.

Mr. CASEY. Now the duty on raw materials is increased, and no increased protection is given to the manufacturer. I do not ask the Minister to give them more protection, for I do not think he could do so, but it must be remembered that they are really being charged the increased duty on the raw material without receiving anything in return. This will prove very hard for some of them. There is a large firm manufacturing threshing machines in my county. They have complained, during the period of the National Policy, that they have been losing money owing to the taxes on raw material, and they will now have still more reason to complain. When the last change was made in iron, there was an increase given on the finished article. Now they will be charged this increased duty on the raw material, and yet not receive any additional protection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know it is not in the power of the hon. gentleman to increase this duty; but if he is exceedingly anxious that the matter should be con-

sidered, I will see if it is not possible to put on 5 per cent. more.

Mr. CASEY. I distinctly stated that I did not ask the hon. gentleman to do that, because I did not think it would help the manufacturers. Competition will keep the prices down to pretty nearly what they are at the present time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to strike out item 102—locomotive tires of Bessemer steel in the rough, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*—for the purpose of placing it on the free list.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the Minister why this is proposed. These goods are largely consumed in the country, and we do not know whether they might not be manufactured here. I do not understand why this should be made an exception to the usual rule.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These tires are not manufactured in this country so far as I am aware.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why not hold out the encouragement to establish a factory here?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to press as slightly as possible on the railway companies. On some items we have been obliged to levy considerable charges upon the railways. For instance, in regard to fish plates, which are manufactured here, we have increased the duty considerably, and I propose to place these tires on the free list, so as to give the companies compensation where we do not manufacture the articles in the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not understand that we cannot manufacture this article here. Even as regards pig iron, we have not as yet a very large production. We have certainly been very light on the railways in regard to the duties upon locomotives, on nuts, bolts, iron plates and everything of that kind. Why this single article, which is so largely used in the locomotives of the country, should be exempted I cannot see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that I am so unable to please hon. gentlemen. If I increase the duty they object, and if I decrease it they object; whatever I propose hon. gentlemen opposite object too. I am in great difficulty; I am extremely anxious to please hon. gentlemen, but I am at a loss to know how to do it. The hon. gentleman who has criticised the previous item, and who has since disappeared from the House, takes exception to our failure to give increased protection to the manufacturers of these portable engines, to compensate them for the increased cost of the iron. I propose to meet this charge of levying heavy duties on important railway corporations that are doing a great service to Canada in carrying on the business of the country, and my hon. friend objects. If I believed that a moderate duty, such as we have been applying to other articles, would have the effect of establishing valuable Bessemer steel works, and if these Bessemer steel tires could be provided in the country, I should be inclined to attempt it. But in this case I am instructed that the plant is of a very costly character, that the thing is really a specialty, and there is no prospect at any very early day of being able to furnish the article by affording increased protection, and consequently I used that as a means of giving some compensation in other matters, in which, for the purpose of stimulating and fostering an industry that does exist and can be carried on, we have been obliged to increase the charge.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has entirely misrepresented me. I expressed no sympathy whatever for the corporation he speaks of. What I wanted was an explanation of why a distinction was made between certain classes of the requirements of these corporations; why it was that in one case they were taxed 30 or 35 per cent.,

while in others these articles were allowed to come in free. I am satisfied with the explanation the hon. gentleman has given, but I am not satisfied when the hon. gentleman goes on and misrepresents me—and has his statements go abroad to the country—by saying that hon. gentlemen on one hand want one thing while I want another. Nor am I satisfied at his putting arguments in my mouth that I never used. I have no sympathy for these corporations. Everybody knows that I have no sympathy for the Grand Trunk, and as for the Canadian Pacific Railway it can take care of itself. But I think that in legislating upon so important a matter as the tariff it is important that we should be consistent in our legislation, and as we have established the principle of endeavoring to manufacture everything in the country, and endeavoring to give protection to industries which do not exist, for the purpose of creating them, I thought that a matter so important as these Bessemer works required some explanation, so that we might know why they were made an exception. The hon. gentleman has given an explanation. He states that he is informed that the machinery necessary for the carrying on of that great work will cost a considerable sum, and that, as far as he can learn, it is not probable that at any early day such an undertaking would be established in Canada, and that is a sufficient reason. I venture this full explanation in order to set myself right, and I hope that in future the hon. gentleman, when I call attention to a particular thing, will not endeavor to put me in the wrong, or to represent me before the public as not being sufficiently intelligent to understand an explanation when it is given, or to understand why, from my own point of view, the distinction was made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The position taken by the Minister of Finance throughout the discussion of the tariff is an extraordinary one. He gives as a reason for not imposing a tax on a particular article that it is one which cannot be produced in the country. Heretofore we have generally gone on the assumption that that was a good reason for imposing a tax, because by the imposition of a tax on an article which is not produced in the country you are not likely to impose a burden incidentally on the population, other than that which you impose directly by the imposition of the tax. Now the hon. gentleman says that if he were to tax this article we cannot destroy it as a subject of taxation. It will continue to be imported, and therefore it is a tax which is not likely to vary; it is a tax on the necessities of the railway corporations, and a tax which will always be paid. But if we put a tax on the locomotives the probability is that the tax will ultimately destroy them as a means of revenue. We will by-and-by produce them in the country, and we will cease to get anything from the imposition of this tax. The hon. gentleman has said that over and over again. He admits, and I admit, that you cannot impose extraordinary burdens on railway corporations in the country, as you certainly would if you tax locomotives, and tax the coal, and the iron, and the steel that is used in the manufacture of the wheels. But it is certainly a remarkable fact that from the beginning of the discussion on these resolutions up to this moment the hon. gentleman has assigned as a reason for the imposition of the tax that by its imposition we will ultimately stop the importation of the article and ultimately cease to get a revenue from it, and because you can put an end to this source of revenue then that is a proper mode of proceeding. The hon. gentleman will see, if his position is a sound one, that after he ceases to get a revenue from the tax upon locomotives altogether, the companies will continue to pay the same amount for these locomotives, and that while you will have ceased to collect revenues from this source, you will not have in the smallest degree, diminished the burdens of the railway corporations.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Boiler tubes or flues or stays of wrought iron or steel, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Should not these next three items be arranged in such a way as to reduce the burden upon these articles which enter into the construction of these machines? We have not here the same classification as we had before, and I would ask under which of these heads are the boiler tubes used by makers of portable engines, &c.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will come under the one you are discussing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And what will item 105 include?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Those smaller than two inches in diameter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Two inches were allowed in the second.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. These are only wrought iron tubes, not wrought iron pipes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that these are not worded as before.

Mr. BOWELL. They are separated to bring wrought iron tubing in the 15 per cent. list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was pointing out how you could give relief in item 101, without reduction of the duty in this, which is part of the raw material they have to use. I am not aware that there is any lap-welded tubing made in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I leave this very low, 15 per cent.

Other wrought iron or steel tubes or pipes, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to change that by making it a duty of 1½ cents per lb. instead of 30 per cent.; that would be equivalent to about 35 per cent. on a value of 4 cents per lb.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why do you make a distinction between this and the other tubes? This is more than double.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The other will be imported, and this will be made in the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will this include all steel tubes that are threaded?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does item 103, "boiler tubes or flues, or stays of wrought iron or steel, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*," mean threaded or plain, or any and every kind?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, any kind, so long as they are for boiler tubes or flues?

Skates, 20 cents per pair and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very heavy tax and a very objectionable one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The manufacture of skates has reached a very high and satisfactory point in Canada; we are celebrated for the manufacture of our skates; yet the cheap German labor threatens to extinguish the industry, and this is for the purpose of preventing that. I am advised that it will not cause the slightest increase in the price.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I think the mode of imposing the tax is very objectionable. The hon. gentleman had better have a specific or an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). An *ad valorem* duty would be better. The hon. Minister must see how hardly that will bear on the poor lad who wants to get a pair of skates. We

know that many lads save up their money for that purpose. I think it would be fairer to increase the *ad valorem* duty. The hon. gentleman ought not to discriminate against the poor lads in the way this will do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am thinking of the poor lads who make these skates, and I think they are quite as much entitled to consideration as the poor lads who amuse themselves. I should be sorry to do anything that would deprive anybody of the healthful exercise of skating, but the question is whether you are going to allow this cheap German labor to come in and wipe out this industry, or impose such a duty as will enable it to be carried on.

Mr. MALLORY. I think the principal manufactory of skates is situated in Halifax, and from information I have been able to obtain, I understand that some of these skates have been patented, and the patent has secured to the holders of the patent a monopoly to a certain extent in the manufacture of them; but the patents have expired, and now the specific duty which is placed on the skates will possibly be an equivalent for the expiration of the patent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman I think is mistaken in saying that there is only one skate industry in the country.

Mr. MALLORY. I said the principal one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there is a manufactory in Montreal, and another in St. John. But the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the Star Company, of Halifax, is the principal one, and I am glad to know that such has been the excellence of their manufacture that the skates of that company have been celebrated all over the world. One of the finest exhibits of that kind that we had in the London Exhibition was the exhibit of that company. Under these circumstances I think we would all regret very much if cheap German labor were allowed to come in and wipe out this industry, and I do not think any hardship will arise to any person, or that any great increase in the cost to the public will result from this duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's sympathy is illusory. I am inclined to think that when he takes into consideration the cost of transportation, insurance and everything else connected with the shipment of skates from the centre of Germany to Canada, he will see that no matter what the labor is, the German skates cannot come seriously into competition with the skates manufactured in Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister says we must take into consideration the claims of the boy engaged in the manufacture of these skates. Last year, there was something required by a representative from Nova Scotia for the boy, and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt as a maxim for the Government that there must be something had for the boy even in the manufacture of skates. The hon. gentleman, I do not think has met the objection as to the compound duty. The duty will altogether amount to something like 100 per cent. on the cheaper varieties of skates.

Mr. CASEY. I am informed by a large wholesale hardware dealer in London, who wrote me on the subject, that this duty on skates amounts to exactly 105 per cent. on the steel skates we have been importing. If the Minister thinks the protection of 105 per cent. is required to enable the boy in Halifax to go on manufacturing skates, let him say so at once. Making it 30 per cent. *ad valorem* and 20 cents per pair is merely to prevent the public from seeing what tremendous protection the boy is getting. The hon. gentleman is, however, doubling the price of skates to the other boys who use them throughout the country, in order to maintain this particular firm in Halifax in great luxury and abundance. I do not know whether this is the cheapest way of fulfilling election promises or

not, but it would be more straightforward on the part of the Minister if he would say at once what duty he is imposing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think on a 50-cent skate it would be an *ad valorem* duty of 70 per cent., and on a \$3 skate, an *ad valorem* duty of 35 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister's own argument is against him in regard to the quality of skates, because these skates which are imported from England are celebrated for their quality everywhere and are superior to the German skates, so that there is no danger of the German skate being imported.

Sledges, track tools, wedges and crow bars of iron or steel 1½ cents per lb. and 30 per cent *ad valorem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to strike out this item and to substitute the following for it:—

Screws, commonly called wood screws, two inches or over in length 6 cents per lb., one inch or less than two inches, 8 cents per lb., less than one inch 11 cents per lb.

Mr. CASEY. If the screws are not in some part of the schedule, they cannot be introduced at this stage. The hon. gentleman cannot propose a new tax on concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will allow it to stand. I merely wanted to substitute it, because it keeps numbers right.

Hardware, namely, builders, cabinet makers and carriage hardware and locks, 35 per cent *ad valorem*.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest that this be allowed to stand. It should be amended to include harness and saddlery hardware. That was in the old clause and should appear here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will allow that to stand for the purpose of looking into it.

Street railway bars or rails weighing not less than twenty-five pounds per lineal yard for purposes other than railway tracks, \$8 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to substitute iron or steel railway bars, and rails for railway tramways of any form, punched or not punched, not elsewhere specified, \$6 ton."

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that include street railways?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Manufactures, articles or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BROWN. I would ask the Minister to allow this to stand or to make it 35 per cent. to cover a number of manufacturers of similar tools not enumerated in the other portions of the tariff. A duty of 35 per cent. would make the manufacture successful.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to make that 35 per cent.

Mr. CASEY. On what ground?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not listen to the hon. gentleman from Hamilton or he would have known.

Mr. CASEY. I thought it was the Minister who was making the Government explanations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member from Hamilton has as much right as the hon. gentleman to make a suggestion in reference to an item and give his reasons. And he did so in a manner which commended them to my judgment as worthy of consideration.

Mr. CASEY. We did not hear what he said.

Mr. BROWN. I said it loud enough.

Mr. CASEY. You did not. You made some allusion to small tools. We heard just now from the Minister that it was not advisable to make these changes without consideration. He told his hon. friend behind him that he could not make such a change without considering it, but his friend from Hamilton seems to have more influence.

Mr. BROWN. I will speak louder. There are a number of tools, such as carpenters' tools and tinmiths' tools, which are not enumerated in the tariff, that could be covered and sufficiently protected by a duty of 35 per cent., and I am sure the wisdom of such a provision will commend itself to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CASEY. I understand now. This is in order to increase the price of tools used by tinmiths and carpenters.

Mr. BROWN. No, it is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the Minister to agree to make this change. He cannot make it. We have been proceeding a little irregularly, but the Minister cannot make the change without going into committee again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, if exception is taken, we cannot make the change, so we will let that item stand.

Mr. MALLORY. I read here: "Articles or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel." I would ask whether articles made partly of wood and partly of iron or steel, would come under that class.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MALLORY. That appears to be a very sweeping clause. If one or two nails or spikes were in a wooden article, it would come under this clause.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no. This was not at all intended to meet the case to which the hon. gentleman refers. The difficulty was in administering the law where it provided for an iron duty. Take the case of car wheels. They were formerly imported at 25 per cent, if made of iron, but manufactures of steel were at 20 per cent. As soon as they commenced to manufacture car wheels of steel, they claimed to enter them at the 20 per cent. rate, as a manufacture of steel, though car wheels were specified at 25 per cent. The courts, however, in the United States, and, I believe, our own courts have decided that, where articles are specially mentioned, the duty so mentioned should cover them, but, to prevent difficulties, it was provided that articles, whether made of iron or steel, or partly of one or the other, should bear the same rate of duty. It is not a new clause. It has been on the Statute-book for years.

Mr. CASEY. Is there any regulation in the Customs Department to show what amount of iron must be in an article to bring it under this clause? For instance, would my hon. friend's suggestion, that a few nails or spikes being in an article, be sufficient to bring it under this heading, be correct?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not.

Mr. CASEY. Is there any regulation to that effect?

Mr. BOWELL. If an article comes in and a man says it is iron or steel, unless it is otherwise provided for it is so classified. In most of these cases it is provided for. A hammer is provided for. It is steel in the head, and part of it is iron. They used to face the heads with steel; but steel is now so cheap that they can make them all of steel. Then part of it is wood, and there may be a rivet through it. I have seen hammers made of brass; but that is provided for.

Mr. BROWN.

Labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionery and other goods; also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders, 15 cents per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. gentleman will require to alter the phraseology of this clause. "And other goods"—does that mean any kind of goods?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It means labels for any kind of goods.

Printing presses of all kinds, folding machines, and paper cutting machines, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. CASEY. What is the duty now?

Mr. BOWELL. This is a reduction on the folding machines, which were 10 per cent. when imported by bookbinders or by printers, while the others were at 20 per cent. We are putting them all in the 10 per cent. class, no matter by whom they are imported.

On the second resolution (free list).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to make an alteration in the second item, fire brick, by adding "for smelting or melting furnaces or for coke ovens," limiting the free use of fire brick to these cases.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why limit it to them? Why not give the potters the benefit of it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because I find it is not manufactured in the country for these purposes, and there is a manufacture here for ordinary stoves.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But a great deal of it is used in potters' kilns.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be a melting furnace.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, it is not for burning the stoneware.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that might fairly be added.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What would you suggest for that?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). "Or furnaces or kilns used in potteries."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to include stove furnaces.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They would not come under that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that he is imposing a tax upon articles of domestic use.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is putting them on the free list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the free list, as it stands, will include all fire bricks, and the hon. gentleman proposes to limit this list to a particular class.

Mr. MITCHELL. While we are on this free list, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he could not include the articles of corn meal, flour and bituminous coal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to my hon. friend that so far as corn meal is concerned, the subject is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad at last that, after something like six years of strenuous efforts on my part, this is the first time I have got that far. I have been refused before, I have been laughed at by the Finance Minister, I have been put off with a smile, by saying that probably at some future time the subject would be considered, but now the Government have got it under consideration, and I trust that our worthy and very able Finance Minister will at last do simple justice to the constituents I have the honor to represent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend that not only have we the question of corn meal under consideration, but we have already removed the duty to the extent of half a million dollars per annum on anthracite coal.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may say to my hon. friend that so far as that is concerned it will not benefit my constituents ten cents, for the reason that the position of my county in relation to the source of supply of anthracite coal, is so distant that such a thing is scarcely ever used. It is the exception where it is used in the county. The coal used in my county comes from Nova Scotia, from Pictou, and the mines of Cape Breton and the Cumberland mines. If my hon. friend is under any impression that in removing half a million dollars from anthracite coal to benefit Ontario, that is an argument for me to present my constituents in exchange for allowing these high duties to go on, he is mistaken. I know that when I point that out to him it will be an additional reason why he should think of the corn meal.

Mr. BORDEN. The House will remember that when the National Policy was inaugurated the duty upon corn meal stood very much in the same relationship to the duty upon flour, that the duty upon anthracite coal stood to the duty upon bituminous coal. We do not raise a large quantity of corn in this country, nor was it expected that we should, and we had not anthracite coal here. But the duty upon corn meal was defended on the ground that it would encourage the use of coarse grain. In the same way the duty upon anthracite coal was defended upon the ground that it would encourage the bituminous coal industry, and the Finance Minister in 1877 stated distinctly that the bituminous coal would take the place, to a certain extent, of the anthracite which is being used in this country. Therefore, I do not see how, logically, the Government could refrain from taking the duty off corn meal inasmuch as they are taking it off anthracite coal, showing that the one stands precisely in the same relationship to the wheat which it was proposed to protect in the one case, as the anthracite coal stands to the bituminous coal, which it was proposed to protect in the other case. The corn meal duty is one which bears, as the hon. Minister knows, very heavily on the Province of Nova Scotia. I have been looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that about nineteenth-twentieths of the duties which have been paid upon corn meal since this policy was inaugurated, have been paid by the Maritime Provinces, and that four-fifths of that have been paid by the Province of Nova Scotia. Now, the Maritime Provinces have also paid a certain proportion of the duty upon anthracite coal, and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have paid a very small proportion of the duty upon corn meal. Consequently, it would only be fair to the Maritime Provinces, in relieving the Province of Ontario of this duty on anthracite coal, that they should also be relieved of the duty upon corn meal. I hope the Minister has not only taken into his consideration that matter, but that it will receive his favorable consideration. I had intended, if we had not received the assurance we have received from him to-night, to have moved an amendment that corn meal should be added to the free list. I did not propose to go further, because I recognised the fact—and I am sorry to have to do it—that this country has deliberately adopted and approved of this National Policy, not, perhaps, to the extent the hon. gentlemen are going, but certainly the question has been before the country during three elections, and they have decided in favor of it. The county which I have the honor to represent, although in 1882 it sent to this House a supporter of the Administration, is not, in my opinion, a National Policy county. It is an agricultural district, and cannot possibly be benefited in any way by the National Policy,

nevertheless, as I said, I recognise the fact that the country as a whole has accepted that policy, and I simply press for the taking off of this duty upon corn meal as a logical result and as a simple act of justice to the Maritime Provinces, in view of the fact that the Minister has taken the duty off anthracite coal, which formed a part of the policy, and which was considered an offset to the duty upon corn meal.

Mr. FREEMAN. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) should not take to himself the credit of having this corn meal question brought to the notice of the Finance Minister, because other members interested in the corn meal question had been attending to that matter as well as himself. I do not think it is necessary to argue the point as to whether in consideration of the duty having been taken off anthracite coal, that therefore it should be taken off corn meal. I, who am deeply interested in this question of corn meal, feel perfectly satisfied that when the Finance Minister tells us that he has taken it into his consideration, he will decide favorably, because I am sure that he understands the position of Nova Scotia, and he understands how hardly that duty bears upon that Province. He understands perfectly well where it bears and where it bears hardest, and I feel satisfied that he is prepared to do justice to Nova Scotia. I may add that I am pleased and gratified with the assurance he has given us to-night.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend from King's county, Nova Scotia (Mr. Borden) has referred to the fact that the people of Canada in 1878 adopted a protective policy. That was confirmed in 1882 and 1887, and it must be the settled wish of the people of Canada that the policy should be applied to our mining, manufacturing and agricultural interests, and to every branch of those interests. I have looked into this matter, and I find that there is a large amount of corn imported into this country. It is very largely used by the distillers, who contribute a large amount to the revenue of the country from the tax of 7½ cents per bushel on corn. It unfortunately happens that we do not raise in Canada sufficient corn for the requirements of our people, and consequently we have to import it, and a large quantity of corn meal is imported into the Lower Provinces, especially Nova Scotia, for human food. I do not think it is in the interests of Canada to take the duty off corn, and I am afraid when the matter is investigated there will be some difficulty in taking off the duty on corn meal. But I take this stand that the miller who grinds the corn is entitled to some such measure of protection as we accord to people who refine sugar, who manufacture cottons or grind wheat. And this result can be attained in this way: We desire to encourage, within our own borders, every branch of manufacture, and to develop each as much as possible. I say then, if possible, we ought to secure the grinding of that corn to our own people. This might be secured in this way: By giving a rebate to the corn miller for every barrel of corn he grinds into meal for human food, on the corn of which he has paid duty. That will meet the case. When hon. gentlemen take the trouble to investigate this matter carefully, they will find there is great difficulty in taking the duty off corn and also in taking it off corn meal, but we might meet the difficulty by giving a rebate to the miller of the duty he paid on the corn.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). As this corn meal question has come up rather unexpectedly, I would just say that in my opinion it would be wrong to take the duty off corn meal. It is the only duty placed upon the food products of this country which benefits the farmers of the county I have the honor to represent. There is not as much corn raised in the Dominion as is consumed; consequently a duty placed upon corn or corn meal enhances the value of that product, and thus benefits the farmers of the counties where corn is raised. I, therefore, say that while we have been

imposing taxes on all varieties of articles which will affect the farmer, it would be improper to remove a duty which alone benefits them. I do not think it should be done. I do not think those millers who have been encouraged to invest money in corn meal mills during the last few years and have been afforded protection, should now have that protection removed. I hold that one of the strongest objections to the tariff as framed is that the Government practically induced people to invest capital in different industries that would not exist except for the protection afforded them, and thus they become hot-house plants; they are fostered and upheld by the Government, and when such protection is withdrawn they cease to exist. We do not want such industries in this country. Of course, it is necessary that we should have a reasonable amount of protection for revenue purposes, and I think the proper course is that if an industry cannot sustain itself with a reasonable amount of protection, then it is not in the public interest that the Government should foster it. I was particularly struck with an argument advanced by some hon. gentlemen opposite during this discussion, and that was in reference to the iron duties. The argument was brought forward that Cape Breton possessed illimitable fields of iron ore and coal, and everything in close proximity, and with the best facilities for shipping, and although there was protection of \$3.50 per ton on iron, yet no steps had been taken to develop those mines. Now, the Government proposed a duty of \$10, \$13 and \$15 a ton, and to levy that tax on every industry in order to foster an enterprise for men who had not "snap" enough with the former duty to build up that industry. This remark, of course, is a little outside of the argument, but speaking of the corn meal question I would say that it would not be right, after encouraging the industry, to make a radical change, more especially as it is a real benefit to the farmers, and the only kind of grain that farmers in the Dominion raise which is enhanced in value by the duty imposed. You may take wheat, oats, peas and barley, and place any duty on them, and it would not affect the price. Even a duty of 40 cents a bushel on wheat would not advance the price, because our price is controlled by that ruling in the old country, and in all cases where we have anything to export the price of the exported article is what regulates the price of the whole. But in corn and corn meal we do not raise as much as we require, and therefore any duty is a real benefit to the farmer by enhancing the value of the grain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall have a future opportunity of dealing with this question, and the discussion is not entirely relevant to the item of fire brick which is at present under consideration.

Mr. BORDEN. We were discussing the free list, and the hon. gentleman himself said that he has under consideration the addition of an item. I think the argument into which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has entered so elaborately with respect to the iron duties shows that this country is not ready for the iron industry, or it would have taken hold of it under the old protection afforded. And that is an answer to the argument put forth by the hon. gentleman with respect to corn meal. I can show from the Trade and Navigation Returns that there has been no increase in Canada of the manufacture of corn meal, and that we are importing just as much as ever. In 1883-84 we imported \$16,400 worth, the year before on \$8,000, the year before that \$9,000, showing there is no justification on any of the grounds laid down by the hon. member for a continuance of this duty. The industry does not belong here and should not be encouraged. This duty is simply and solely a tax and nothing more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As regards fire brick I will let the item stand as it is, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) objects to its being changed.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent).

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the item "anthracite coal," the proposal which is supposed to be a benefit to Ontario and a saving to the people of towns and villages, I am afraid I shall have to tell my farming friends that they have been seriously misled by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have been told at every election during the past few years that the tax on anthracite coal had added so much to the price of their cordwood. I have known intelligent farmers who were actually influenced by that argument, and said they would support hon. gentlemen opposite, because the tax on anthracite coal, which is the kind we chiefly import for house use in my part of the country, affected the price of cordwood. I shall have to tell those gentlemen either that the Government were humbugging them before, or else that this great boon to Ontario is a boon to the inhabitants of the towns and cities at the expense of the farmer.

Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal Item No. 816 in Schedule "E" of tariff of Customs duties, and to substitute the following in lieu thereof, viz. :—

1. Shingle bolts of pine or cedar, and cedar logs capable of being made into shingle bolts, \$1.50 per cord of 128 cubic feet.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that while we are repealing item No. 816, with regard to shingle bolts of pine or cedar, &c., we are neglecting a very important industry, and that is the export of elm and ash logs, oak, birch, black birch and basswood. There is an export duty on spruce and pine logs going to the United States. I have before me the strongest evidence of the deep injury which will be done to a very important industry in Canada, if an export duty is not put on ash and elm logs, and in fact upon all these woods that I have enumerated. The position of the matter is this, that a great industry has been established on Lake Huron and in some of the counties bordering on River St. Clair, and it is being very seriously affected, and will be ultimately crushed out, and a large loss incurred, if an export duty is not put on these timbers, on the principle upon which an export duty has been applied to pine and spruce—a principle which will equally apply to these woods. I wish to say—and I hope the matter will be freely discussed by gentlemen on both sides—that the export duty on elm and ash logs is \$1 per thousand; \$1 per cord on elm stave bolts and \$1.50 per cord on basswood and ash stave bolts. There are about 50,000,000 feet annually exported in the shape of logs and bolts, for which the country is benefited to the extent of \$200,000; and this if manufactured at home would leave about \$1,000,000 in the country, and there is about the same quantity manufactured at home. There are 35 mills in active operation, nearly 1,500 men are employed, nearly \$1,000,000 invested, and there is over \$1,000,000 of an output annually. Now there is no export duty on the logs or bolts—the raw material entering the United States. There is a duty of 35 per cent. on hoops and headings, and 10 per cent. on staves entering the United States. The quantity of staves manufactured in Canada and the amount manufactured from Canadian timber, control the United States market. Our manufacturers of the products of these woods when they go to the United States are confronted with their own logs admitted free, in addition to the American duty, and I think it is impossible for that state of things to exist. The American mills along our border can, on account of the facilities of water communication, transport their raw material to these factories at a very little in advance of the cost to local mills; and on account of the American manufacturer being able to get our timber free, the Canadian manufacturer is compelled to compete against our own timber and a 10 per cent. and a 35 per cent. duty against him. The American manufacturer can purchase his machinery on the other side possibly cheaper, and at all events as cheap, as the Canadian manufacturer; but the great burden he has to contend against is that, when he

goes to the United States with the manufactured article, he is confronted with the American duty, and it is impossible for him to compete against it. The cost of manufacturing pine logs into timber is about \$1.35, and the cost of manufacturing elm logs into staves is about \$4 or \$5 per thousand. At the present rate of exportation, in five years there will not be sufficient elm left to make this profitable. Now, these men have a very great difficulty to contend against. The Americans must and will have our logs, and they will pay the export duty. They are now paying the export duty on the timber which bears such a duty. My hon. friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will be able to testify to this House how important the lumber industry is in his constituency, and how greatly the people are suffering for the want of this export duty. It will do good to our people. It will enable them to make their industries successful, and at the same time bring considerable money into the Treasury. I can tell the House that nearly a million dollars in one section of the country is at stake in the manufacture of elm, and claim, in the interest of the country, and in the interest of those industries which are sure to go to the wall if an export duty is not put on, that the Government should take this matter into their serious consideration. It is a matter of such grave consequence that it cannot be allowed to rest. I know that the constituents of all hon. gentlemen are suffering from the condition in which all timber except pine and spruce now stands. I make this statement, and I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are cognisant of the facts, will give free expression to their views on this subject.

Mr. DAWSON. What the hon. gentleman has said in reference to the export duty on lumber of certain kinds is quite correct, so far as it applies to the district I have the honor to represent. The export duty on logs has already had a good effect in Algoma. Within the past two years we have had a large number of additional mills put in operation there. Still, I do not think the duty is quite high enough yet, namely, \$2 per thousand on saw-logs, because this summer there will be a very large number of logs exported across the line to be sawn in the United States. I received lately a letter from one of my constituents, in which he pointed out that there should also be an export duty on birch, which was being exported from certain sections of the Islands of St. Joseph and Manitoulin in considerable quantities, and that an export duty would lead to the manufacture of that wood in our own country. The same is the case with some other woods. I quite concur in what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) has said on this subject, on which he seems to have bestowed a good deal of consideration.

Mr. MASSON. I think this subject is one requiring the immediate consideration of the Government, because the supply of elm is very small, and if any benefit is to be gained to the country by placing an export duty on that class of logs, it will require to be done very shortly, otherwise the country will be entirely denuded of that class of timber, the supply being so small. The effect the export duty has had on the lumber trade of Algoma, the hon. member for Algoma has himself explained; but in the riding I represent I found life-long opponents of the Government and of a protective tariff join in supporting the export duty placed on our logs, and the fault they found with the Government in that respect was that the duty was not high enough.

Mr. GUILLET. It happens that this question of the export duty on timber was discussed in my riding during the recent election, and I found a very strong sentiment prevailing among all classes that the Government had not gone far enough in that direction. It was also felt that there should be a movement for the placing of an export duty on stave bolts. There is a strong feeling in Ontario

in favor of conserving our forests. The subject of forestry is more and more engaging the attention of the people of that Province. This is very largely due to the interest created in this subject by the Ontario Government. It is coming to be felt that it will not result in injury to the Province if the consumption of these woods is to some extent diminished for the time being, because they will enhance in value as they become more in demand in the United States as well as in our own country. That will be a large offset to the diminished production of stave bolts. But there will also be this advantage that in the meantime our stave makers will obtain better value for their staves on the other side of the line, where there is an enormous market for them. They have depleted their own forests, and are now exhausting ours. I think that should be checked, or our stave producers should be placed on the same footing as the Americans by having the advantage of some protection in the form of an export duty. I know this will be a wise move, and it would be most valuable for the development of the various industries that require these goods. I hope the matter will receive the immediate attention of the Government.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to say a word on the same subject. It fell to my lot to be one of the two gentlemen who waited on the Government on this matter some time ago, and proposed that a duty should be put on cedar. We had elm and other woods included, but for some reason they were struck off. I thought that was an unwise move, because elm timber has become very valuable; the Americans seem to require it, and we may as well have some revenue out of it as not. This is an interest of very great moment to our people, and we ought to preserve our forests as far as possible.

Mr. MILLS. Is there a factory for the manufactory of elm in your provinces?

Mr. HESSON. Yes, there are factories that require elm, and I saw a very considerable quantity of it. The Americans are exporting from our country immense quantities of logs, with which all we have to do is to cut down the trees and then put the logs into the water, the rest of the labor being done in the United States. The Americans have depleted their own forests, and it is time we prevented them from entering ours by putting an export duty upon wood, and thus give to our own people the opportunity of buying it in our own markets at reasonable rates, and giving them also the labor of cutting it up.

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa.) It is very proper that the attention of the Government should be called to this subject of the exportation to the United States of our timber free of duty. Our forests are the enrichment of this country, and it is the duty of the Government to protect this interest as much as iron, the manufacture of cottons and woollens, or any other interest. In this section of country we are so far from the frontier that complications such as are complained of along the water frontier, represented by my hon. friends who have just spoken, have not arisen. I do not see why we should allow our timber to go across to the United States and be there manufactured, thus depriving our people of the labor to which they are entitled, and which they ought to derive from the growth of our forests. A year ago the Government very properly imposed a duty on pine saw-logs of \$2 a thousand, and reserved to themselves the power of increasing that duty to \$3, when they deemed it necessary. I contend a corresponding duty should be applied to all the different descriptions of marketable timber of our forests. I believe in the endorsement of this principle, as of vital importance taken in connection with the protective policy the Government have adopted. I hope, therefore, the Minister of Finance will take into consideration the importance of putting an export duty

on the various qualities of timber that hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the subject would suggest. I hope no time will be lost, but that it will be done this Session.

Mr. HESSON. There were 111,000 logs of oak, hemlock, pine and spruce got out, not manufactured. The export of this must have caused a great loss to the country, because the work that had to be done on them was all done in the United States. Instead of having those logs manufactured into very valuable articles here, we export them, and all we have in return is simply a certain value of property. When the Government last year brought down their resolutions imposing \$2 a thousand feet on pine lumber and \$1 on spruce, it met with my hearty approbation, and I am prepared to support a continuance of that policy.

Mr. BRYSON. At the time the Government brought down their resolutions last year changing the tariff by imposing \$2 a thousand on all pine lumber and \$1 on spruce, that change met with my hearty approbation. I have felt for some time the lumber trade of this country required certain protection, but I was not prepared to go so far in this direction as the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Perley) as to approve of a duty of \$3 a thousand. My own views with reference to that are that \$2 a thousand on pine lumber is quite sufficient, and that is what we put on saw-logs. I think that our forests should be protected. With reference to all other woods, such as ash, elm, oak and basswood, to a great extent that class of timber in the Ottawa valley has not been tampered with, but I am aware that that class of trade is growing up in this section of the country. I think that those classes of woods which are exported on Lake Huron should be taken into consideration, and, if we give protection to all the industries of this great country, we should give protection to the lumber trade, which has hitherto had little or no protection. I think it is for the Government to consider seriously whether it would not be well to protect ash, elm and basswood in the same way as we have protected spruce. I think this is the time to strike. We may not have an occasion to discuss this matter for some time to come, for another year at any rate, and I think, as large quantities of timber are being exported from Canada now, there should be at least a duty of \$1 a thousand on these woods, the same as on spruce.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) and the hon. member for the City of Ottawa (Mr. Perley) are very anxious that there should be a tax on logs which are sent out of the country, and contend that we ought to keep our timber in the country for our own purposes. I should like to know if they are willing to put an export duty on lumber as well as on logs. Do they propose to put the mill-owner and the farmer on the same ground in the matter? It would be interesting for the House to know that.

Mr. HESSON. Our American friends charge us \$2 a thousand on sawn lumber, and there is not a great deal of labor that goes into that. Now we are going much closer into the matter, we are referring to what goes into the employment of labor to a large extent by the factories. The Americans charge \$2 on our sawn lumber, and they are very wise in their day and generation. Their own timber being pretty well exhausted, they permit our logs to go in free. Did they admit our sawn lumber free, there might be some justification for the course we have been pursuing in permitting them to come and denude our country of the most valuable timber we have, while we have nothing to show for it but the stumps which are left and the paltry amount the Government receive for stump duties. Hon. gentlemen will see that the Americans are very wise. If they permitted our sawn lumber to go in there free, the miller could afford to pay a little more for his timber; he could afford to give a little more to his workmen

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa).

and the country would receive more advantage. But now we are not getting a fraction of advantage out of that. Besides, in regard to square timber, upon which the commonest labor is used, there are millions of dollars worth exported out of the country, and are we getting all we ought to get in that regard? A man at a dollar a day or at \$20 or \$25 a month in a camp does that kind of work in the winter, and what have we to show for it? The best of our timber is being taken out of the country, and we have nothing to show for it. I think we should control this matter. I ask the Government to take it into their serious consideration and I hope they will.

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa). In reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I desire to make a little explanation. What I said was that we were entitled to protect the labor, and, as a further illustration of that point, I may state to the House that what is termed the waste from sawing is very important to furnish labor for our people in this country. A few days ago, one of the mills belonging to my firm of Perley & Pattee was burnt to ashes. That mill was used to cut up the slabs and edgings from the main mill, and that gave employment to about one hundred men. The main advantage in working up this waste is in giving the employment. The profit upon it is very little indeed, but the main point is to give employment. I say we are entitled to protect the manufacture of these trees in this country.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What was the export duty on this last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no data. This subject was not before us, and I have no data dealing with it.

Mr. SPROULE. Coming from a section of the country in which the effect of this policy is felt, I desire to say a word or two upon this question. Anyone who has had occasion to go through the Algoma district a few years ago and to see the number of saw mills which were then in operation cutting lumber, and who would pass through there now and see that some of them are closed altogether, and others have moved to the American side, where they are doing the trade which was done in our own country a few years ago, cannot but understand the importance of putting on some duty to protect our lumber here. Every year thousands of the logs are cut down in the bush, taken to the lake, put in booms, and taken across the lake to the American shore; and along the lake, in the State of Michigan, may be found extensive mills, employing hundreds of our Canadian young men, manufacturing the lumber that ought to be manufactured in our own forests. Besides that, the loss is sustained of the offal connected with the manufacture of lumber, which might be taken into account if it were made here. It seems that this policy gives us the first instalment and the rest is taken by the Americans. I think the first difficulty arose from the duty which was imposed upon lumber by the Americans. As there is no duty on logs, the lumbermen took the logs to the American shore, cut the lumber, and then had the advantage of an extensive market beyond that which they had here; but, since the evil is getting very extensive, and our timber is disappearing, not only pine and oak, but our soft timber such as ash, cherry, birch, and other kinds of timber is fast disappearing, it is of great importance that the question should be taken up early by the Government. Last year, when this export duty was imposed, it was thought to be sufficient, but whether it is necessary to put on a higher duty than is now put on Canadian lumber by the Americans or not I do not say. At all events, the duty should be sufficient to prevent the timber being taken to the United States and sawn, to the detriment of the people of this country and especially of the people in the localities where the mills should be.

Mr. WATSON. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak you would imagine there was no duty on lumber coming into this country. There is an export duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber coming into this country, which hon. gentlemen do not appear to realise. I come from a section of country where we feel seriously that duty on lumber. Now, to put an export duty on logs might lead to a higher duty being placed on logs coming into our country. At present logs are brought into Manitoba where they are manufactured into lumber, and they come in free of duty. I believe two-thirds of the lumber consumed in the North-West today comes in in the shape of logs from Minnesota. In the present unsettled state of affairs between Canada and the United States, I fear if you place a higher duty on these logs it may lead to retaliation on the part of the United States Government, who may place a duty on logs coming into our country. There appears to be a difference of opinion as to which would benefit most by placing an export duty on logs, but it appears to me that the freest trade relations that can possibly exist between the two countries should prevail in respect to lumber, and we ought to avoid legislation that might lead to retaliation on the part of the Americans by placing a duty on logs coming into Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. We had better look out for ourselves, and let them do the same.

Mr. WELDON. I am sorry we are not able to ascertain what the duty was last year. My impression was that when we discussed the question on a previous occasion, the export duty amounted only to \$10,000 or \$11,000, showing that the duty did not afford much protection, or that the quantity exported was very small. As one of the members from New Brunswick, I want to speak more particularly about the present duty upon cedar logs. We all know that on the river forming the boundary between the United States and Canada, there are a number of shingle mills on the Maine side of the river, and the farmers on the New Brunswick side cut a great many cedar logs, which are of no value on this side, but when they take them across the river they can sell them at a good profit. This duty will certainly take away a profitable industry from a large number of poor people in the counties of Victoria and Madawaska. It seems to me the whole thing is indefensible in placing an export duty on logs. It is simply putting the manufacturer against the farmer. You might as well put an export duty upon wheat, to enable the millers to buy it cheaper from the farmers. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), ridicules the idea that it costs the farmers nothing to cut the logs. I tell him that if he goes into the lumber business he will find that it costs a great deal of money to cut logs and bring them to market. Large numbers of men are employed in this business, and large amounts of money are expended in it. But I object to this whole notion of an export duty. For instance, we see an immense number of hop poles along the line of the Canada Atlantic Railway, which are sent to the United States. You might as well put a duty on them. You might as well put a duty on the deals and square timber that we send to England, so as to compel them to be manufactured here. The principle is the same, and it is simply sacrificing the interests of the laboring population of this country for the purpose of building up new manufactures.

Mr. CASEY. I should be glad to hear the views of the Finance Minister on this question. If he is prepared to state his opinion on this matter, I will sit down and give him a chance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the Government have had this subject under their consideration, but they did not arrive at a determination to place an export duty on elm logs. But I may say that, after listening to the very important discussions that have taken place in the House

to-night, I shall feel it my duty to put before my colleagues the views which have been propounded, and bring the matter under their consideration.

Mr. CASEY. As the Minister has not made up his mind, I will simply say this: that the demand for an export duty on elm, ash and oak logs, staves and bolts, and all that sort of thing, manufactured by a certain ring of mill owners in Western Ontario, is the most impudent of all the demands that have been made by any class for legislative assistance at the expense of the general community. I was charmed, from a party point of view, to see so many gentlemen from the other side of the House giving in their adhesion to this impudent proposal, which I suppose they did without fully realising how shameful it was. And I should be charmed, from the same point of view, to see the Finance Minister take up the question and give them what they ask. It would be the surest method of getting rid of a number of those gentlemen in Ontario, that I can possibly imagine. I hope it will be the means of disposing of a few of those who have spoken so strongly in the interests of the stave manufacturer, and so on. The old proverb says very truly: "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad." Now, if there ever was a case of protection run into the ground, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) neatly put it, it is this case. Those people are not content with asking for protection against imports, they are not content with preventing the Canadian farmer from buying where he can get things the cheapest, after paying a reasonable duty, but they actually wish to impose such a duty as will prevent him from selling what he has at the ordinary price. The object of this export duty on elm and other such logs is simply to enable the local mill owner to buy them so much cheaper. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) speaks because there is a large manufacturer in his county; I believe there is a mill belonging to the local member.

Mr. HESSON. I did not speak in the interest of any individual.

Mr. CASEY. Each of those hon. gentlemen spoke for some constituents. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) was evidently well instructed by a brief, either from some constituents or some friend. He read from a carefully prepared paper which appeared to be a letter from somebody, and to be written in the first person. If it was not such he can lay it on the Table. But it was evidently a carefully prepared brief from some saw mill owner.

Mr. BROWN. It was not written by a constituent of mine.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman has less excuse than the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). I do not suppose there are any stave factories in Hamilton interested in the matter. But I say this is simply a demand to enable the saw-mill owner to buy his logs and stuff much cheaper than he otherwise would. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) and some other hon. member on that side of the House said the Americans paid the export duty, and the hon. member for Algoma said it was in consequence of the export duty that a number of new mills had been built in that district, although the Americans paid the duty. How could that occur, unless it enabled the saw-mill owners to obtain their logs cheaper? The hon. gentleman contradicted himself and showed his hand too freely. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that when he was along the north shore of Lake Huron he had found that the export duty had driven the mills out, that several mills were shut up and the people had left and gone to the States.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to make an explanation, as do not want to be misrepresented.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman can explain afterwards. He said at any rate that the mills had been shut down when the duty was in force. A large number of people in western Ontario, especially in the counties along lake Erie, bought lands timbered with elm, ash and other soft woods, in the hope of being able to pay for them by using the timber. This impost, while it will act for the benefit of mill owners, will operate to the injury of these settlers and will take from them their means of living. It would prove very hard for some members of the saw-mills "rings" if they found themselves in some of the back settlements of the western counties after such a duty had been carried through this House. The feeling would take a personal turn, and I could not blame those settlers for having a personal feeling, because it would mean ruin to many of them. I understand the Minister of Finance has promised to consider the question, and I hope he will consider it from the point of view of the settler.

Mr. HESSON. I have not been communicated with by any American, although we have a large number in my county. I am simply acting in the interest of the country. The case is different in the part of the country from which the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) comes, in this respect: There the farmer controls the sale of the timber on his land; but in the districts where the forests are being denuded of millions of feet of timber this is being done by American capitalists who bought under the Government conditions. A farmer can put a value on every tree he desires to sell to Americans or other parties; but these men whom we propose to regulate are those who have taken up large limits on the Government terms.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) made an enquiry with respect to the amount collected from these duties on logs during the past year. On pine and spruce the duty amounted to \$20,454; on shingle bolts to only \$271.50. I suppose the latter amount is accounted for by the fact that the provisions of the law were evaded. There is one point which must have been amusing to hon. members who are acquainted with this subject. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) stated that the imposition of \$2 duty upon the exportation of logs enabled them to obtain them cheaper. I am under the impression that all those timber logs were cut from within limits obtained from the Ontario Government, and that that Government has raised the stumpage duties very largely.

Mr. MILLS. Not on elm logs.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman was not speaking of elm logs. There are no elm logs in question, and therefore he could not have referred to them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The duty which formerly amounted to \$11,000 has nearly doubled since, showing that it has not checked export.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to correct the statement of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), which, I think, should not go uncorrected, viz., that, on account of the export duty, mills were built on the American side. I made no such statement. I said it was in order to evade the duty imposed by this Government that mills were transferred to the American side, and that they were erected there because there was no duty on logs on the other side of the line.

Mr. FISHER. Living as I do in a border constituency from which a good many logs go across the border, I can say that it is a fact that the people on this side have to pay the export duty and not those who buy the logs. The result is that poor men who are trying to make farms out of woodlands are hindered in consequence of the export duty on logs. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite, who advocate this duty in the interest of lumbermen and mill owners,

Mr. CASEY.

forget those settlers who are trying to establish homes in this country and to clear their lands. I trust when the Minister of Finance takes up this question he will not fail to consider this side of it. I cannot quite understand whether this duty is intended to include hard wood timber or not. I trust there will be no export duty on hard woods, such as maple or birch, which have to be sent across the line to market, because there is no market on this side of the line. I am not particularly interested in the question of elm logs, but I am interested in that respecting hard wood and spruce, in respect of which I trust the duty will not be increased.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose now with the consent of the House to go back to item 118, which I have allowed to stand; and having considered the proposal of the hon. member for Hamilton, I cannot consent to make the increase he desires, and I ask the House to pass the item as it stands.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to a telegram I have received from Montreal in relation to one of these items, and that is wall paper. I will read it to the hon. gentleman.

"Duty on wall paper is altered from 30 *ad valorem* to specific, amongst which are brown blanks, 2 cents per roll. This for the lower grades, costing one penny per roll, and 3 cents per roll on white blanks costing, for low grades, one halfpenny, is equal to 100 per cent., and is used chiefly by the poor in the Lower Provinces. The makers in Canada are coining money at the 30 per cent. duty; why change? Move that the duty in no case exceed 40 per cent. of the value, or try and get it to remain at 30; important to me.

"SAMUEL WOODS."

I will hand it to the Finance Minister for consideration, and I hope he will consider it.

Mr. ELLIS. I have a telegram of a similar character upon the same subject, though, perhaps, a little stronger. It is as follows:

"Protest against such an enormous duty on low grades of wall paper. It will ruin our business.

"GEO. NIXON,
"HOLMAN & BURTON."

It was contended the other night that the duties were increased 100 per cent., and that was denied; but I will put in the hon. gentleman's hands a paper which shows that upon the lower grades the duty is really increased 100 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I admit that the duty will be somewhat increased in the first item, but on the other it was simply a change from *ad valorem* to specific. I would also say that I think I would be consulting the wishes of the House if I asked them to-morrow to go on with these resolutions, so as to complete them before the adjournment, and for that purpose I would like them to be the first Order of the Day. I move, therefore, that the further consideration of these resolutions be adjourned till to-day at 3 o'clock, and that they be made the first Order of the Day.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before that motion is put I would ask whether the Government propose to-morrow to sit after 6 o'clock, and what business besides these resolutions they propose to take up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: We think we would be consulting the desire of the House by not sitting after 6 o'clock, as a large number of members wish to leave by afternoon and evening trains. We will take up these resolutions to-morrow and I suppose we may expect that the speeches upon them will take up the afternoon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope they will not take very long.

Mr. MITCHELL. If we are not going to sit after 6, of course, it is all right, but if we were, I would like my motion on Manhood Suffrage to stand over, because I shall leave at six o'clock.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:40 a. m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Anglo-Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Wright.)

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Waterloo and Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Labelle.)

Bill (No. 102) to amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Hereford Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 106) to incorporate the *Standard* Printing and Publishing Company.—(Mr. Small.)

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. HALL moved:

That as the time for the reception of Reports of Committees on Private Bills will expire on Wednesday next, the 25th instant, the same be extended to Friday, the 24th day of June next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This motion, I think, is quite contrary to the policy that was agreed upon some time ago between both sides of the House. There would be practically no restriction whatever upon the introduction of private Bills if a motion of that sort were adopted. If we intend to allow private Bills to be introduced up to the last day of the Session, we will practically do away with any limitation of time for their introduction. If that is thought to be in the public interest, we should so change our rules as to enable promoters of private Bills to introduce them without restraint as long as the Session continues. But if we intend to attach any value to the rule, it does seem to me that we shall have to adopt a different policy from that indicated by this motion.

Mr. HALL. I am only making the motion to carry out the recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Commerce. Of course, there is no desire on the part of the committee to protract the Session of the House, but there will be an adjournment for a week, and it was thought that the 24th of June was the shortest time within which it

would be proper to limit the reception of reports on private Bills. However, the matter is in the discretion of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The motion is not to extend the time for the introduction of private Bills, but only for the reception of reports from committees, and I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. WELSH. I understood the hon. gentleman to move for an extension of the time for the reception of private Bills as well as for the reports of committees. I thought it was a long time for such an extension. If we are going to have holidays, I think an extension for a week after them would be sufficient. But I did think we would be home before the 24th of June.

Mr. WELDON. The time for receiving petitions for private Bills and for presenting private Bills has been already extended, the former to the 30th of May and the latter to the 6th of June.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed consideration of resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to ask the House to adopt resolution 110 as it stands:

Hardware, viz: builders', cabinet makers', and carriage hardware, and locks, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest to add to that the following:—

Hardware: builders', cabinet makers', upholsterers', harness saddlery, including curry combs, machine screws, carpenters tools, cabinet makers', blacksmiths' and all other mechanics' tools, and tools of every description not otherwise provided for.

This item is specially enumerated in classes 237 and 406, which have been prepared so that they are not now included in the general list. These are all manufactured in the country, and ought to be included. By the sections that have been repealed, these items are dropped, and this will lead to endless confusion in the Customs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to accede to the proposal of my hon. friend. I have given it a good deal of consideration, and I cannot see my way clear to embrace the articles he has mentioned. I do not think confusion will arise in the Customs, as these articles, like all others not specially enumerated, will fall under the unenumerated list. To accede to the hon. gentleman's proposition would lead to a great deal of difficulty, because he proposes to increase the tariff on articles that enter into the construction of a number of other things, which would require to be proportionately increased, if that were done. I must ask the House not to agree in the proposal of the hon. gentleman to adopt the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. I feel that an injustice is going to be done to the industry, particularly in my own town, that is engaged in the manufacture of saddlery and carriage hardware. They have, perhaps, a hundred hands employed, mostly in making carriage hardware, composed partly of wood and metal, not altogether forgings. These have to come into competition with goods made exclusively—with the goods made in the prisons of the United States, at Auburn, which are sold to brokers, and through them to the trade, a certificate being furnished to our Customs officials that they are not prison made goods.

Mr. McKAY. I agree with what has been said by the hon. gentleman. There are important industries largely engaged in the manufacture of saddlery and hardware, and the duties on cast iron will make a material difference to

them. I would suggest that the Minister take this into consideration.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen are making their proposals too late. They ought to have made them when we were in committee. There is another thing which must have impressed this House, and that is, that almost every kind of goods spoken of here, almost everything in the list, is said to come into competition with the products of prison labor in the United States. One would suppose the whole manufacturing industries in the United States were carried on in the penitentiaries. These penitentiaries must be controlled by men of marvellous mechanical skill, if such be the case. Certainly, if these hon. gentlemen wish to press these matters on our attention, they should have done so at the other stage.

Mr. CASEY. They ought to have brought these matters to the attention of the Government, not only before this stage, but before the elections.

Mr. BROWN. We have in Hamilton men of energy and enterprise, who have invested a large amount of capital in this industry, and who have assured my colleague and myself that they cannot make it successful unless it is protected by a duty of 35 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to ask the House to concur in item 114 as it stands:

Out tacks, brads or sprigs, not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, two cents per thousand.

Exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, two cents per pound.

Mr. MILLS. What are they now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say. I propose to ask the House to go into committee for the purpose of considering the postponed items Nos. 23, 24, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115. I will take opportunity then, not only of considering these postponed items, but of asking the consideration of the House to a few additional items which I will more fully explain.

Mr. MITCHELL. While the Government is on the subject of the tariff and the trade of the country, I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to an industry which I think is unfairly dealt with. I speak of foreign petroleum oil. Under the Act, while local manufactured oils are permitted to be moved in tanks from one point in the country to another, for the purpose of getting barrelled, foreign oil cannot be brought in, except in barrels of under 50 gallons capacity. This is felt to be a great hardship. It deteriorates the character of the oil and increases the cost of the freight, inasmuch as the barrel weighs about 69 pounds, while the whole thing, barrel and oil, weighs only 400 pounds. The oil is also injured in transit, and the foreign manufacturer placed at great disadvantage in conducting his business. It is a fact, no matter what protection may be put on—and I believe there is 100 per cent. protection on the native oil—the foreign oil is demanded by the people who require a higher, a safer grade, a better quality than is alleged to be produced from our own oil wells. Whether that is a fact or not I do not know, but it is alleged that it is a hardship to make a distinction in transporting foreign oils through the country, by giving facilities to native oils which are refused to the foreign. The foreign oil traders ask that, inasmuch as a sure and desirable way to transport oil to distances is in iron tanks, that the foreign oil be permitted to come in in tanks, in place of in barrels under 50 gallons capacity. I will not take up the time of the House by referring further to this matter, except to say to the Minister that I have prepared a statement showing what is required, and what is complained of, which I will hand to him, and I trust he will give it his consideration.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McKAY.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to reconsider resolution No. 20 in which an error was made while the subject was under discussion. That resolution is "floor oil cloth." I propose to restore that to 20 per cent. It was reduced to 15 per cent. by mistake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to retain the specific duty of five cents a square yard?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the only change is to bring it from 15 to 20 per cent. as originally printed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the five cents a square yard when reduced to *ad valorem*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 35 per cent. Then I propose to make a corresponding change the other way in the next item, "Oil cloth in the piece, cut or shaped, &c.," by reducing it from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What does that taxation amount to?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About the same percentage. I propose to amend the next item, "paper hangings or wall paper in rolls," so that it will read:

Paper hangings or wall paper in rolls, the following specific duties on each roll of eight yards and under of the following descriptions.

It is just to add the words "on each roll of eight yards and under." I also propose to correct a typographical error. "Single point bronzes" should be "single print bronzes."

Mr. CASEY. What would be the duty if the roll was over eight yards?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is charged in proportion to the length. A roll of sixteen yards would be charged double.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does the Minister propose to reduce the duty upon the lower classes of these hangings, in accordance with the memorandum which was sent over to him the other night, showing that this was practically a tax of 100 per cent?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. I do not think it would be anything like that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I handed the Finance Minister a telegram which I had received from a paper manufacturer, who complains that, on the cheaper kind of wall paper, the duty was equal to 100 per cent. It seems very heavy on a class of paper which is used by the poorer classes, and especially in the Maritime Provinces. I think the Minister might consider that and make some modification. A tax of 100 per cent. on cheap common papers which are used by poor people, is certainly too high.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These papers will still be very cheap.

Mr. CASEY. Where are these papers manufactured in the country?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In a number of cities. This is one of the largest manufactures in the country. It is made chiefly in Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are two very large factories in Montreal.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister says these articles will be cheap after all, but, when a mechanic wants to paper his house and has to buy a certain number of rolls, it is a question with him whether he must pay two or three cents more on each roll. I have no doubt the figures given by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) are correct, and that this will be 100 per cent. on some of these articles, and

it is no answer to say that they will be cheap after all. Suppose you taxed an article worth one cent, two cents apiece, that would be 200 per cent., still it would be only three cents for the article after all. Yet you would give the manufacturer the opportunity of charging three times what the article was worth, without fear of competition. The difficulty here is that the manufacturer can charge twice as much as the article is worth, and that is what we complain of. The cost may be small, but the tax is exorbitant, and is practically prohibitory.

Mr. ELLIS. The telegram I sent to the Minister was a very urgent one, and represented that on an article worth two and one-fifteenth cents the duty is two cents. It is a very heavy duty, and I am very sorry the Minister could not yield something to the wishes of those people in St. John.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, sent me a telegram, but if I were to accept telegrams from the parties whose interests are to prevent anything being manufactured in this country, I am afraid I would have to change our tariff very much. Our object is to encourage the manufacture in our own country of anything that can be manufactured here; and these paper factories are so extensive, there is so much capital invested in them, and they do their work so well, as to be able to produce paper at a very low cost that is quite good enough and cheap enough for any purpose. I do not think that any person will suffer from this added impost. The only one to which this change refers, I suppose, is the very cheapest description of paper, but we could not see our way clear to make the duty less than two cents on the roll of eight yards. I propose to modify item 23, by changing the duty on paper of all kinds from 22½ to 25 per cent. In order that the hon. gentleman may understand the whole case, I may state that I propose to strike out "tissue paper" and substitute the following for item 24:—

Manufactures of paper, including ruled and bordered papers, papeteries, boxed papers, envelopes and blank books, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman proposes to increase the duty on paper to 25 per cent. The tax heretofore has been a very heavy tax upon almost every publisher in the country. Everyone connected with the newspaper business knows that the newspapers of Canada are printed at a lower rate than any other papers on the continent—certainly far below the price of newspapers in England. I know, myself, that nine-tenths of the men who are engaged in the newspaper business find it anything but a profitable enterprise. The hon. gentleman proposes to tax the raw material of the newspaper man at a very high figure, and so with regard to other publishers. Now, even under the former tax, the paper used by publishers in this country is 35 to 40 per cent. higher than the same kind of paper used by publishers in the United States. The various paper manufacturers of Canada are already well remunerated under the existing tariff. I think I could satisfy the Minister of Finance, if I wished to enter into a discussion of the private affairs of a good many of the publishers of this country, that the manufacturers of paper have a very great advantage over those who are engaged in the publishing business; and when the hon. gentleman proposes to increase the tax to 25 per cent., he is proposing to tax those whose profits are little for the advantage of those whose profits are very great; in fact it is an attempt to distribute the profits earned by different parties in this country to the advantage of one particular party. It does seem to me that the hon. gentleman will do a serious injury to the publishers in this country, if he persists in increasing the tariff upon paper.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to call the Minister's attention to one point on which I think he is a little inconsistent. The

other day he placed a duty of 25 per cent. on these printed backs, these papers which come from the United States half printed. Now, he is going to place the same duty on paper unprinted; therefore, he is going to give a direct premium on the importation of these American half printed papers.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I would like to correct some of the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who says that by making this duty 25 per cent., a heavier tax will be imposed upon publishers. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. Publishers to-day import but very little paper—I believe during the last 12 months, only three or four car loads, between 40 and 50 tons of paper of that class used by the publishing community in Canada, has been imported. This additional duty has been asked for from the hon. Finance Minister for various reasons. During the past year, in fact for several years past, the tariff on paper has remained stationary; it has been 20 and 22½ per cent., a very peculiar state of things indeed. From a lack of knowledge on the part of those who approached the Finance Minister previously, two different duties were placed on paper; the one was termed calendered paper, and the other simply paper. Now, under that tariff ruled paper, not calendered, that costs the most money, came in for the lesser duty. Take hand made papers, for example, and blotting papers of the finer grade, those came in during all this time at a duty of 20 per cent.; whereas calendered papers, of an actually cheaper grade, being only glossed over, came in at a duty of 2½ per cent. This has been a vexed question between the paper importers and Custom house for the past seven or eight years. Seeing that there was some modification in the tariff about to be made, the paper industry approached the Finance Minister for the purpose of having that state of things done away with, and not only for that purpose, I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell, but because there are three or four million dollars invested in the mills in this country, which are making a class of paper that has not been made in Canada before. Now, since so large a sum of money has been invested in this business, is it not proper for this Government to protect to that extent this new industry? The Finance Minister has in his possession paper made in St. Jerome by the Rolland Paper Company, of which we may well be proud. Now, Sir, we must, as a Government supporting a general National Policy, protect at least this new industry of ours. Then, I can tell the hon. gentleman, we have only raised the duty from 22½ to 25 per cent., and seeing that the Government were rearranging the tariff, we have asked them to put the whole duty on all kinds of paper at 25 per cent., so as to avoid the collisions and disputes that arose between the Customs appraisers and the paper importers for the past seven or eight years. We have not asked very much, and considering the amount of capital invested in this industry, I think it is entitled to the same consideration as brass, or iron, or cotton, or wool, and we ask no more. The paper trade of Canada asks no more protection than those industries. Nearly all of them have a protective tariff of 25 per cent., and that is all that is asked for the paper industry. I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell that there are several million dollars invested in this, the paper industry, and it is certainly entitled to some consideration from the Government in rearranging the tariff. We have a mill, started two or three years ago at Cornwall, where \$300,000 or \$400,000 are invested; there is one at St. Jerome in which \$250,000 are invested, and the Canada Paper Company's works at Windsor have an investment of \$250,000. These mills are all making, and will continue to make, a fine quality of paper for which we ask a protection of 25 per cent. That is not asking too much. As to the question as to why the tissue paper item is to be left out, I might say that it was an oversight, no doubt, on the part of the Government, because there is a mill mak-

ing tissue paper. The proprietor has gone to large expense to establish it, and had it been known by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, I am sure tissue paper would have been included among other classes of paper, as the Minister of Finance intends to do to-day.

Mr. CASEY. Where is the mill?

Mr. WILSON. It is in Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil, sixty or seventy miles from here. The other item to be introduced is a further protection of 10 per cent. on the manufactures of paper, articles such as paper boxes, ruled papers, bordered papers and envelopes. I may inform the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is the only member who has spoken on the question, that the envelope business is no mean industry and that it has come to stay, provided the Government will give it that protection which it deserves. The trade has been protected with a duty of 25 per cent. heretofore. That duty did not, however, protect us from job-lots and under-valuations from the other side of the line. We went to the Finance Minister to have that remedied. We wanted a specific duty of five cents per pound or thereabouts on envelopes so as to keep out job-lots, because cheap envelopes weigh as much as dear ones. In order to strike at the root of the matter a specific duty would be necessary. But specific duties are not desirable, in my opinion, and seeing we were going to rearrange the items connected with the manufactures of paper, and as blank books had a duty of 30 per cent, we propose to put blank books, envelopes, and all those articles under an *ad valorem* duty of 35 per cent. That is only asking 10 per cent. additional, which has been granted already to the cotton, woollen, and brass industries. In regard to the protection of labor put on the paper after it leaves the mill and is manufactured into paper bags or boxes, envelopes or blank books, I might say that 10 per cent. does not represent a proper protection, if we make a fair comparison between the amount of the duty placed upon the articles and the labor, as compared with the cotton, woollen or brass industries. In fact it is necessary to place an additional duty of 15 per cent. on paper goods in addition to the 25 per cent. to place them on the same footing as these other industries, but we did not wish to be excessive in our demand; and as the demands of other industries for 35 per cent. have been granted, I hope the House will not object to accede to it in this instance. It is nothing but a fair and reasonable demand that the paper industry of Canada makes.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman seems to possess a good deal of special knowledge on the paper question, and he has given the House considerable information. He seems to take it for granted that as soon as capital is invested in any industry it is proper to tax the rest of the community to make the institution a paying one. But in regard to the tissue paper item I confess I was astonished to find it increased from 10 to 35 per cent. in the space of two days. The Finance Minister has, no doubt, been informed since the tariff was first framed that there is a mill in Canada making tissue paper, and the hon. gentleman has told the House the mill is in Lachute. It seems to me I have heard of a paper mill at Lachute owned by a gentleman of the same name as the hon. gentleman himself. I do not know whether he is the owner of the mill or not. Perhaps he will give the House information on that point?

Mr. WILSON. Do you wish an answer to that question?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think it is a crime to be a member of this House and at the same time a paper manufacturer. I do not, however, think my name should be dragged into the question in this manner. I fail to see why

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

because a paper manufacturer happens at the same time to be a member for Argenteuil, the paper industry should on that account fail to secure protection. I cannot help it if I have accumulated sufficient money to have acquired that paper mill. The fact that I am a paper manufacturer and member of Parliament is no crime, and I should not be treated differently from other hon. members. I do not want it to go abroad that because I happen to be a member of this House I am treated any way better than my *confrères* in the trade.

Mr. CASEY. No, of course it is no crime to be a member of this House and at the same time to be a paper manufacturer.

Mr. MITCHELL. Except if you are in the minority.

Mr. CASEY. I must say I admire the frankness with which the hon. gentleman has put his case, in the last few words. He wishes the House to understand that it is perfectly proper for a paper manufacturer to be a member of Parliament; that it is perfectly proper for the proprietor of the only mill manufacturing tissue paper to make representations to the Minister whom he supports, showing that tissue paper should get 25 per cent. additional protection. He wishes us to understand that it is perfectly proper for that paper maker, the proprietor of the only tissue paper mill, to urge upon the Government to impose 25 per cent. additional protection upon tissue paper. It is perfectly proper for him, in his opinion, to vote for this extra protection upon tissue paper, which will put a considerable sum of money in his own pocket. That is the hon. gentleman's position, as he has stated it to the House. I do not happen to agree with it, and I do not think the country will agree with it. It is, however, a grand illustration of the principle on which the tariff is arranged. These duties are arranged, either in fulfilment of promises made before the elections, in repayment of subscriptions made by large firms before the elections, or in order to further the interests of members of this House engaged in certain industries. That is evident from the statement of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson). It is well that the country should know this, and the people will be able to form their opinions upon it, without my further enlarging on the subject.

Mr. GUILLET. It seems to me most extraordinary to hear such statements from hon. gentlemen opposite. On a former occasion they objected to American capital coming into this country, and being invested in different industries. Now we find that because a gentleman interested in a certain industry happens to be a member of this House, the industry with which he is connected should not receive consideration at the hands of Parliament. If that argument were to be applied, no one connected with our railways or our banking business, or manufacturers of agricultural implements, or any merchant, could be a member of this House, because Parliament would be legislating upon mercantile interests with which they might be connected, and, therefore, all those important interests would have no representative in this House. It would come down to this, that no one should be a member of Parliament, except he was a foreigner. That is the amount of the argument, and it is a preposterous argument.

Mr. CASEY. My argument was not of that sort. I was merely pointing out the very peculiar position occupied by the member who controls the whole of one kind of trade, who is not a representative of the trade, but is the trade himself. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) is the tissue paper maker of Canada, the tissue paper interest of Canada, and I pointed out that his position, being such a very peculiar one, is different from that of other members who may be more interested in various kinds of trade. I am not attacking the hon. member so

much, for I admit he is only doing as the rest do, that is, only following the rule that appears to be in force. The hon. gentleman is only acting like other hon. gentlemen on that side. I am not attacking him personally, but I am attacking the system of making a tariff in which such things are possible, and only attacking that very briefly and by implication, because I believe the country will be quite capable of pronouncing their verdict upon it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I trust the Finance Minister will not persist with this impost. Ever since the tariff was proposed I have had a large number of communications from publishers, in various parts of the country, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has received more than I have, and there is no doubt that this is a very serious matter for them. The hon. gentleman knows, and I am sure the Minister of Interior and the Minister of Customs will bear out the statement, that the paper that is consumed in Canada is practically given gratuitously to the subscribers to newspapers, and the purchasers of books and other publications. The publisher may be paid by the advertising, or in other ways, but as far as the papers are concerned, in Canada they are circulated at a far lower price than the product of any other trade or calling in this country, in consequence of the intense competition which exists among publishers. You can hardly go into a little town or village in the country in which you will not find two newspapers. In most cases they are published at \$1 a year, though sometimes at a higher rate. Now, I know that the manufacturers of paper in Canada are better paid than the manufacturers of the United States. The material cost them the merest trifle, because the cost of collecting it is very little, and I know that these men are to-day receiving a higher compensation than the paper men of the neighboring Republic. I venture to say that there is not a paper manufacturer in Canada who is not receiving from 25 to 30 per cent. more than the American manufacturer, for precisely the same article. He has certain local advantages; in many cases they are the creditors of those who are the purchasers from them, and with the protection already existing, they are certainly well paid. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to increase the amount of the paper duty to such an extent that he will destroy, in a great measure, the little competition that, in spite of the tariff, exists at the present time, and he will simply place the hundreds of publishers of this country at the mercy of two or three paper manufacturers.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire to say that, so far as the publishers are concerned to whom the hon. gentleman referred, my experience is that there is very little paper imported for use as ordinary news paper, and that this tariff will not in the slightest degree affect the price of such paper to publishers in Canada. The result of the adoption of a substantially protective tariff has been largely to reduce the price of paper. No man who is a publisher can fail to know that, comparing the price of ordinary news paper to-day with the price paid comparatively a few years ago, the price has gone down enormously. We really do not compete in the slightest degree so far as the ordinary news paper is concerned. There is a competition for certain special classes of paper that the publisher may sometimes require—not for his newspaper, but in the jobbing department, or for book publishing, and this paper he may desire to import. But this paper is being manufactured every year to a larger extent, and a better class of it than formerly; the country to-day is supplied with a class of paper which a few years ago we had to import altogether, and that has been the result of the policy of protection. To say that this in the slightest degree affects the newspaper publisher is to ignore the conditions under which papers are published and the class of paper used in publication. The advantage of the change is that it destroys the difficulty that existed in the Customs Department with regard to classification—a

difficulty which resulted in serious injustice to special importers, in determining to what particular class certain papers belonged; and, in this respect, the adoption of a uniform tariff is a very great improvement, while, as I have said before, it will not enhance the price of paper to either the publisher of a newspaper or the publisher of books in Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must confess that I am a little surprised at the attitude taken by my hon. friend, or rather I would be surprised, if he were purely a publisher, but as he is a member of a Cabinet which has brought down a policy of protection that they are running into the ground, I ought not to be surprised that he tries to defend this duty, and, as he always does when he undertakes it, defends it very well. The hon. gentleman says that the effect of the duty is not to increase the price of the paper at all. Whether that is the case or not, if putting up the duty on paper in order to prohibit importation does not increase the price of the local article, it is a wonder to me that they do not make it 50 per cent., because it would seem to me to be their duty to put that rate upon it, if the higher they put the duty the less it will interfere with the protection. I will not deal unfairly with the matter. I admit that the imposition of duties which, by giving large bounties to the manufacturers, induce men of capital to put their capital into the industries of a country, like the paper industry—I am free to admit that down to a certain point the charges do not increase in proportion to the amount of protection. But to expect an intelligent public to believe that the imposition of this 25 per cent. duty does not add to the cost of the paper more than if there was not duty upon it, is ridiculous. It is an argument which men of intelligence ought not to be asked to entertain. With regard to the hon. gentleman's other argument, about making greater facility in the entries at the Custom house, we all know that there were graded and classified duties on paper up to this time under the existing law, and in order to simplify the matter and make it more easy to ascertain what the duty was, they made this 22½ per cent. But will the hon. gentleman tell me that changing the duty from 22½ to 25 per cent. simplifies the matter, or gives greater facility to the men who make the entries? I do not think that argument will be entertained by this House. The hon. gentleman says that, practically, no paper is imported into the country under the present tariff.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I said no paper upon which newspapers are printed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will take the hon. gentleman's words, and I state that I was purchasing some paper the other day from a large manufacturer, and, in discussing the matter with me, he told me that he could buy paper, of as good quality as his own, in New England, bring it into the country, pay the duty, and let me have it at the same price as that at which he was selling his own make. That statement came from a large manufacturer, who is an intelligent and straightforward man, and the statement was made only three or four weeks ago. If that is the case, is there a reason, unless we wish entirely to prohibit the foreign article at the expense of the people who consume it, why we should increase this duty, after having removed the objection which the hon. gentleman pointed out, and facilitated the arrangements of the Custom house for ascertaining what the duty is? After having agreed to one duty of 22½ per cent., why does the hon. gentleman come down to-day and ask us to increase that duty to 25 per cent.? I do not think that is treating the newspapers of this country fairly. I have great respect for the talents of the hon. Minister of Finance, and for his perseverance, his determination, and his doggedness too, and I hope that before this matter is ended, I shall have a high respect for his sense of justice and right also. Does the hon. gentleman wish to close up

the newspapers altogether? Is he dissatisfied with the criticisms they make on his career? Does he wish to have these newspapers, some of which are so ably conducted, closed up by adding this heavy duty to the difficulties they already have? What the hon. member for Bothwell said, is true, that the newspapers of this country are practically given away, and to add to the cost of the raw material, which is already high enough, seems to me to be a great outrage. I trust the hon. gentleman will not insist on increasing that duty. There was not a murmur against the duty of 2½ per cent., although the newspaper publishers thought it very high, but if he goes on and increases it to 25 per cent., my hon. friend will excuse me if I think he has not that high sense of justice which I hope, before this matter is disposed of, he will give some evidence of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not be necessary for me to detain the House long, for my hon. friend has, I think, established our whole case. In that forcible and clear manner in which he always states his views he has illustrated, by a practical demonstration, the absolute necessity of increasing the tariff on paper. He admits that it is desirable that we should furnish employment for our people—that we should do our own work on Canadian soil with Canadian hands. No man has held that doctrine more strongly than my hon. friend; and what does he tell you? He tells you that as the tariff stood the manufacturers of paper could go into New England and buy the same article that they made and bring it into Canada at as great a profit as they got on their own product.

Mr. MILLS. Why?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because there is not sufficient protection against the manufacture of the article in the New England States. It is because we are not able to compete. With any duty we have imposed, we have not given such an advantage to our own industries as to enable them to supply the trade. Now, I must say that in this matter we had the advantage of receiving a very large deputation of paper manufacturers and of persons interested.

Mr. MITCHELL. Had you any journalists?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I had the advantage of having at my side a journalist who understood the whole question. I had the advantage of having as a colleague in the Cabinet a gentleman who has been able to conduct one of the most important papers that has influenced public opinion in Canada for many years. I had the advantage of having journalists to the right of me and journalists to the left of me, to protect me against any imposition on the part of people interested in the manufacture of paper; and I came to the conclusion, I believe the sound conclusion, that the paper industry of this country was in such a position that there was sufficient competition in the trade to thoroughly and completely protect the general public and the publishers of newspapers, and that we could safely make this slight increase in the tariff on paper without increasing the cost to the consumer, while enabling the manufacturers to go on and produce a paper which would compete with those better classes of papers which still, notwithstanding our large paper industries in the country, continue to be imported. Under these circumstances, I came to the conclusion, in the interest of the public and in the interest of maintaining those industries in the country, and without bearing too heavily on any other industry in the country, that I might fairly ask this slight increase. I had the advantage of consulting, not only some of the paper manufacturers, but some of the most eminent publishers in Canada, and it was only after full and careful consideration that the Government arrived at the conclusion to impose this duty. I may say that the submission of the resolution in its present form, with 22½ per cent., was owing to a

Mr. MITCHELL.

clerical error in copying the determination the Government had arrived at, which was the same as I am now submitting to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I certainly protest against the duty the hon. gentleman proposes to impose upon paper, an article which is, in fact, the raw material of a large number of our population. I venture to say that there is no manufacturing industry in Canada, of any kind whatever, that gives employment to so large a number of people, as the publishing industry. There are offices in Canada in which from fifty to one hundred men are employed, and in some perhaps even a greater number; and when the hon. gentleman proposes this tax he proposes to legislate against that industry in the interest of an industry which is to-day enjoying larger profits than perhaps any other industry in this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How can that possibly be, after what the hon. gentleman has heard from the hon. member for Northumberland?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will explain how it can be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman pretend to be so innocent in this matter that he does not know that there is not a pound of paper sold in this country to-day that is not sold for twice what it costs to produce it? And when that is the case, it will certainly be very easy for the manufacturer abroad to pay the cost of transportation and insurance and the duty of 20 per cent. and at the same time sell the foreign product at the price at which paper is sold in the Canadian market. I know something about this matter myself. I had communication, twelve or fifteen months ago, with several Canadian publishing houses, and I found, accidentally, that paper was being furnished by a manufacturer in Philadelphia to his patrons throughout the United States at a very much lower rate than any paper manufacturer in Canada was furnishing paper to the publishers here. We brought to the notice of the Canadian manufacturers this fact, that we could pay the duty and bring the paper from Philadelphia for a very much less sum than we were paying, not because it was costing so very much to produce the paper in this country, but because the Canadian manufacturers were making enormous profits at the expense of the publishers. We gave them the choice between reducing their charges to us and leaving us to make arrangements elsewhere, and the result was that we got more favorable terms from them; but if the hon. gentleman's tariff had been in force at that time this opportunity would have been denied. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is legislating in the interest of men whose profits are ten times as great as the profits of those against whom he is legislating, and I can tell him this, that if there is any independence in the Conservative press of this country that is not subsidised by the Government, then the hon. gentleman will find that there are a good many others, besides the newspaper men who represent the Opposition, who will resent this attempt to legislate in favor of those already amply provided for. The hon. gentleman tells us that he has had the benefit of the support of certain newspaper men. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. the Minister of Customs can give him accurate information upon this subject, and I have no doubt the hon. the Minister of the Interior can give him accurate information; but certainly the Minister of the Interior stated to-day what is not in accordance with my experience. We know that there are newspapers in this country to which it does not make any difference—newspapers that are getting \$12,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year from the public Treasury can afford to pay better prices for paper than newspapers conducted on strictly commercial principles, but I shall not refer to newspapers alone. I speak of publishers in general; and everybody who

knows the price of wages, the appliances necessary for the production of paper, and the material from which the paper is produced, knows that, so far as the interference of the Government is concerned, the paper manufacturers require less protection, are capable of relying more upon themselves, than almost any other industry in which the population is engaged. The hon. gentleman, adopting the principle of protection, as the hon. member for Muskoka has stated, has proposed to permit papers, partly printed elsewhere, to come in on payment of a duty of 25 per cent., and proposes to place the same duty on blank paper. There is hardly a town or village in Canada in which there are not two papers published, and we know that they are hardly able to live. We find the papers published in the cities are published at lower prices than they are elsewhere; they are published at scarcely the actual cost of the paper, and the hon. gentleman proposes to increase the burdens, and increase the difficulties, where competition is so severe, by increasing the cost of the raw material. In this respect he insists upon departing widely from the rule which he has professed to act upon, and the principle by which he professes to be guided. I may say that the hon. gentleman has legislated in the interests of some two or three powerful companies, to the detriment of the interests of this population.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. the Finance Minister has made an allegation that I have entirely proved his case, and he based it upon the fact that I stated that when purchasing paper some few weeks ago from a manufacturer in this country, the manufacturer told me he could lay down the same paper from the States at that price and pay the duty and freight. How does the hon. gentleman conclude that proves his case, that the paper manufacturers require additional protection. I should take the solution of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that it proves entirely the converse, namely, that the Canadian manufacturers put on such a price that the American manufacturers can pay the duty and freight and deliver the article in Canada as cheaply as we can get it from the home manufacturers. Look around at the paper manufacturers in this country, millionaires almost the whole of them; or, if not, they will be in a short time. I can understand why the Finance Minister, leading the Government, as he is practically doing, and exercising a moral influence as well as the magnetic influence that he exerts on those around him—I can understand his being able to sway and control his party and raise or lower the tariff as he pleases, and have it swallowed wholesale by the hon. gentlemen behind him; but when he refers to the information he has, upon which he bases this increase, when he refers to the fact that at his right hand he has two gentlemen who have been engaged in the trade—one, at least, who has been for a considerable time out of it, and the other who has ceased for some time to take an active interest in it—I say it is not right for that hon. gentleman, on the plea of information from these sources, to come down and increase the duty on an industry such as the journalistic industry or that of the book publishers. If he wanted information as to what the paper industry would bear, why did he not ask hon. gentlemen on this side who would tell him the truth. We would tell him not to increase the duty over 22½ per cent. If he goes on increasing the duties on journalism, he will not have an independent paper like the *Herald* to point out his faults and call attention to the iniquities carried on in the shape of legislation in the interests of the National Policy, so called. I appeal to the sense of justice of the Finance Minister—I hope he has some left. I know his manner, his style, is very much improved; he has had some eulogiums from everybody in this House, in private—in public they do not speak so favorably of him; and I hope that, while he has shown his visits across the Atlantic and

associations with distinguished peers and, no doubt, peeresses also, have improved his manners and style and temper, we will not have to come to the conclusion that he has departed from that sense of justice he used to give us more of before he left us. I hope the duty will not be increased.

Mr. MILLS. Twenty per cent. is plenty.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will leave it as it is, 22½. There is a motive behind this. I hope the hon. gentleman has not sent applications to those millionaires he is now benefiting for aid in the last elections. It looks a little like it. I hope it is not so, and that he will leave the duty as it is, and not further burden the journals of the country which are struggling for existence.

Mr. DAVIN. I consider that the eloquent appeal of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is one that will be made in vain to the newspapers, and for this reason: I do not believe that this duty will increase the price of the paper used by newspaper proprietors. Hon. gentlemen opposite discuss every proposal made in this tariff from the point of view that every addition to the tariff will raise the price of the article. Well, those of us who originally supported the National Policy, and all of us who support it now, hold that we should not raise the price of the article to the consumer by protecting our own manufactures; we hold that the competition amongst our own manufacturers will bring down the prices; but should the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Northumberland be correct, that this increase of duty will raise the price of paper used by newspaper publishers, what will happen? From one end of the country to the other, an agitation would be excited and the paper makers denounced by the newspapers. Do you suppose, Sir, for a moment that if, as the result of the change proposed by the Finance Minister, the newspapers should have to pay more for the paper they use, their protests will not at once be heard from one end of the country to the other against the conduct of the paper manufacturers? The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has referred to the case of a paper manufacturer in the United States who was ready to pay the existing duty and still send in paper at a lower rate than the Canadian manufacturer could supply it for. If we enquired into that case we should probably find it was analogous with dozens of similar cases that were brought before us when we were enquiring into these matters before 1878. We found that the manufacturer was turning out large quantities of goods, and could easily afford to turn out a small surplus quantity for the Canadian market, rush it in here, and sell it at a ruinous price, as far as the Canadian manufacturers were concerned, but for an amount which would pay him very well on a mere surplus from his factory, besides making a Canadian market for his goods. I am a member of a company which publishes a newspaper, and I am naturally interested in the price at which newspaper publishers can get the paper; and, if I thought that the result would be to raise the price of paper, I should not like it, I should think the proposal was bad, not only for the company to which I belong, but for the community at large. I should think it would amount to a tax upon knowledge.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and, if I thought it would raise the price of the article, I would not support it any more than, if I thought, in dozens of other cases, the price of the article would be increased by the duty, I would support the proposal. But I repeat that our theory is wholly different from the theory of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. Our theory is that, by adopting a National Policy, we superinduce a state of things by which we not only get the manufacture of

the article done in our own country, on our own ground, developing the resources of Canada and employing our own labor, but that in the end we lower the price of the article, and immediately after bringing the policy into existence we give you the article at a cheaper, or, at least, as cheap a rate as before. Two years ago I happened to be in that gallery, listening to a speech made by a member who, I am sorry to say, is no longer in this House, and that hon. gentleman, in his reply to the leader of the Opposition, and I think he referred also to the member for Bothwell, in regard to this question, because it comes up again and again, showed that the statement of the leader of the Opposition, that the price of the article was raised, was wrong, and that the result of the National Policy in regard to the article in question was to lower the price of it to the Canadian consumer. If these hon. gentlemen were logical, what they ought to do, and what would please many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, is that we should take off the duty completely, throw wide the door to the American manufacturer, let him come in here and take our own manufacturer by the throat and kill him off, and then we should have to pay the price that would suit the views of the American manufacturer. If, for instance, you could injure the paper manufacturers of this country so as to throw us at the mercy of the American manufacturers, the effect would be that probably for a short time we should be getting cheaper paper, but in the end we should have to pay a higher price and probably not get as good an article. I will say to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—and I will note the matter, and make a point of seeing what will happen—that, if it is found that the result of putting on the duty that the Finance Minister wishes to put on paper used for newspapers is to raise the price of it to the publisher, I will take good care for one that the manufacturers hear of it within twelve months, and before this Parliament meets again. As a person who is interested in this matter, and knowing a little about it, and as one who is also interested in the general question of protection to our industries, a question to which I have given a good deal of attention, and behind which there is the general principle, which cannot possibly be driven into the heads of hon. gentlemen on this side, I have no hesitation in supporting the duty proposed by the Finance Minister.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to enter into a general discussion of the subject of the tariff or the theory of protection on this item, but I would remind the hon. member who has just spoken that it is very extraordinary if he subscribes to the views he has just now enunciated, that he should ever favor a drawback. The hon. gentleman has supported the policy of giving to the millers a drawback upon the wheat which they import from the United States for manufacture. He has supported a drawback upon the iron which is imported and enters into the composition of a ship which is sold in a foreign market. If the hon. gentleman's views are correct, that the imposition of a tax never increases the price of an article, upon what principle does he propose to pay back to any man money which they have never paid; upon what principle does he propose to pay them money which has not increased the price of the article which they have purchased? The hon. gentleman enunciates one particular view, but, when it comes to a question of practical politics, neither the hon. gentleman nor those whom he follows on the other side of the House, act upon the principle he has just enunciated. On the contrary, all these gentlemen go upon the presumption that the duty imposed upon an article enters into the price as much as the wages do. What does the hon. gentleman say as to the articles which are imported here from the United States? We have heard a score of times, since we have been discussing these resolutions, about the prison

Mr. DAVIN.

labor, about the small price of an article on account of the low price of the labor. Why, the labor, the original price of the raw material, the material used, whatever it may be in the manufacture of an article, enters into its price, and upon what theory does the hon. gentleman pretend that the duty paid upon an article, when it reaches the border, does not enter into its price as much as the labor and the cost of the raw material? The hon. gentleman's leaders do not subscribe to his view. They sometimes enunciate it, but it is never the view put forth in practical politics; and, if the hon. gentleman knows anything, he knows that the duty imposed upon paper will necessarily add to the price of every publisher in the country.

Mr. DAVIN. I will explain that in reply to the hon. gentleman. I do support a drawback in the case of an article which is about—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the question of drawbacks will not be entered into at this stage. It will quite defeat the object we have in view.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I will reply to that at another time.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I wish to make a few remarks—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend will not prolong the debate, or we will not get through to-night.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). Of course, if the Finance Minister wishes, I will not proceed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In item 24 I propose to strike out the words "tissue paper," and to substitute the following:—

Manufactures of paper, including ruled or bordered papers, paper-teries, boxed papers, envelopes, and blank books, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Then I propose to take up item No. 40, woollen goods. I may explain to the House that having had the advantage of a very full discussion with a large representation of the Board of Trade and others from Toronto and Montreal, I propose to reconstruct that clause in order to meet their views, and to simplify the tariff in this way: to strike out number 40 and restore item 473 of the revised tariff, and make item 475 of the same to read as follows:—

All fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca goat or other like animals, not otherwise provided for, on all such goods costing 10 cents per yard and under, 22½ per cent. *ad valorem*; costing over 10 and under 14 cents, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; costing 14 cents and over, 27½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

I do away with the specific duty altogether.

Mr. MILLS. That is a very great improvement. I have in my hand from a leading wholesale man of Toronto, a criticism of the tariff as it stands, and these resolutions. According to his statement goods that in England cost 2½d. sterling per yard would actually pay a duty of 57½ per cent., and goods costing 3½d. per yard would pay 49 per cent. In fact the hon. gentleman has proposed a reduction of the tariff on these goods of a little more than one half.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to alter item 92 so as to make it read:

Plate of iron and steel combined, and steel not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

That is to meet the case of certain articles in which there is a combination of iron and steel. I propose that item 169 be struck out and the following substituted:—

Screws commonly called wood screws, 2 inches or over in length, 6 cents per pound; 1 inch and less than 2 inches, 8 cents per pound; less than 1 inch, 11 cents per pound. (b) Other screws of iron, steel, brass or other metal, not otherwise provided for, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. MILLS. That will be a very high duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not very. Just about the same as at present. Then, I propose that item 112 be struck out and the following substituted :—

Iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without threads, or nuts or bolt blanks, less than $\frac{3}{8}$ of an inch in diameter, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

This gives about 35 per cent. on the highest value.

Mr. MILLS. About 75 per cent. on the lower.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I propose to strike out item 113, and substitute the following :—

Nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, galvanised or not, horse shoe nails, hob nails and wire nails, and all other wrought iron or steel nails not elsewhere specified, and horse, mule or ox shoes, one and a half cents per pound, but not less than 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

I also propose to submit the following resolutions :—

Resolved that it is expedient to repeal the following items in schedule "A," chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada intituled: An Act respecting the duties of Customs, namely, numbers 57, 135, 143, 344, 345 and 369, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof as follows :—

All clothing made of cotton or other material not otherwise provided for, including corsets and similar articles made up by the seamstress or tailor, also tarpaulin, plain or coated with oil, paint, tar or other composition, and cotton bags made by the use of the needle, not otherwise provided for, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. DAVIES. What change does this make in the present tariff?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present duty is 30 per cent., and it gives an addition of 5 per cent. on all clothing made of cotton or other material not otherwise provided for, including corsets and similar articles made up by the seamstress.

Mr. WELSH. Does it include the tarpaulin that belongs to ships?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. The duty is increased 5 per cent.

Mr. WELSH. This is used on ships to cover up the hatchways when they are filled with grain, to keep it from getting wet. It is taken away. It does not stay in the country. Do you think that is fair?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If it came in that way and went out with the ship, it would not be entered.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, it would; because I have seen it done. I have sometimes ten or twelve loads of grain, and I want the hatches secured to keep the grain dry. Sometimes I send over to the sail-maker and say: Make me a dozen tarpaulins as cheaply as you can. I want that canvass, and when you put a duty on tarpaulins you strike me home. When you come to the shipping interest, I tell you that you had better strike out tarpaulins, and if you take my advice you will.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I think he would not communicate a little arrangement of that kind to the Customs Department.

Mr. WELSH. No; all right, I won't object to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.—

Drain pipes and sewer pipes, glazed, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

The duty is now 25 per cent. and we propose to make it 35 per cent. The next item I propose is:

All square piano fortes, whether round cornered or not, not over seven octaves, \$25 each; all other square piano fortes, \$30 each; upright piano fortes, \$30 each; concert, semi-concert or parlor grand piano fortes, \$50 each; in addition thereto 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

The duty is now 15 per cent., which I make 20, and there is no change in the specific duties, so it is an addition of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* on these articles.

Mr. WELSH. Well, I do not object to that, I am not very musical. They that want it as a luxury let them pay for it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.—

Parts of piano fortes, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

They are now 25 per cent.

Clothes wringers a specific duty of \$1 each and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

They are now 35 per cent., I propose to make it a specific duty on each and reduce the *ad valorem* from 35 to 30 per cent. The new duty will be, as near as I can judge, 35 per cent.

Mr. WELSH. There will be an increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. WELSH. I am glad of that, because having dealt with the seamstresses I think we should not tax washer-women's clothes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to add to the free list: "Red wood planks and board, sawn but not further manufactured." This is done for the purpose of furnishing the matter for the promotion of manufacture of cigar boxes in the country.

Mr. MILLS. That will take the duty off all lumber I suppose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All red wood. I now propose to deal with item 115, to strike that item out and substitute:

Wrought iron or steel nuts or washers, iron or steel rivets, bolts with or without thread or nuts and bolt blanks and finished hinges or hinge blanks not elsewhere specified, 1 cent per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

And also in resolution 2, strike out item 700 from the heading in the first paragraph.

Mr. MILLS. What is item 700?

Mr. BOWELL. It places certain vegetable matters used for mattresses on the free list. It was proposed to impose 15 per cent., but this amendment is to strike that out and leave the item on the free list.

Mr. MILLS. The Finance Minister has not given me any information with respect to the admission of red wood free of duty. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that in Canada we have no wood out of which to make cigar boxes, and that it is necessary to import wood from a foreign country. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there are many kinds of lumber in Canada that would be admirable for that purpose and that by this proposal he is discouraging native industry.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is it?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has but to look in an ordinary lumber pile at any mill in the country, and he will find hard woods of various sorts admirably adapted for this purpose. The hon. gentleman surely is departing widely from his notion of keeping the money in the country when he proposes, with the immense quantity of wood of every kind here, to import wood for the purpose of making cigar boxes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The extent to which I depart from the principles I have enunciated will, I am sure, be very gratifying in the view of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no such wood as red wood in the country. There is a red cedar, but that does not exist to any very great extent. More than that, it cannot be used for the purpose of cigar boxes, because it would destroy the flavor of the articles placed in the box. There is another

reason. There is such a striking similarity between a cedar which is now free, and the red wood of southern California and other southern countries, that it is difficult to draw the distinction. Red wood does not exist in this country, and consequently does not come into competition with anything here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Any wood imported must come into competition with another wood used here. Nearly all the wood used for the manufacture of cigar boxes years ago in the United States was obtained from Canada from Canadian sycamore. When the hon. gentleman pretends to say that no wood can be used except red wood, he seems to be imposing on the credulity of the House.

Mr. WELSH. What is the reason why the whole people should be taxed on iron, and the railway corporations are to have their iron admitted duty free?

The Committee rose and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope, with the consent of the House, the resolutions will be allowed to be received now. It will be a great convenience, for we can print the Bill; and, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, there will be every opportunity of dealing with every item when the Bill comes before the House at a later stage. I wish to express the great obligation the Government are under to hon. gentlemen opposite for the facilities they have offered, and the great saving of time that has resulted from the spirit in which they have met these propositions; and I think they will be still further consulting the convenience of the House without impairing in the slightest degree their opportunity of dealing with any part of the Bill, if they allow these resolutions to be concurred in now.

Mr. MILLS. With that understanding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With that understanding.

Mr. BAKER. I desire to say a word in connection with iron pipes. I received a telegram the other day from the president of the Board of Trade of British Columbia, stating that the revised Customs tariff will seriously affect the shipments of iron pipe contracted for in connection with the water and gas works in Victoria, New Westminster, Nanaimo, and the new city of Vancouver. I desire to ask the Government if there will be a proviso inserted that all those shipments that are *in transitu* will not come under the new tariff. If some such provision can be made, by which they will be exempted from the operation of the new tariff, a great hardship will be prevented.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject has been very carefully considered by the Government. I have no doubt very much inconvenience will necessarily arise to importers and persons who have made large and important contracts, in consequence of the very material changes in the duty, and I propose to submit in the Bill a clause authorising the Government to deal with those cases, with a view of preventing the hardships which would otherwise arise in connection with it.

Resolutions read the first and second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 107) to amend chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Duties of Customs.

Bill read the first time.

ADJOURNMENT—PASSES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not in his place, but I would ask if it is the intention to send passes on the Intercolonial to all members of the House, or only to favored individuals. I am not interested in the matter myself, because it is not my happiness to be able to return home, but it has been communicated to me in a man-

Mr. BOWELL.

ner that entitles it to belief, that these passes have been sent to some members and not to others.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am able, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, to say that every member of the House will be treated precisely alike in that regard, on whichever side he may sit. All will be treated precisely in the same manner; there will be no distinction, and whatever favor has been accorded to hon. gentlemen on this side, will be accorded to every hon. gentleman on the other side.

Mr. DAVIES. I am glad to hear it because it has not been the case up to half-past five to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am certain that if anything of that kind has occurred it is an oversight, because I communicated with the Minister of Railways and he assured me that what was done in the one case would be done in the other.

Mr. DAVIES. I may state that some gentlemen have gone home, and they had to pay their fares; they were accompanied by others who had passes sent to them, and unfortunately the distinction was that those gentlemen sitting on this side had to pay their fares, while the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite had passes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure the hon. gentleman that that is entirely an oversight which will be corrected, for all are to be treated precisely in the same manner. If through an oversight anything of that kind has occurred measures will be taken to make it all right.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Scarth.)

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to inform the House that I have just received intimation that Mr. John R. Dunn, the returning officer for the county of Queen's, N.B., is now present and is waiting the pleasure of the House.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, and to make better provision for the trial of claims against the Crown. He said: This is the Bill of which intimation was given in the Speech with which His Excellency opened the Session, and in which it was referred to as a Bill making provision for the improvement of procedure relating to the trial of claims against the Crown. At this stage I will merely explain the principal features of the Bill, and defer further explanation of the reasons for introducing it until the motion is made for the second reading. It is proposed to establish the court which is indicated by the title of the Bill, the Court of Claims. This court shall bear the title of

the Exchequer Court, and it is proposed to transfer to it all the Exchequer jurisdiction which is now possessed by judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. The judge of this new court is to be possessed of Exchequer jurisdiction to the same extent as the judges of the Supreme Court; he is to have exclusive jurisdiction where they have exclusive jurisdiction, and concurrent jurisdiction where they have concurrent jurisdiction. He is likewise to have transferred to him all the jurisdiction which is now exercised by the Board of Dominion Arbitrators. It is proposed to repeal the several Acts relating to the Board of Arbitrators, and to apply the procedure in investigations by that board to the tribunal of this judge. The jurisdiction, therefore, which he will exercise in lieu of that which is now exercised by the arbitrators, he will exercise in cases referred to him by a Minister of the Crown, who will have the same facility for transferring claims to him as the Minister now has for putting claims for adjudication before the arbitrators. It follows, from what I have just said, that, instead of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, he will have the adjudication upon petitions of right, and likewise upon that class of claims which, not having the formal procedure attached to petitions of right, are assigned to the Board of Arbitrators by any Minister. It is proposed that this judge shall receive \$6,000 per annum as his salary, and that he shall have a registrar who shall receive a salary of \$2,000 per annum. These salaries, of course, are not mentioned in the Bill, but will be mentioned in the resolutions of which I will give notice to-day. I only mention the salaries at this stage in order to facilitate the consideration of the Bill. It is also provided that the present Dominion Arbitrators, although their present jurisdiction is abolished, shall be continued in office to act as official referees of this judge. Hon. members are aware that claims are frequently investigated by the board, or by individual members of the board, which involve very small amounts, in regard to which the board is a convenient method of obtaining redress. It is often the case that the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways and Canals dispatches a single arbitrator to investigate a claim in a distant part of the country, and in this way the large expense of the board in regard to transit to that distant part of the country, and the sittings of the full board at that place, is obviated. The Minister is informed of the nature of the evidence, and in many cases he makes his report and dispatches the matter without any additional expense. It will be convenient to continue this method in connection with the new court, so that the judge of the Court of Exchequer appointed under this Bill will have power to use the Dominion Arbitrators as official referees. It is, however, provided that when vacancies occur in the office of Dominion Arbitrator, these officers shall not be replaced, but the position shall be filled by official referees, not bearing the title of Dominion Arbitrators, and not exceeding three in number. It is provided, likewise, that there shall be an appeal from this judge to the Supreme Court in all cases where the amount in controversy exceeds \$500, and there is also a proviso that pending business may be transferred to this tribunal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he proposes in this Bill to give to the judge simply or strictly judicial functions, or whether his functions are to be similar to those hitherto exercised by the Board of Arbitrators. At present, the decision of the board is not conclusive or binding upon the Government. Is this to be a recommendation to the Government instead of a judgment, or is the judge to give judgment upon the merits of the case before him, by which the Government would feel itself bound and with which it would comply?

Mr. THOMPSON. The judge is to exercise purely judicial functions, and any decision which he may give on any claims tried before him will have the same effect as a

decision of a judge of the Exchequer Court has now on a petition of right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAURENTIDE BRANCH LINES TARIFF.

Mr. RINFRET, in the absence of Mr. GAUTHIER, asked, Whether the tariff of rates for the transport of freight and passengers on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the Province of Quebec, on the Laurentide branch lines to St. Jérôme and St. Eustache, have been laid before the Governor in Council and approved of by His Excellency?

Mr. POPE. This tariff was fixed by the Local Government and has never been submitted or interfered with since, as the railway was then under the control of the Local Government.

ELECTORAL LISTS FOR THE COUNTY OF L'ASSOMPTION.

Mr. RINFRET, in the absence of Mr. GAUTHIER, asked, What is the total amount of expenditure made by the revising officer, Pierre Blouin, Esq., in the electoral district of l'Assomption, in the drawing out of the electoral lists, including salaries, printing expenses, travelling allowances, wages of clerk and bailiff?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The answer to this question is to be found in the report of the Auditor-General, containing all these statements, and which was brought down before the House the other day.

CAPTAIN LUDGER BOLDOC.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant another enquiry to Captain Ludger Bolduc, in relation to his dismissal as commander of the Government steamer *La Canadienne*, under order dated 27th May, 1884?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to grant another enquiry to Captain Bolduc.

KIT ALLOWANCE TO VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked, Was any application made for kit allowance for the York and Simcoe Provisional Battalion? If so, what answer was made to such application, and why has not such allowance been made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. An application was made by Lieut.-Col. O'Brien, through the proper channel, on the 2nd March, 1886, for an allowance in lieu of underclothing, &c., on the grounds that all the other battalions which were engaged in the North-West and were in action were either supplied with underclothing or were made an allowance in lieu thereof, which statement is at variance with the facts. This application was replied to through the General commanding on the 4th January, 1887, stating that this battalion had no claim, as they had been provided with their kit by the county, and that if payment was made at all, it should be made to the municipality. Some battalions were given some allowance, but they proved that they had expended the amount for the purchase of kits for the men. The York and Simcoe battalion does not appear to have any claim for such allowance.

GABRIEL DUMONT.

Mr. RINFRET, in the absence of Mr. PRÉFONTAINE, asked, Whether the proclamation published in the *Canada Gazette* on the 17th July, 1886, announcing an amnesty in favor of persons implicated in the troubles in the North-West in 1885, covers the case of Gabriel Dumont, formerly of Batoche, and

now in the United States of America? Is the said Gabriel Dumont perfectly free to return to Canada and reside therein, without being molested or liable to criminal or civil prosecution on the part of the Government, or of any person acting for the Government, in case of his return to Canada; and, in the event of such molestation or arrest, would the Government be prepared to grant full and complete protection to the said Gabriel Dumont? If not, what course would the Government take in relation to the said Gabriel Dumont, in case he should return to Canada, or what proceedings would they take against him?

Mr. THOMPSON. The proclamation which the hon. gentleman's question refers to extends an amnesty to all persons engaged in the North-West disturbance, except such as committed homicide otherwise than in actual warfare. It must be in the knowledge of Gabriel Dumont himself whether his case is covered by that amnesty or not.

WHARVES AT ST. FRANÇOIS AND STE. FAMILLE.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause to be continued during this summer the works already begun on the wharves at St. François and Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans, county of Montmorency?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I must say that a balance of \$248 was left out of the grant for the wharf at St. François. That amount will probably be expended on that wharf. With regard to the wharf at Ste. Famille, nothing has been expended there for the last two years, and I am informed by the chief engineer of the Government that the extension of this wharf would require an enormous sum, which the Department is not now in a position to ask the House to grant.

WHARF AT ST. CÉCILE DU BIC.

Mr. FISET asked, What is the amount of the sums expended since 1878 for the building of the wharf at St. Cécile du Bic?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount expended on the wharf at St. Cécile du Bic, up to the 16th of May this year, is \$15,931.08.

INDIAN AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. HOLTON asked, What was the total cost of sending four officers of the Geological and Natural History Survey to the late Indian and Colonial Exhibition—including their salaries while absent from Ottawa? What was the total expenditure in connection with the Exhibition incurred through the Survey, and what proportion of this outlay was paid out of moneys voted by Parliament for the purposes of the Survey?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The total amount expended on Exhibition account by the Director of the Geological Survey was \$15,873.37. This amount was made up of salaries, \$6,449.12, and expenses \$9,424.25. Of the sum of the expense there were paid by the Department of Agriculture, \$4,243.54; by the Department of Interior out of the vote for Geological Survey purposes, \$5,175.71. The salaries were the ordinary salaries of the officers in charge of the Geological Exhibit, and were paid out of the appropriations for Civil Government, Department of the Interior, in the usual way. I may say further that the cost of the four officers engaged in this service is substantially the same as the cost of those engaged at Philadelphia and Paris.

POSTMASTER OF ST. ALEXANDRÉ.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether the Government have received any complaint or petition asking for the dismissal
Mr. RINFRET,

of George Brochu, postmaster of St. Alexandré, in the county of Kamouraska, or for an enquiry into his conduct as postmaster? If so, what is the name of the petitioner? Has such enquiry been held? when and by whom, and what are the names of the witnesses examined?

Mr. McLELAN. A complaint was received against the postmaster. It was sent to the inspector for enquiry, and no report has been received yet.

FISHING IN THE RIVER MATANE.

Mr. FISET asked, To whom have the Government leased for the last five years, and at what price, the right of fishing in the River Matane? Is it the intention of the Government to lease the said right this year again, notwithstanding the formal protests of the riparian proprietors and *censitaires*?

Mr. FOSTER. The admitted right of fishing in the River Matane has been let for a series of years to Sir Alexander Galt. There has been nothing received in the way of payment from him except that he has borne all costs of the guardianship of the river and the maintenance of the fisheries. That was in pursuance of arrangements made by the late Government as a compliment to Sir A. T. Galt. The lease has still to run till December 31st of this year.

WHARF AT KAMOURASKA.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the works executed under their control, last summer, on the wharf at Kamouraska, have been considerably injured by the ice? If so, is it their intention to make the necessary repairs and to complete the said wharf this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The damage done to the wharf at Kamouraska amounts only to \$250, and consequently the wharf will be repaired immediately. As to the last part of the question of the hon. member, I am unable now to answer it.

SCHOONER LIZZIE LINDSAY.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Whether the schooner *Lizzie Lindsay*, employed last year in the service for the protection of the fisheries, is to be employed again this year? If not, for what reason?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not proposed to employ the schooner *Lizzie Lindsay*, it having been found desirable to engage for the protective service, vessels of a different build and weight.

GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Why the contract for carrying the mail between the post office of Gaspé Basin and the wharf at which the steamer *Admiral* touches, was taken away from Mr. A. Carter, who held it since 1879? Were tenders called for in relation to the said contract, and what is the price paid to the party who is now charged with the execution of the same?

Mr. McLELAN. It has not been the practice to ask for tenders for conveyance of the mail between post offices and wharves at which the *Admiral* touches. Arrangements are made from time to time with persons who are considered suitable for the service and are willing to perform it on economical terms. The price paid this year is the same as last.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency). That is no answer to the first part of the question.

Mr. McLELAN. There was no contract before. The inspector makes the arrangements from year to year with parties willing to do it on economical terms. The inspector made the arrangement this year at the same price as last.

SCHOONER BELONGING TO ROBERT LINDSAY.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, For what reasons have the Government refused this year to employ the schooner belonging to Robert Lindsay, Esq., of the township of Douglstown, county of Gaspé, in the protection of our fisheries; after he had gone to considerable expense in fitting her out in a suitable manner for this purpose? Whether it is the intention of the Government to indemnify the said Robert Lindsay, for the expenditure aforesaid, and to pay him the sum of \$500, which is still due him?

Mr. FOSTER. The first part of the question has already been answered. The vessel was chartered for one season only, and certain repairs were necessary in order to fit her for the work. The full charter fees have been paid, and Mr. Lindsay has no further claim in respect to that vessel.

MR. H. J. McGRATH.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Is Mr. H. J. McGrath still in the employ of the Government as inspector of masonry of the new wing of the penitentiary at Dorchester, N.B., or in what other capacity? and at what salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. McGrath was employed in 1883 at \$90 a month. On the completion of the work he was notified, on the 12th May inst., that his services would be no longer required.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SUBWAY.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause a survey to be made during the present season, of the Straits of Northumberland, with the view of building a subway across the straits, as promised by the First Minister in a letter to Senator Howlan, dated January 28th, 1887?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to cause a survey to be made, with a view to building a subway across the straits.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to commence this year the establishment of an experimental farm in the Province of British Columbia?

Mr. CARLING. The establishment of an experimental farm in British Columbia is under the consideration of the Government.

BLACK COD BANKS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to bring down this Session, the report of the expedition sent out last year to examine the Black Cod Banks in the waters of British Columbia?

Mr. FOSTER. A partial report will be brought down this year, and a complete report when the explorations shall have been completed, which will not be until this season is over.

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make any change in the liquor permit system now in practice in the North-West Territories?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question is now engaging the attention of the Government.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S LAND SALES.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) asked, Whether the information asked for by him, in reference to lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, will be furnished? If so, when?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been asked to furnish that information, and I am told that they are now procuring it from their officers in the North-West.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK—CLAIM OF McNAMEE & CO.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed to examine into and report upon the claim of Francis B. McNamee, Anthony Gilbert Nish and James Wright, as set forth in their petition, received on May 8th, 1887, said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Casey, Casgrain, Colby, Shanly, Tupper, Weldon (St. John), and the mover.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman should give the House some information with respect to the nature and merit of the claim, before asking the House to appoint a committee.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The petition sets forth the claim. It states that F. B. McNamee & Co. have a claim against the Dominion Government; that on 24th January, 1880, they entered into a contract with the Province of British Columbia for the building of a graving dock at Esquimalt; that \$10,000 were deposited as security for the fulfilment of the contract; that they entered upon the work in September of the same year, and prosecuted it until 1882, expending a large sum of money; that in June, 1882, the Government of British Columbia took possession of those works; that afterwards it was publicly stated the Dominion Government intended to purchase those works from the Provincial Government; that Messrs. McNamee & Co. notified the Dominion Government, as the petition sets forth, that they were the real owners of that property. Still, it appears, the Dominion Government, in the face of that notification, purchased the property from the British Columbia Government, and this company claim that the Dominion Government are indebted to them in the sum of some \$60,000. Now, the question is, whether the ground of claim they set forth is a justifiable one or not. The object of obtaining a committee is to investigate the matter, and ascertain whether this company have a just claim or not.

Mr. MILLS. I think the House is entitled to know from the Government something with respect to the merits of this claim for which the appointment of a committee is asked. According to the statement of the hon. member, the Dominion Government is a party, the British Columbia Government is also a party, and McNamee and Co. constitute the third party interested, and this House has a right to know precisely what is the position of the matter, what are the contentions of the company, and whether the Government admit the validity of the claim, because large claims made against the Government should not be recognised unless the Government consider they possess some merit.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This case was properly put by the hon. member who submitted the motion. McNamee & Co. had a contract with the British Columbia Government to build a dry dock at Esquimalt. After proceeding with the work for a certain time the Provincial Government thought they had the right under the contract to take the contract off the contractors' hands, to confiscate all their plant, and also retain the deposit of \$10,000 which McNamee & Co. had made under the contract. Sub

sequently the Dominion Government concluded an arrangement with the Provincial Government, which arrangement was sanctioned by Parliament, by which a certain sum of money was given to the British Columbia Government, and that Government transferred to the Dominion Government the plant they had on their hands and also the graving dock so far as built, and the Government of Canada undertook to complete the work. Later on, whilst the work was proceeding under a new contract entered into by the Government of Canada with other parties, McNamee & Co. made a claim on the Dominion Government for the value of the plant and also for the deposit of \$10,000 which had been placed in the hands of the British Columbia Government. The matter was investigated (of course I will not enter here into all the details), and finally the matter was brought before the Minister of Justice in order to ascertain whether there was any legal claim against the Dominion Government, and the advice we received was that there was none, but that the claim was against the British Columbia Government. Nevertheless, McNamee & Co. made a strong case, and the Dominion Government considered that, if there was not any legal claim, McNamee & Co. had, nevertheless, shown strong reasons why they should not be left without redress, and under those circumstances, the Government have no objection to this matter being investigated by a committee of the House. Hon. members will observe that it is a mixed matter between this Government and the Government of British Columbia, and the investigation being conducted here with proper care will most likely bring out all the facts, and the report of the committee will show how the case stands. Then, of course, the matter will be laid in the hands of the House, and in the hands of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

VOTERS' LIST—COUNTY OF MONTMORENCY.

Mr. L'ANGELIER (Montmorency) moved :

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do lay before the House the final list of voters for the county of Montmorency, sent to him by J. A. Charlebois, Esq., revising officer for the said county, with letter of the said Charlebois accompanying the said list; also the other lists, with all additions thereto subsequently sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by the said Charlebois, with copies of letters of Charlebois accompanying the same; also the polling books of the parishes of L'Ange Gardien and St. Pierre, in the said county of Montmorency.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, before this motion is adopted I wish to give a few explanations on this question. At the beginning of the Session I have listened to the various remarks which were made from both sides of the House on the way the returning officers had acted during the last elections. But I believe that in no other county has there been such a violation of the law as that which was perpetrated by revising officer Charlebois in the county of Montmorency. In order to show the unlawfulness of his conduct it will be sufficient for me to state, as briefly as possible, the circumstances which induced me to put this motion on the order paper. In the course of last summer, Mr. Charlebois, a notary who had been appointed revising officer for the county of Montmorency, proceeded to draw out the lists, and in July last he finally revised the electoral list for the county of Montmorency. The notice stating that the final list for the county was deposited, is found in the *Official Gazette* of the 6th of August. This notice reads as follows:—

"Notice is hereby given that I have received the finally revised voters' lists for all the polling districts of the following electoral divisions for the year 1886, to wit: Megantic, Rouville, Montmorency, &c., &c."

(Sd.) "RICHARD POPE,
"Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

"OTTAWA, August 6th, 1887."

As will be seen, at that date, on the 6th of August, not only were the electoral lists finally revised, but the notice
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

to the effect that they had been deposited was published in the *Official Gazette*, and no appeal had been lodged with regard to these lists, so that these lists were legally in force and nobody had a right to tamper with them. Mr. Charlebois, as he was in duty-bound to do, had transmitted in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the lists such as finally revised, as stated in the notice which I have just read. Everything was correct so far, and it is known that the law is very clear on that point. Mr. Charlebois had acted according to clause 29, of which a part reads thus:—

—"and from the date of the publication of this notice in the *Canada Gazette* the persons whose names will be inscribed on these lists as electors, will be held as electors duly inscribed in and for that electoral district under correction or alteration by the judgment rendered on appeal, as hereinafter provided.

Now, as I have just stated, no appeal has been lodged, consequently the lists were final, and Mr. Charlebois has no right to change these electoral lists. But Mr. Charlebois, that most extraordinary and exemplary revising officer, had noticed in the meantime that general elections had arrived, and, as he wished to take part in these elections, he saw fit to resign his office as revising officer. He only sent his resignation on the 2nd of February, and it was only accepted on the 14th of that month. Subsequently to his resignation as such revising officer, he took upon himself to add names to the electoral lists of the parish of St. Pierre and of the parish of L'Ange Gardien. He took upon himself on the 18th of February, that is to say, a few days before votation, after having resigned his office as revising officer, to add fourteen names to the electoral list of St. Pierre, and on the 21st of the same month, or one day before the votation, Mr. Charlebois again took upon himself to add twenty names to the electoral list of the parish of L'Ange Gardien. And Mr. Charlebois did this without taking too much trouble to keep the thing secret. He sent copy of this list to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, with a letter informing him that he had taken upon himself to add these names to the electoral lists, in spite of the law, which says that when once the final deposition of the lists has been made in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and when the notice has been published in the *Canada Gazette*, these lists will be final; these lists, which the judge is bound to respect, Mr. Charlebois has thought that he might change them and thus put himself above the courts of the country; he has thought that he could become guilty of forgery of a public document. I do not hesitate to say it, Mr. Charlebois has been guilty of a real forgery. Because, if a revising officer was to be permitted, on the eve of the elections, to prepare lists as he sees fit,—and it is known that in many cases the revising officers have shown themselves very unscrupulous—and to add names to them as in the present case, where, I ask, would be the guarantee of the candidates? At the beginning of an election, the candidate gets the electoral lists; he sees with what kind of electors he has to deal; he sees who are his friends in such and such a parish, but while he is in another part of the country—exactly as the thing happened to myself—Mr. Charlebois takes upon himself to add nearly forty names to the electoral list of the county of Montmorency. Well, Mr. Speaker, here are facts which will be established by the papers which I desire to have brought down before the House. And in order to show how revolting has been the conduct of Mr. Charlebois, of what a violation of the law he has been guilty, I will quote the 31st clause of the Electoral Act, which says:

"Only the persons whose names will be inscribed on these lists, thus revised, altered and corrected, will have a right to vote at any election of a member for the House of Commons, in the polling districts and electoral divisions for which these lists shall have been made, respectively; and these lists shall be binding for any judge, or court, who will be charged with the hearing of a petition, complaining of the election, or the irregular return of the election, of a member of the House of Commons."

So this clause says that these lists will bind the judge, or the court, having to deal with a contestation of election, but, as I said, Mr. Charlebois saw fit to put himself above that, and thought that he had more power than the judges or courts. But what is most outraging in his conduct is, that he took the liberty to alter these lists even when he had ceased to be revising officer, and when he had no right whatever to alter the voters' lists. But, more than that, Mr. Speaker, he took upon himself to make these alterations in violation of the law, at a time when he had sent in his resignation as revising officer, at a time when he had just taken an active part in the elections, in the district of Quebec and in the county of Montmorency. Well, the revising officer is one of the officers of this House, and I ask, as a simple act of justice, that the House should punish this revising officer, so that his example may be a lesson to the others in the future. No member of this House, I am sure, whether he sits on this side or on the other side of the House, would like to be exposed, to see the law violated in this way in his county, and to see his election imperilled by such a disgraceful violation of the law as that of which I, myself, have been a victim during the last election. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in this House will, like myself, feel an interest in securing respect for the law, and in compelling revising officers to do their duty, and I demand that this revising officer, as an officer of this House, be punished according to law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House has already been called upon the great inconvenience, not to say the unfairness arising from the fact of an hon. member making remarks bearing condemnation on or involving very serious charges against a public official, with regard to papers which are not yet before the House. It is very difficult, even impossible, for it would not be parliamentary to say that the hon. member has not given to the House an accurate statement of the facts just as they have occurred, and it is impossible for me, notwithstanding the information I may have received personally, to make a statement contrary to that which has been made by the hon. member, as I have not the papers before me. But I know one thing, or at least I have received information which I have reason to consider as correct, and it is that the man against whom the hon. member is complaining, has not been actuated by party spirit in doing that which is charged against him, and, furthermore, has not acted in an underhanded or secret manner. The information I have received has reference to the correction of an error which the revising officer considered as the correction of a clerical error, which was made known to the hon. member, who was then a candidate. The revising officer sent him a list of the names to be added. I must say, by the way, that these names formed a category of a list, that is to say, in the list forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the whole series of names, commencing by a certain letter, had been overlooked—for instance, the letter F or the letter D. The error was palpable as a clerical error, and according to the information I have received, the hon. member, who was then a candidate, was informed of the fact. Moreover, the electoral committee, which was in favor of the candidature of the hon. member, was also notified that this clerical error had been corrected, in order to avoid complaints being made. The notice was given that the list, as completed and certified by the revising officer, contained these names which, through a clerical error had been omitted from the list which had been sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say any more; I have not the documents before me. The revising officer, of whom the hon. member complains, said to me: "Let the papers be brought down before the House; let people take cognisance of what has been done, and it will be seen that I have acted

in all fairness and with all possible courteousness towards the man who was then a candidate, and who, now that he is elected, complains of my conduct, and says that I have been actuated by the desire to defeat him." The names of the supporters and non-supporters of the hon. member, without any distinction, were to be found in the correction of this clerical error. As I have just said, the list, such as it has been made, is perfect, and is conformable to the lists which were furnished to the deputy returning officers by the returning officer for the election. Now, my hon. friend has mentioned before the House a fact which he seems to consider as highly important: it is that these corrections were made after the revising officer had sent in his resignation as such. This is true; but it is well known that until the moment when the resignation of a revising officer is accepted, this officer, whenever there is a necessity for him to act, is obliged to do so during the interval which elapses between the sending of his resignation and its acceptance. This is admitted by everybody, because in certain cases the revising officer might dispense with doing his duty by sending his resignation, and in this manner certain acts which he is bound to perform would not be accomplished at all. In the present case, if the revising officer has thought that he was doing, not a blameable act, but if, on the contrary, he thought that it was his duty to correct a clerical error, it was perfectly fair for him, when his resignation was not accepted, to do what he has done. Therefore, the only question is whether the facts as stated by the hon. member will be corroborated by the papers when they are laid before the House, to which neither the revising officer nor the Government have the least objection.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency). (Translation.) The hon. Secretary of State has been fairly correct in the remarks which he has made in the first part of his speech. In fact the revising officer informed me towards the end of the election that he had made alterations in the list of one parish. But, as I said in the course of the remarks I had the honor to make a moment ago, it was only after the election was ended that I was informed of that fact. I was then in another part of the county, and on the day before the votation the revising officer wrote me a letter, in which he stated that he had made certain alterations to the list of St. Pierre—I have that letter still—but he never told me that he had made alterations to the list of L'Ange Gardien. The hon. Secretary of State may assure us that this was not done through party spirit, but I know Mr. Charlebois, the notary, more intimately than he does, and I can tell him that he is one of the most violent partisans in our district; he is a member of the Conservative Association in the district of Quebec, and one of those who have always taken an active part in the elections in the county of Quebec and other counties. He is perfectly known as a supporter of the Government, and a most devoted supporter, and the best proof that he has shown party spirit is, that out of that list of St. Pierre to which he added fourteen names, I only received thirteen votes in all, consequently I do not think I had much chance to obtain votes among the fourteen names which were added. Now, in the parish of L'Ange Gardien, where he saw fit to add twenty names, I had a minority of thirty-six votes. As will be seen, he might have exerted his zeal in other parishes, and I can inform the hon. Secretary of State that in other parishes my friends complained bitterly that names which were placed on the list as being those of qualified voters, were struck off the list by the revising officer, and were not on the list when votation took place. How is it that he exerted such an extraordinary zeal, and that he took upon himself, a few days before the votation, to add names to the lists of these two parishes, where he knew that my friends were by far the minority, while in the parishes where he knew that I was strong, he did not deem it expedient to do the same

thing? Besides, the hon. Secretary of State is too good a lawyer not to know that either the law exists or does not exist. If it does exist, it says explicitly that when the final lists have been made they cannot be changed, except on an appeal, by a Judge of the Superior Court. Therefore an appeal may be lodged before a judge, and if these gentlemen thought that their names had been illegally struck out, nothing was easier than to apply to the court—because there are judges at Quebec—and have the list altered in the way they desired. But, I repeat it, Mr. Charlebois saw fit to put himself above the law; he thought that he was a higher authority than the judge, and he altered the list himself. I will ask the hon. Secretary of State whether he is willing to take the responsibility of declaring before this House that this revising officer, after the lists had been deposited, and after the notice had been published in the official *Gazette*, had a right to alter these lists. For my part I have not the great experience of the hon. Secretary of State as a member of the profession, but I hold that he had no right to do it, and that his conduct was absolutely contrary to law. Mr. Speaker, if that revising officer had been a man having little knowledge of the law, I should understand that he might have had some excuse, but Mr. Charlebois is one of the most prominent notaries in the city of Quebec, a man who is conversant with the law, who knows his profession perfectly well, a man who must have made himself familiar with the law which he was called upon to carry out, and consequently, Mr. Charlebois, the notary, ought to have known that when he added those names to the list he was shamelessly violating the law. Again I repeat it, the papers which I demand will thoroughly establish the facts which I have just related. I have little experience in this House, and I may have used rather severe expressions with regard to Mr. Charlebois, but it will be admitted that I had reason to complain in a somewhat bitter manner of the way in which I have been treated by him. Besides, Mr. Speaker, the revising officer did not add any Liberal names to the list; it may not be for the sake of party spirit, but, at all events, it was not for the sake of their candidates; it was probably a mere chance.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was done on the sly.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency). Unfortunately he has committed on the sly a violation of the law, and I have suffered greatly from it. Again I ask this House to make it their business to consider this question. The hon. Secretary of State says that it was done on the sly, but it is for that reason that my majority has been reduced to one vote. Had I been treated like other candidates of the hon. gentlemen opposite with whom I am acquainted, had I had more sympathetic revising officers and returning officers, I would probably have had a majority of a hundred or a hundred and fifty votes. At all events, my election is contested, and should we have a new election we will be delivered from the services of Mr. Revising Officer Charlebois, whose resignation has been accepted by the Government, and my majority will be greater.

Motion agreed to.

P. E. I.—WINTER SERVICE.

Mr. ROBERTSON (King's) moved for:

Return of all papers, reports, correspondence, Orders in Council, &c., relating to the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, or referring to the condition of the *Northern Light*, and any steps that have been taken for the construction of a new steamer to supplement the *Northern Light*.

He said: This is a subject which has frequently been before the House on former occasions, and the only apology I can offer for bringing it up again is its importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. The establishment of this winter communication was one of the

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).

reasons for our entering Confederation, and we feel very much disappointed at the manner in which the service has been carried out. The only real attempt which has ever been made to carry it out was the placing of the *Northern Light* on the route some eleven years ago. For the first three years she performed the service very effectively, keeping up communication for the greater part of the winter, and being stopped only for very short intervals in February by the heavy ice. After being on the service for about three years she was sent on an expedition to Pugwash, and after battling with the ice for three weeks she had to abandon the attempt, and return to Georgetown some time in February, and she remained there until late in the following spring, before again resuming her trips. Every year since then she has been laid up from about the last of January until late in the spring, and as these intervals when she is not engaged in the service are becoming longer and longer each year, the people are very much dissatisfied that more energy and determination are not shown to lessen the length of these yearly intervals. No doubt this difficulty is caused by the boat becoming old and getting so much out of repair, and the reason I make the motion is to ask the Government to place on the route a new boat of larger proportions and greater power, to supplement the *Northern Light*. I take the liberty also of asking the Government to be particular not to depart from the model of the *Northern Light* when building the new boat, as that vessel has been found to perform the work so effectually. We frequently hear it said that if a Newfoundland sealer was put upon the route she would do much better service. Last winter the Government put on the Newfoundland steamer *Neptune*, and having had ample opportunity of observing and comparing the work of the two boats, I have no hesitation in saying that the *Northern Light* was by far the best of the two, and that she frequently helped the *Neptune* out of her difficulties in the ice. I would also say that I think it would be much better if the movements of the *Northern Light* were left entirely to the judgment of the captain of the vessel, instead of being governed from the Department at Ottawa, as their agent at Charlottetown frequently loses good opportunities of making the trip across the straits, simply because the captain has not the orders to proceed to sea. It may be asked: why build a new boat, as the Government are about to build a subway. I see this was promised in a letter from the right hon. Premier to Senator Howland, and circulated in the island during the time we were running the late election. Even supposing the Government decided to construct a tunnel or submarine way, it would take some years to get the contracts let and the work completed. It is on behalf of the service in the meantime that I wish to speak on this occasion. What we want is to have the steam communication kept up efficiently. The present steamer, *Northern Light*, is becoming old and considerably damaged, and she may not be fit for the service next winter. We think a new boat should be built to take her place. This is not a party question at all. It is one in which all the people of Prince Edward Island are interested, and I hope the Government will take the matter into their serious consideration, and give us a new boat at as early a day as possible. I wish to urge, particularly, that the management of the boat should be left entirely in the hands of the captain. That would secure a better service than can be secured when the captain is governed from the Department. I think he should be left to use his own judgment as to when he should go to sea and when he should not. As I said before, the maintenance of inter-communication with the mainland was one of the principal reasons why Prince Edward Island entered the Union, and we are disappointed with the manner in which the service has been performed. With strong and thoroughly equipped steamers, it could be performed much more satisfactorily than at present, and I

believe the service could be made to pay for itself. During the last season the *Northern Light* carried a very large quantity of freight, and a very large number of passengers, and I believe that with the increased business which an improved service would bring, it would not be such a heavy expense to the Government as the service has been in the past.

Mr. McINTYRE. I do not intend to occupy very much time on the subject of the winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, as it has been before this House for a number of years past. But I regret to say that so far very little improvement has been made in that service. One thing that both sides are agreed on is, that the *Northern Light* is now a used-up boat. She has been engaged for nine or ten years in the most arduous service that any vessel can perform. For some years past she has been laid up too early in the winter and has started out too late in the spring, and this state of things is getting worse year after year. There is now some reason for that, because she is getting old. Last year she was laid up as soon as ice began to appear in the Straits of Northumberland, and she did not start out until the 4th of April, although the straits had been clear of ice for about three or four weeks before. In addition to the *Northern Light*, a Newfoundland sealer, the *Neptune*, was placed on that route in the hope that she would be of some assistance, but it turned out that she was altogether unfitted for the service. In the first place she was too slow, travelling at the rate of only five or six knots an hour. A boat of that description is entirely useless to navigate through the ice of that channel. Again, she was not of the proper construction for the service. A boat to contend successfully with the ice in the Straits of Northumberland must be built somewhat after the model of the *Northern Light*. The steamer *Neptune* turned out an entire failure. I see in a return made a few days ago that this boat, during the period she has been running, has cost something over \$18,000. It is my opinion that that sum would have been much better expended in building another boat adapted to the service. The manner in which the terms of Union are being carried out is really getting worse, year after year. There appears to be less desire on the part of the Government to carry them out. During the late election contest another project was broached, that is, the project of a subway connecting the two sides of the straits. What there is in this project I do not know. There was, I believe, some sort of a survey made last summer, but what the result was we have not learned up to the present time. During the election this question was brought very prominently before the public. Meetings were held by Mr. Howlan at various points for the advocacy of the scheme. At one of these meetings, I believe at Charlottetown, Mr. Howlan read a letter from the Premier, a copy of which I hold in my hand, and which, in the light of the fact that there was an election going on at the time, becomes very interesting reading. It is as follows:—

“EARNESCLIFFE, OTTAWA, January 28th, 1887.

“MY DEAR HOWLAN.—Referring to our several conversations, and especially to the one of to-day on your return from the south, I desire to repeat that the Government has shown its interest in your subway already by the expenditure last year. The Government continues its interest and is encouraged to make further examinations and surveys, and to submit those already made, as well as those proposed to be made, to a board of civil engineers accustomed to hydraulic works, and works altogether or principally in water, with the view of ascertaining, first, the feasibility of construction; second, the durability; third, the danger of injury or destruction from any known causes; and fourth, the cost. This all important point will be strictly scrutinised in Parliament, and it must depend on the amount necessary for the construction of the subway whether the representatives of the people will consent to incur the expense. The surveys and reports can be easily and speedily obtained, and I trust that the report will be such as will justify the Government in entertaining the project.

“Believe me to be, yours very truly,

“JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Hon. Senator HOWLAN.”

I have very little to add in reference to this letter; but it is a very extraordinary thing to me, and also to the people of Prince Edward Island that all these promises were made on the eve of an election. In the election of 1882 we had not the question of the subway; but we had what is known as the East Point Railway, which was to be built for eight or ten miles to a section known as the East Point, and during the campaign we had surveyors running lines all through that part of the country. On the eve of the last elections, the question of a subway was brought up. So far as the subway is concerned, it is popular with all classes, no matter on what side of politics they may be, because all parties are anxious that the terms of the Union should be carried out as nearly as possible. No doubt, the Premier will continue to display that great solicitude in the future, which he did prior to the elections of 22nd February last, and I hope he will see his way clear to carry out all that he mentioned in his letter. Of course he is as solicitous to-day as he was on that occasion, and there is every reason to believe he will go right ahead with the work so that in a short time we may have easy communication with the mainland.

Mr. WELSH. This *Northern Light* service is very important. It was begun some ten years ago under the Mackenzie Administration, and at the election, two years later, the *Northern Light* was denounced by supporters of the present Government as a boat totally unfit to perform the service. In the campaign of that day the late Hon. John Pope said the boat was totally unfit for the work, and that, if elected, he would at once urge upon the Government to replace the *Northern Light* by a new steamer. He even went so far as to show the models of a new boat. Well, nine years have passed and we still have the *Northern Light*. To every question put the Government as to what they intended to do, they answered: “The matter is under consideration.” The Government have had the matter under consideration for the last seven or eight years, and it is time we should have something more than consideration; it is time immediate action should be taken to replace the *Northern Light* by a proper steamer. This would cost from \$150,000 to \$200,000. Even if the Government took immediate action it would still take eighteen months before they could get a proper boat for winter navigation. I believe the service carried on in winter from Charlottetown to Pictou by the *Northern Light* is the best solution of the question of winter navigation, so far, and also that the regulations which the Minister of Marine has made at the cape for the winter service there, when the *Northern Light* is laid up, are the best that could be made for the present. The Government has made great improvement in that direction during the past two or three years, but the crossing is quite open to further improvement. The Government, as far as they have gone, have done well as regards crossing at the cape, but there is room for more to be done still. The hon. member who has just spoken made a reference to subways, and we could go on talking about these visionary projects for a long time. We do not want to be like the dog crossing on a plank with a bone, and who, seeing the shadow in the water of another bone, let go the one he had in his mouth and lost everything. We want to hold on to something that is solid. The crossing at the cape in winter, as we have it now, is the proper thing, and I believe an improved *Northern Light*, or two of them, would be the proper plan at the lower end. The subway may be valuable or not. I class it with the undertaking that was proposed some years ago in the district represented by the hon. Minister of Finance—that was the marine railway to cross from Baie Verte to the Bay of Fundy. A company was formed—I do not object to it; I think the Government acted rightly in that matter. First, the project was formed to build a canal; a commission was named, which made a report, and that

project was condemned. Afterwards, a company proposed to build a marine railway across from Baie Verte to Bay of Fundy, to take ships across. The project was brought before Parliament, and an Act was passed granting a subsidy, but the company did not get their hands into the public purse, and we have no marine railway. I have understood from Senator Howlan himself that all this company wanted was a subsidy from the Government, as they had money enough to build and run the road, if the Government would grant them a subsidy payable when the road was finished. If that be the case, I would not object to the Government treating the subway as it did the marine railway. I would urge it upon the Government, as a matter of justice and right, that this matter of the *Northern Light* should be taken into hand at once. It would be better if the Government even had to put up tenders and give the work to a company, but I fancy hardly any company would tender for it, as it is a risky and dangerous undertaking, with a very uncertain prospect of definite success. However, that is for the Government to see about, and I hope they will take immediate action. Last winter a boat was engaged by the Government from Newfoundland, a very fine sealer. She was brought up, but proved no better than the *Northern Light*.

Mr. DAVIES. Not as good.

Mr. WELSH. I have been engaged in this sealing business and am fully acquainted with these steamers. Those Newfoundland sealers are the finest ships in the world. They are built strong enough, but are too heavy. They are not suited to the service, because there you want almost double and treble the power you put in an ordinary steamer. Our boats of Newfoundland are driven by auxiliary power, at the rate of eight or ten knots an hour, whereas a proper boat would require sufficient power to make fourteen or fifteen knots an hour, so as to force her way through the ice. The *Northern Light* has power sufficient, but has not weight sufficient, and her model is not quite suitable, although she has performed good work. I think the Department is fully alive to the interests of the case. I have had the pleasure of a conversation with the Minister of Marine, and I think he has the matter under consideration. I only say these few words to urge on the Government the necessity of immediate action, which will do away with the word consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not much new to be said upon this question. Reference has been made to the efforts of the Government last year in putting the *Neptune* upon the route as a trial steamer. That was done in response to representations which had been made to the Government that the very best kind of vessel that could be used for the service was a powerful sealer; and having some respect to those representations, and the *Northern Light* not being in the very best possible condition, last year, the Government determined to get. A sealer—and, as one of the hon. gentlemen has stated, a sealer which, I think, was the very best that possibly could be got, a sealer from Newfoundland, which was the strongest, and had the greatest power—was chartered by the Department and put upon the route, and ran for two months, or two months and a half, the result, as stated by some of my hon. friends, not being very satisfactory. It has been stated that she did not prove as satisfactory as the *Northern Light*, and, from reports of her work in the ice, as far as our officers have given them, I am inclined to think that this is about true, and that the largest and best sealer we could get would not prove herself to be much, if any, better than the *Northern Light*. The intention of the Government was to test that question. That has been tested, and there will probably not be found a necessity to make another test. It has been stated by some of the hon. gentlemen that better work could have been done by the *Northern*

Mr. WELSH.

Light, provided the control of her were given to the captain, and she were not directed altogether by the Department at Ottawa. It is true that the captain and the agent there upon the spot must be the men who are best in a position to judge when the vessel can go out with safety, what amount of strain she can bear, and how she is to be conducted, and I want to say here that that discretionary power is not, and has not, been taken away from the officers there. This year, the commander of the *Neptune*, as well as the commander of the *Northern Light*, and as well as our agent there, were given that control. Of course, the question as to when they are to start and when they are to stop in their operations in the winter and in the spring is in the hands of the Department, and I do not suppose my hon. friends would wish to take that out of the hands of the Department at Ottawa. From what has fallen from the lips of the three hon. gentlemen who have spoken, I gather that they think the *Northern Light* is the best model yet devised for that service.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Mr. FOSTER. At least two of those hon. gentlemen believe that. Perhaps my hon. friend who has made an expression of dissent does not believe that, but I am inclined to think that it is true, not from my own knowledge of the vessel, which is extremely limited, but from the evidence before me. From the evidence which was taken before the special committee, from the men who have been in the vessel and have run the vessel, and from our officers who have observed the vessel's running, and from our marine officers, I am inclined to believe that the *Northern Light* is the best vessel, so far as model and power are concerned, which has yet been devised.

Mr. WELSH. Best as to power, but not as to model.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the Province will be ever thoroughly satisfied until complete communication can be carried on between it and the mainland. It is hard to overcome nature, and I believe they will always feel the difficulties of being cut off from the main channels of communication. I believe that feeling will always continue more or less in the case of Prince Edward Island, but it is not fair to say that, from year to year, the Government has been keeping, worse and worse, the compact to carry on communication between the island and the mainland. I do not think that is a statement which will bear investigation. I do not think my hon. friends will adhere to it. If you take the old ice-boat service and the present ice-boat service, I think there is no one who will not admit that the present service is a great advantage and gain over the other. That brings to my mind the objection which will be brought by my hon. friend's suggestion, that the whole matter should be let out by contract. The ice-boat service was let out by contract, and the Government had no peace until they took it into their own charge and conducted it themselves; and I think it will be admitted that the service has been conducted much more satisfactorily since the Government took charge of it, than it was before.

Mr. WELSH. Hear, hear; you are right there.

Mr. FOSTER. In that case, then, the Government have not been going backward, but have been making an improvement. I believe that anyone who reads the report and the evidence will come to the conclusion that, by vessel, it is impossible to keep up continual communication between the island and the mainland. You may talk about vessels having power and dashing through the ice, but there is some ice that no vessel can dash through at all seasons of the year. My hon. friend seemed to think that, with a suitable vessel, the cost might be lessened in consequence of the passengers and freight that would be carried. I do not think that the returns for the last few years would

bear that out. Although at the beginning and the end of the season there may be a considerable number of passengers and a considerable quantity of freight, yet, if you take the season through, and what it amounts to in the way of carrying passengers and freight, you will find that it would be very small, and would form no considerable item of the expense necessary to carry on and conduct the service. My hon. friend from King's asked whether it is the intention of the Government to build a new vessel? I must make the answer which I have made before, that that matter is under the consideration of the officers of the Department, and I hope, within a few days, when the matter next comes up for discussion in the House, as it will on the Estimates, if not before, to be able to tell the House what has been determined upon with reference to that route. There are certain things which may be considered as alternatives. A new vessel may be built. I must say that my hon. friend rather startled me when he put the cost of a new vessel at \$200,000. It is a large amount.

Mr. WELSH. \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We generally take the larger amount when an estimate is made in that way. There is the other alternative of taking the *Alert*, a solidly built vessel, built for ice service, putting powerful engines into her, and fitting her up for that service. There is the third alternative of taking the *Northern Light*. The bulk of the vessel is just as good as when she was built. She is stronger in fact than she was then, because she has been strengthened. Her boilers last year would not allow a high pressure of steam, and, therefore, she could not make the speed she otherwise would, but it is believed that, by putting new boilers into her, by revamping her, and by rebuilding her top, she will gain a knot or two on her old speed, will be stronger than she was at first, having been strengthened considerably, and will be a thoroughly equipped and good vessel for that service. There are these three alternatives which are now engaging the attention of the officers of the Department. I think the reports are nearly in, and, when these come, I will have pleasure in bringing them down to the House and stating the conclusion which has been come to. This is a subject which we must approach in a reasonable spirit. It is the desire of the Government to give as good a service as it reasonably can, and it should not be the wish of the people on the island to get a service more than can reasonably be given. We may differ as to what is a reasonable service, but the Government desires to give the very best it reasonably can in order to make the position of Prince Edward Island as little isolated as possible during the three months of the winter season.

Mr. DAVIES. The apologetic speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine sounds rather strange in my ears, when I recollect the language which was made use of by his predecessor in office. It now seems that the *Northern Light*, although she has been some ten years engaged in battling the Straits of Northumberland, is still such a remarkably good vessel, with model and everything so perfectly satisfactory, that she is really considered, after ten years of hard work, good enough to continue the service. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman talk about approaching this question in a reasonable and rational spirit. I remember, a few years ago, when this boat was put upon this route and endeavored to carry out the contract between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, she was put upon this route as an experiment, to do what no boat had ever done before. But so far from approaching the subject in a rational or reasonable spirit, before the boat had fairly been tried at all, there were torrents of abuse heaped upon her by hon. gentlemen, then in Opposition, who support the present Government. Not a good word could be said for her, hon. gentlemen denounced her right and left, and after she had proved that she could do good service these de-

nunciations continued the following years, while the Mackenzie Government was in office. There was nothing then too fierce and too bitter to say of that boat or of those who were trying to carry out that contract. Now, that is all changed, and the Government are coming to the conclusion that this old, worn-out boat, after having done service for ten years, is the best thing that can be devised. Hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island cannot understand how it is that while the members who live in Manitoba, or the North-West, or British Columbia, can always start an agitation which can procure them almost anything they want; in Prince Edward Island it seems, no matter how real our grievances are, or how simple they are, or how simple the remedy is, we go on year after year repeating the same old story and get the same old answer: "It is under the consideration of the Government." I tell the hon. gentleman, without desiring to use any harsh language at all, that in this year, 1887, for the hon. gentleman to say it is now under consideration, is disgraceful to the Department. The hon. Minister knows well that, five years ago, at the instigation of the Department over which he presides, an hon. member here moved for a special commission to enquire into all the facts, to lay the data before the Minister on which he could form a judgment. I pointed out to him that the facts were very simple, that the facts were known to everybody who had crossed from Prince Edward Island to the mainland—the facts were that the *Northern Light* was doing excellent service, but she was getting worn out and needed to be supplemented by a new boat. The hon. gentleman talks about the different way in which the people of Prince Edward Island look at this question from the way in which those on the mainland look at it. Well, Sir, it is to be borne in mind that it is the interest of the mainland to have this service carried out, and it is the duty of the Government to carry it out, because it is a solemn compact made between the island and the mainland that it should be done. But when that commission which was appointed, reported to the House, the report did not contain one new fact. They sent down and examined a lot of gentlemen who had a pretty good knowledge of the service, but who had not a bit better practical knowledge than have the members for the island, who are crossing there every year. The report just stated what we have told the House from our places here, but after they had gathered all the facts and gone to a good deal of expense, the report was laid before the Department, and it has been there for four or five years, and the Minister of Marine comes down to-day and says it is under consideration. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman it is not creditable to him, because he knows that since the report was presented he has had reports from those in charge of the service that the *Northern Light* is a dangerous boat to run in her present condition. I tell the hon. gentleman this—and I am speaking language which I have carefully weighed—that I shall hold him, as one member of this House, responsible if anything happens in that service. I took the trouble to go to the officers in command. It is true they would not say a great deal; they said they preferred to communicate to the Department. Then I went to some of the largest shipbuilders and vessel owners in Prince Edward Island, and they told me, eighteen months ago, that it was not safe for a man to cross in that boat in its then condition. The hon. gentleman is running a service which experienced men declare to be an unsafe service, when the hon. gentleman had witnesses to that fact, when reports went to the Department to that effect. The hon. gentleman knows it is so. My hon. friend and colleague has told him that if he makes up his mind to do so, it will take eighteen months before he is able to put a fit boat on the service to carry out the contract. What he ought to do, what he was told five years ago to do, was to repair the *Northern Light*, and to put her into something like effec-

tive condition as a supplementary boat, and then to supply a thoroughly good boat to do the main work. We know, Sir, that the service can be maintained continuously every year, except for four or five weeks. Hon. gentlemen know that; the witnesses before the commission told them; the members who represent Prince Edward Island told them that. But they knew that the *Northern Light* could not do that, they knew she was a dangerous vessel, and yet they have kept her on that service ever since. What is the service? Hon. members who have not been down there do not know. This boat, running against great masses of ice day after day, at full speed, it is a wonder to me that she endures, and if she had not been remarkably well built she would have been smashed to pieces long ago. But she was a thoroughly built boat when she was refitted and strengthened in the hands of the then Minister of Marine, after she left the contractor's hands; she was thoroughly repaired and did good service. But I will tell the Minister now what I told him a year ago, and I am only voicing the opinion of all the practical men in Prince Edward Island, and the practical men on the mainland, that he ought to build a boat something like the *Northern Light*, but three or four hundred tons larger, and then put the *Northern Light* in such a condition that she will be able to act as a supplementary boat in spring and fall. Of course hon. members in the House, listening to the island members talking about this every year, may be getting tired of it, but it is a vital matter to us. It is most essential that business men should be able to cross to the mainland to carry on their business, and what must they think when this boat is laid up under repair, or if the officers are not quite sure that she is strong enough to risk a voyage? The hon. Minister knows that what I am saying is correct, and he knows that he has undertaken a very heavy responsibility if he runs that boat again without having her thoroughly well repaired; and I tell him I am not satisfied for one with the manner in which the service is being carried on—I am thoroughly dissatisfied. I am informed by those who ought to know, that those who get on that boat take their lives in their hands when they cross the straits. I say that ought not to be so, and the hon. gentleman, if he had been as keenly alive to the interests of that part of the Dominion as he was to some other parts of the Dominion, would have had a boat built long ago. Supposing it does cost \$150,000, that amount of money is not going to stand in the way of the Government. Why, they are spending millions, and tens of millions, at the demand of the people of British Columbia and the North-West, who are only a few hundred thousand people. They can get anything they like. If they want a million, or ten millions, they have ways of getting it. But it seems that Prince Edward Island can get nothing from this Government, no matter how badly she needs it—nothing whatever. Just before the election we had great promises. The leader of the Government smiles.

Mr. MILLS. A submarine railway.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, the hon. gentleman smiles. He heard read a little while ago, by my hon. friend from King's county, a letter which he wrote down there. He was not going to be satisfied with the *Northern Light*, but he was going to have a subway built; he was going, at all events, to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether the scheme was feasible. That is very proper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I have the hon. gentleman's letter. I went with it upon the platform throughout the island, read it over paragraph by paragraph and gave it my thorough endorsement. What I now want to know is, whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to implement his pre-election promise? That is the point. I heard with some surprise

Mr. DAVIES.

this afternoon the hon. gentleman tell one of my colleagues that it was not his intention to cause surveys to be made with a view to the construction of a subway. And that in the face—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope that we will have an explanation of what the hon. gentleman did say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the language was sufficiently plain.

Mr. DAVIES. I think that what the hon. gentleman said was, that it was not the intention of the Government to cause surveys to be made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A little further.

Mr. DAVIES. With a view to having a subway built?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Then it is not with a view to having a subway built. There are two objects which the hon. gentleman could have in view: One, to deceive the public; and the other, to obtain data on which capitalists might go on and build the subway. He says he has not the latter intention, and I do not like to impute the former.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. No, I think the hon. gentleman's career has been such that he would do nothing of the kind—his career has been so particularly good. What did the hon. gentleman say to the people of the island just before the elections? He wrote this letter during the elections, when the people were considering Dominion questions, to try and draw their attention away from them and to secure the defeat of my colleague and myself.

"The Government continues its interest and is encouraged to make further examinations and surveys, and to submit those already made, as well as those proposed to be made, to a board of civil engineers accustomed to hydraulic work and works altogether or principally in the water, with a view to ascertain, first, the feasibility of construction;"—

The hon. gentleman pledges himself to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES. We will go on step by step. The hon. gentleman pledged himself to ascertain the feasibility of constructing a subway; and yet he tells us to-day that he is not going to have a survey made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman continues:

"—second, the durability; third, the danger of injury or destruction from any known causes; and fourth, the cost."

And he winds up with a very proper statement that:

"This all important point will be strictly scrutinised in Parliament."

That was perfectly right; but I want to know whether the hon. gentleman is going to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose we shall have an explanation before the debate closes. I would be sorry if he should allow a misconception of his views to go forth on a question of such importance as this. But the hon. gentleman was not alone in promising to the people of Prince Edward Island that if the Government were returned they would take the necessary steps to build a subway. The hon. gentleman who sits beside the Premier, the saviour, if not the driver, of the Government, the Finance Minister, who is second in command, if not first in command, went to Amherst just before the election, and, speaking with all the authority he possessed, either as the actual Prime Minister or the Prime Minister in succession—and, possibly, we shall hear he is to be so very shortly—also made a statement, and

for fear that the First Minister's letter could not have all the effect intended, and would not defeat your humble servant and his colleagues, the Finance Minister expressed his sympathy in favor of the subway scheme in the following language:—

"He says that we have not treated Prince Edward Island very well. All I can say is that the Government of Prince Edward Island are not making any complaint."

And that in the face of the fact that the hon. gentleman was straight from London, where he had been carrying on a controversy with two members of the Island Government, who had gone home and complained at the foot of the Throne that they could not get justice done to the island; and yet the hon. gentleman declared that he was not aware that the Government of Prince Edward Island were making any complaint, although he was aware that the Local Government had gone to the utmost extreme in complaining of the unjust treatment they had received at the hands of this Government. "I am not aware," he said, "that the Island Government are complaining." I have in my desk a document signed by the hon. gentleman himself, containing fifty or sixty paragraphs, a very large part written by himself and all signed by him, setting forth reasons why the complaint of the island at the foot of the Throne should not be received or given weight to by Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"The Provincial Secretary of that Government has resigned his seat to support us, and the Government of Prince Edward Island are standing at our backs to-day."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I tell the hon. gentleman that they stood at their backs and that they fell at their backs, too. The hon. gentleman continued:

"The Government of Canada, to show how anxious they are to realize the highest expectations of the people of that Province, are providing the money necessary to have a proper survey."

No half way measures with the hon. gentleman just before an election. It was not a question of to-morrow, it was a question of to-day. The Government were determined to carry out the highest expectations of the people. He knew what that meant; that it meant that we are commencing surveys for the building up of the subway. That is what the hon. gentleman intended to convey, and no other construction can be placed upon the language. The hon. gentleman further said:

"We are providing the money necessary to have a proper survey, examination, and report upon the proposal to construct a subway connecting the island with the mainland, and if it can be shown that that work can be constructed at any reasonable cost, the Government of Canada will be prepared to take that question up and to connect the Island of Prince Edward Island with the rest of Canada by rails, so that you shall have the advantage of the closest and most complete winter communication with our neighbors."

We have that promise. And the hon. gentleman, fearful almost that the island people would not read the report of his speech in the Halifax papers, took the precaution to telegraph over to the gentleman contesting the county in his interest in the following words:—

"On nomination day, at Amherst, I came out strongly in support of connecting Prince Edward Island with the rest of the Dominion by rail."

Hon. gentlemen know what it means when the Minister of Finance says that he came out strongly, that it was no half way measure, especially before the election; that he put down his foot squarely, and that he was going to connect the island by rail; and, no doubt, those who listened to his speech believed that the railway would be built within six months. He added in his telegram:

"It is most important to the island to send a united phalanx to sustain the Government."

The people of the island might have doubted as to the language of the First Minister, but when the Finance Minister

made this promise the people thought it would be carried out. The friends of the hon. gentleman opposite, moreover, made all the use possible of those promises. I should like to ask the First Minister whether it is his intention to implement the promise given in his letter, and when the surveys are to be made? But I take this opportunity of reiterating the language made use of by my colleague, that even if the hon. gentleman does determine to make the surveys, and should, after obtaining the information which the surveys will give him, come to the conclusion to recommend Parliament to expend a certain sum for the purpose of building a subway, that would be no excuse for the delay of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in providing efficient boats to carry on the communication with the mainland, and I hope the island is not going to be like the dog which grasped the shadow and lost both the bone and the shadow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It did not lose the shadow.

Mr. WELSH. We have nothing but the shadow now.

Mr. DAVIES. I am afraid the island will be placed in the same position as the dog, and will not catch the implemented promise. I hope, however, to see the surveys made, because, whatever may be my private views, I am not capable of forming an opinion on such a great scheme, until we have the promises of the First Minister and the Finance Minister carried out, and the results of the surveys and reports laid before us. I think their promises should be implemented, and that the surveys should be made, and the results laid before Parliament, and Parliament should determine whether it will vote money to carry out the project or not. A matter of a few millions in the present state of our finances is nothing, but in the meantime I desire to impress on the mind of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with all the force of which I am capable, that his duty is clear, that I hope that he will be prepared to carry it out. I hope his attention will not be entirely carried away to other parts of the Dominion, but that he will see that action is taken at once with a view of providing efficient steam communication on the route between the island and the mainland.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is very curious to know whether I am going to implement my letter, and he says he was rather surprised and sorry to hear my answer to the question which was put to me to-day. Well, it was a plain question, and I gave it a plain answer. I will read the question:

"Is it the intention of the Government to cause a survey to be made, during the present season, of the Straits of Northumberland, with the view of building a subway across the Straits, as promised by the First Minister in a letter to Senator Howlan, dated 28th January, 1887?"

If the hon. gentleman had asked me this question: Is it the intention to carry out the promise respecting the survey? I would have said yes. But the hon. gentleman's question went further, and said it was with a view of building a subway as promised, and I was obliged to say no, because there was no promise of building a subway. That is not contained in the letter read just now, and, therefore, I was obliged, in order to give a truthful answer to the question, to answer it just as I did. Some hon. gentlemen objected very much to that letter being written at all—perhaps not the hon. gentleman himself, but some of those who addressed the House.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, what is the meaning of the charge that that letter was written just before the election, and that it ought not to have been written just before the election; that it was evidently written for the purpose of trying to seduce the electors in the hon.

gentleman's county away from him. The hon. gentleman must settle that with an hon. gentleman in the Upper House. An hon. gentleman in the Upper House chose his own time to write me a courteous letter, and I answered him promptly as I answer every letter, if it is written in correct and courteous language. I answered him, and the hon. gentleman got the letter, and that letter will be carried out unless, indeed, it is shown that there is not the slightest use of going to the expense. The hon. gentleman said awhile ago that the *Northern Light*, when it was built and set afloat, to perform that service between the island and the mainland, was perfectly sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Don't interrupt me just now. He considered it was quite sufficient, and he said that the Mackenzie Government were attacked again and again, and improperly attacked, for objecting to the *Northern Light* as insufficient. Well, if the *Northern Light* was sufficient always to do that work there can be no necessity for a subway. Then again my hon. friend, the hon. gentleman's colleague, says he does not believe much in the subway, that it is somewhat like the marine railway on the mainland, that it is a myth; and the hon. gentleman not very obscurely says, that whatever his private opinion is there is no harm in having the survey. The hon. gentleman has made up his mind that the subway cannot be built, that it ought not to be built, that a subway never will be built.

Mr. WELSH. That is pretty near right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then what are the Government to do? What can they do? The senior member for the county says that it is very extraordinary that Manitoba, and the North-West, and British Columbia can get whatever they want, but that poor Prince Edward Island cannot get anything she wants. Well, they have got a good deal; and, perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will agree with his colleague as to what more they want they may get more. But what do we find now? The hon. gentleman who sits near me just now, and who I hope will by-and-bye sit *en permanence* on this side, says it is pretty well true that the subway is a myth, that is not wanted. The hon. gentleman says the *Northern Light* was sufficient, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, says that by making some improvements in the machinery and the boilers, and putting her in a good state of repair, she will be as good as or better than ever. My hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, says she once was good, and that, from information he has got from his officers, who are experts in the matter, he believes she can be made as good as ever. What more does the hon. gentleman want? He says that whatever his private opinion may be, there is no harm in having the survey made; a little more expenditure of public money can do no harm, except to the public Treasury. If we are to take the opinion of those two hon. gentlemen, we will not go on with the surveys. But I am not convinced that the hon. gentlemen are quite right. They have no confidence in me, and I have not much confidence in them, and, perhaps, notwithstanding the facts that they are both of opinion that the subway is no good, as we have voted some money before, I think we might vote some money to a reasonable extent again, to ascertain whether the survey already made can be implemented or carried out further. The hon. gentleman was rather annoyed that that letter was written, and that an answer was given, because, I suppose, he found it perhaps might have had some effect. But happily his great influence, his great power, his great eloquence, and those various powers which have made him so prominent a public man, defeated this corrupt object that a corrupt Government had at the time. But, notwithstanding

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that the elections are over, unless my hon. friend the Minister of Marine is convinced by the statements and opinion of those two gentlemen as to the expenditure of the money, the promise will be carried out.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise for the purpose of correcting the hon. gentleman, who, two or three times over, gave as statements made by me statements which I did not make. I did not say the *Northern Light* was quite sufficient for the purpose for which it was built. On the contrary, I explained that in spring and fall it did effective service, but that in the middle of the winter, for a period of a month or six weeks, no boat could be built to do the work. The hon. gentleman should not put words in my mouth that I did not use. I used no language capable of that construction, nor did I use any language such as he imputed to me at the close of his speech—that I had information that the subway was no good. I carefully guarded myself upon that subject; I expressed no opinion on it one way or the other, simply because I was without the information to enable me to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister has explained, circumstantially, how this letter was written. He says that Senator Howlan wrote to him a courteous letter of enquiry and he answered it, as he answered all courteous letters of enquiry, at the time, and that it was Senator Howlan's fault if the time was inopportune. It so happens that Senator Howlan did not write him a letter at the time. How do I know the hon. gentleman's business better than he does? Because I have the letter here, and it begins:

"MY DEAR HOWLAN.—Referring to our several conversations, and especially to the one of to-day, on your return from the south, I desire to repeat that the Government has shown its interest in your subway already, by the expenditure last year."

So the explanation of the hon. gentleman was, no doubt, circumstantial; it was particular; he gave us an account of the courteous manner in which Senator Howlan had written, though perhaps at an unfortunate time, and how in his stern performance of his duty he answered that letter. But the only difficulty is that there was not a morsel of truth in it. They talked earnestly at Ottawa on January the 28th, 1887, about the subway; but of course on January the 28th, 1887, three weeks or four weeks before the elections there was no talk about island politics. Of course there was no talk about island politics; oh, no! The hon. gentleman talked about the subway and discussed the matter, and proceeded to obtain from the leader of the Government a letter—not a personal assurance, not simply word of mouth. They had had a conversation; Senator Howlan stated his views to the hon. gentleman; but Senator Howlan, knowing the hon. gentleman very well, was not satisfied to take a verbal answer from him, or else he wanted a letter to satisfy somebody else. Now, we all know the relations of Senator Howlan to the hon. gentleman, and we are quite sure that it was not for his own satisfaction that he asked for a letter. He had perfect confidence in the hon. gentleman, and he would have been quite satisfied with any statement the hon. gentleman should make in conversation, and, therefore, the letter was obtained, as no doubt Senator Howlan explained to him, in order to satisfy somebody else. Now, there is no use of attempting to disguise it, you know. Even the hon. gentleman himself, with all his self-possession cannot say with a straight face that this letter was not written to aid Senator Howlan to carry the island elections, just as the telegram expressing the urgent and strong desire of the Minister of Finance that there should be a railway to connect the island with the mainland, was sent across to the island at the same time. This is not the first occasion on which political use has been made of this communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I remember very well what use was made for political purposes of this question at the period when my hon. friend from East

York (Mr. Mackenzie) led the Government. I remember very well the attacks which were made on the Government, and also on the bulk of the island representatives, because of the inefficient and improper steps which it was said they were taking towards securing that communication. The predecessor of the present hon. Minister of Marine, the former member of Queen's, Prince Edward Island, the late Mr. Pope, on that occasion spoke, and it was very plain with what object. It was very plain from his language that the object was to make a political point against the Liberal members from Prince Edward Island because of their course with reference to the *Northern Light*. On the 16th of February, 1877, Mr. Pope said this :

"He did not look on this vessel as a great success. At the same time he had no desire to find fault with the Administration on that account, as he believed they allowed the Maritime Province members to settle it pretty much their own way. He did not wish, at the present time, to say much against the *Northern Light*; but in his opinion she was not capable of doing her work in the solid or fixed ice, although he thought she might answer very well for working her way through drift or floating ice."

Then he gave a number of instances of alleged failure in her duty, and proceeded to discuss the subject with all the authority which his position in Parliament, as the representative of the Conservative party on the island, and as a prospective Minister, and his position as a person engaged in the shipping trade, could give :

"The Newfoundlanders had a great deal of experience in ice-breaking vessels, and all theirs were built with overhanging sterns, which facilitated their being forced up on the ice. Besides this, the main breadth of their vessels was near the bow, and when they broke the ice down the rest of the vessel passed through easily; whereas the *Northern Light* was much the shape of a wedge, and when she broke through she wedged herself in nearly her whole length, and could not go further without first backing out and running full speed at it again. Another great objection to the *Northern Light* was her great draught of water, which was over 17 feet, whereas she should not exceed 12 feet. On this account she could not enter many of the harbours."

That was the first year. In 1878 Mr. Pope renewed the attack. He stated again :

"He did not find any particular fault with the Government as regarded the style of the boat, because he believed that the members for Prince Edward Island agreed to accept her offer, having seen the model. If there was any blame to attach to any persons, that blame was to be attached to the members for Prince Edward Island who had consented to take such a boat. She was a boat which from her model was never suited at all for such a purpose; he said so last winter, and he repeated it now, and the experience they had, he thought, had proved it."

Then he proceeded to admit :

"She had powerful engines, but so far as the boat herself went, he never saw in all his experience—and he had been ship-building for 25 or 30 years—so great a fraud imposed upon any people."

And he went on to discuss the materials used in the construction of the steamer. This was the style of attack with which we were regaled during the period when the *Northern Light* was new and was first used. This was the method adopted by a gentleman belonging to the Conservative party in treating the subject that the hon. member for Queen's now asks should be discussed in a reasonable spirit and with a fair consideration of the circumstances of the case. And after all this, after a political success had been achieved in the island at the next election, very largely on account of the undue and improper attacks on the Government and the members for Prince Edward Island in regard to the *Northern Light*, after all that, we find that eight or nine years of subsequent experience of the *Northern Light* has left the hon. gentleman under a conviction that it is at least doubtful whether he can improve that boat to-day. He says some improvements, some rebuilding of the boat, will give an increased speed of a knot or two an hour. He acknowledges that she has done good service and he does not know whether the conclusion will not be that the *Northern Light* will be the best thing yet. But as she is apparently worn out, after so many years

of service of such an exceptionally arduous kind, it is impossible to suppose that the attacks which were made in 1877 and 1878 were founded in truth and in fact, with reference to the model and style of that boat, in face of the declaration of the hon. Minister of Marine to-day. I trust very earnestly that no attempt will be made to use the *Alert* from what I have heard and read of her. I do not profess to be engaged in the shipping business or to have any very great knowledge of the matter; but all I have heard in reference to the *Alert* leads me to the conclusion that it would be a great mistake to employ her on this service. There are two questions to be considered. The first is whether the *Northern Light* can be substantially improved on in style and construction, which is not at all unlikely, seeing that it was a somewhat experimental business to build a boat for that berth at that time. If she can, then I say a boat ought to be built on that ground, because I maintain that it was the duty of Canada, having regard for the compact with the island, to do all that skill and science could do to give the best communication possible. Then comes the other question, no less important, what the condition at this time of the *Northern Light* is? Is she safe, or can she be put in a safe condition? Even if she be in model and other particulars suitable for the service, is she, or can she be at a reasonable expense made safe? Of course, it is absolutely essential that she should be made safe. Now, considering all I have heard about the *Northern Light* for this long time, having regard for those diatribes of which I have read only a few lines, and there are much stronger phrases than any I have read, it seems to me unlikely that the boat can be reasonably placed in such a condition as to be made the sole dependence. And I was strongly impressed with the view of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that the proper course would be to fit the *Northern Light* out so that she would be safe as a second subsidiary boat, and to put a first-class boat upon the route. Of course, if the hon. gentleman, the First Minister, and the hon. the Minister of Finance, putting their heads together, are determined to proceed immediately with the surveys, not at all with the view of constructing the subway, but with the view that it is possible—just possible—that they may result in a determination to construct the subway. Of course, if that is so that does not alter our duty in this respect. It is quite out of the question to expect that, with all the stern determination to construct that work which the hon. gentleman has evinced this afternoon, it will be constructed in time enough to supply the wants of the service for a year or two at any rate. Therefore, we must proceed in this matter, just as if the subway were out of the question, to secure the continuance of the best possible service by the best navigation that can be obtained. I do not express an opinion upon the feasibility of the case. I was a little surprised to learn the hon. gentleman was shaken in his views by the expressions of hesitation and doubt of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). I had understood from this letter of the right hon. gentleman that the Government had been encouraged by scientific information, by information it had received from experts after the imperfect survey that had been made. The hon. gentleman nods a gracious assent to that. But the encouragement appears to have been so faint, the spark of animation attached to this project appears to have been so feeble, that the mere suggestion of my hon. friend, who, however conversant he may be with things above the water, does not profess to be an engineer in matters under the water, has imperilled the continued existence of that spark of hope, that encouragement which the hon. gentleman entertained on the 28th January, and even up to five o'clock of the evening of the 22nd February, it seems now is in such a sickly, weak condition that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Queen's is enough to blow out the flicker-

ing spark. What was the hon. gentleman going to do? He was very precise and particular.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And dogmatic.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no, not at all dogmatic; but he was so particular that you would almost have supposed, if you had not known him as well as you and I do, that there was something in it. He says:

"The Government continues its interest and is encouraged to make further examinations and surveys, and to submit those already made, as well as those proposed to be made, to a board of civil engineers accustomed to hydraulic work,"—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE.—

—"and to works altogether or principally in the water, with a view of ascertaining,"—

Now we come to the categorical part,

—"first, the feasibility of construction; second, the durability; third, the danger of injury or destruction from any known cause; and, fourth,"—

And of course last,

—"the cost. This all important point will be strictly scrutinised in Parliament, and it must depend on the amount necessary for the construction of the sub-way, whether the representatives of the people will consent to incur the expense, the surveys and reports."

After having thrown that little dash of cold water on the project he proceeds to encourage it once again:

"The surveys and reports can be easily and speedily obtained, and I trust that the report will be such as to justify the Government in entertaining the project."

One would almost think this letter was written to be read at an election meeting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is a model letter, and I recommend to the hon. gentleman and his friends to write such letters.

Mr. PERRY. This question has been before Parliament ever since the first Session the Government came into power, and the people on the island are no nearer the fulfilment of the terms of the Union to-day than they were then. I was surprised to hear the statements of the Minister of Marine that all that could be done had been done by this Government to carry out the terms of Confederation. He said that without a blush. I contend that it is an insult to the people of Canada, if the hon. gentleman thinks he voices the sentiments of the people of Canada to throw such a slur upon them. We find that the *Northern Light*, which the present Government hounded down as a gigantic fraud and imposition on the people, is now, according to the Minister of Marine, the only thing the Government can do to carry out the terms of Confederation. The *Northern Light* commenced operations last fall on the 21st December, and made regular trips until about the 1st February, when all of a sudden she stopped. By whose orders she was stopped, I would like to know. How is it that the *Northern Light* made, from the 21st of December to the 4th of February, 63 trips and carried 714 passengers. How comes it to pass from that day to 6th of April, not one trip was made by that boat. Is it because my hon. friend who manages the Marine Department wrote down to Mr. Lord to stop the boat from running, in order to punish the people for not having returned a solid phalanx, as the Finance Minister says they should have returned? Let us go a little further and ask what sort of experiment the hon. gentleman made in bringing out the *Neptune*. I suppose the *Neptune* must be owned by some people in whom the hon. gentleman has a great interest. I find that for the short time she was here she has cost the Dominion not less than \$18,500, or about three times the amount of her services from the 20th of December up to the 4th of February, which that hon. gentleman has recommended, and no doubt orders, and which may be one of the items of the \$2,000,000 paid by Governor's warrants. I find from the 20th of September to the 4th of February, that that boat has fleeced this country out of

Mr. BLAKE.

\$18,500 for 38 trips, she carried 156 passengers. Three times that amount would build a boat which would be an improvement on the *Northern Light*. My hon. friend has stated that the traffic between the island and the mainland is very small. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not small, when I come to find that the *Northern Light* has crossed nearly 800 passengers during the winter.

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

After Recess.

ST. GABRIEL LEVEE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 12) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the St. Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS. It might be well, for the information of those of us who were not in the Railway Committee, if the hon. gentleman were to state the reason for extending the time, why the work has not been gone on with, and what greater prospects there are now than there were before.

Mr. CURRAN. When the Bill was passed last year the time was limited to three months, during which the work had been begun. It was expected that the city of Montreal, and the neighboring municipalities which were interested in this work, would contribute a certain sum of money towards carrying it out. The city of Montreal was very anxious to do so, but it had not the power to make any advance of money for this particular work without applying to the Local Legislature of the Province of Quebec, and the consequence was the work fell through for want of the powers both in the city of Montreal and in the neighboring municipalities. The city of Montreal, however, has taken a deep interest in this matter, and this Bill has been so amended in the Railway Committee as to allow the city of Montreal itself to take up the work by carrying out the dyke at Point St. Charles as well as by constructing additional works in front of the city, and, at a meeting of the corporation of the city of Montreal held two or three days ago, a resolution was passed to take up this work by the city, so that the company which has been incorporated has had a clause put in the Bill to permit the city, on payment of the actual disbursements by the company, to take over the work if it chooses to do so, and the city will now carry out this work as a city work.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GODERICH AND CANADIAN PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway.—(Mr. Porter.)

Bill considered in Committee and reported.

On the third reading,

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it not be better to pursue the order and let the Bill take its third reading to-morrow? I do not oppose this particular Bill, but we are getting into an irregular practice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the Bill is reported without amendment, it is the usual practice to pass to the third reading at once.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is contrary to the rules of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If there is any opposition to it—

Mr. MITCHELL. I withdraw any opposition to this Bill, but I think it is the duty of the Speaker to see that the rules of the House are observed—with all due respect.

Bill read the third time and passed.

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Manufacturers' Life and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. HALL. It was the sentiment of the Committee on Banking and Commerce that the clause in this section about the decrease of capital should be withdrawn. That clause was reconsidered, but the discussion drifted upon some other subdivision of it, and that matter was overlooked. I believe there is no objection on the part of the promoters of the Bill.

Mr. BROWN. The promoters of the Bill accept that alteration.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Sir Donald Smith.)

Bill (No. 81) to confirm and amend the charter of incorporation of the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Grandbois.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Londonderry Iron Company.—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 85) to authorise and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 87) to revive and amend the charter of the Quebec and James' Bay Railway Company, and to extend the time for commencing and completing the railway of the said Company.—(Mr. Grandbois.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Canadian Horse Insurance Company.—(Mr. Small.)

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDGAR moved second reading of Bill (No. 46) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: I would like much that this Bill should be read the second time, so that a committee of the House should have an opportunity of considering it this Session. It has already stood over at the request of the Government, and I am perfectly certain, if it stands over after this, that will be the end of it this Session. I think the experience of all members of this House who have recently been to their electors will have shown them that there are a great many defects in the election law as it stands. I do not at all suppose that all the defects of the election law have been covered by this

short Bill, but I am quite satisfied that some very glaring defects in the law are covered by it. I do not think any session could be more appropriate to consider an election law than one which just follows a general election, when we have all had the experience which will enable us to consider it profitably. Nor is there any use in saying that it is unnecessary to amend the Dominion Elections Law in the first Session of a new Parliament, because we cannot help knowing that there are a great many petitions before the courts, and that it is very probable that there will be a good many new elections before long in the Dominion, and therefore I think we should try to amend the law this Session. The first two clauses of this Bill refer to the system of voting by ballot. Of course the whole object of changing the system of voting from public to private, from the open vote to the secret voting of the ballot, was to obtain secrecy; otherwise, there was no excuse for doing so. It has been the experience of the last election that the system of voting by ballot as practiced then was in very many cases far from a secret system of voting. I do not propose at all to make any suggestions affecting the system that has been adopted of voting by ballot. Probably it is as good as any of the many systems which have been adopted in different countries. I propose only some small changes in the mechanical appliances for carrying out that system. Now, I happen to know individually, from having voted in several ridings, that the quality of the paper used in making the ballots—the paper upon which the names were printed and upon which the votes were to be marked—was altogether too thin and slight in its material to prevent the mark made by the pencil from appearing through on the other side. There are no directions in the Act, and I do not think any have been issued by the Government to returning officers, requiring them to see that the quality of the paper was of a certain standard of thickness. There is no doubt that ordinary newspaper paper is so thin that if a hard pencil is used in the marking of the ballot, especially if the surface upon which it is used be rough or soft, the pencil will make an impression upon it which shows through upon the other side very distinctly indeed; and the deputy returning officer, the poll clerks and the agents of the candidates, who have the right to be present, will know from the position of the mark on the ballot just exactly how a man has voted. That is a difficulty which I think might be very easily remedied. I have made enquiries from a number of sources, and especially from the officers of the stationery department of this House, as to the different qualities of paper, and as far as I can judge, if it is provided that the paper upon which the ballot shall be marked shall be writing paper, there is a distinct quality of paper provided for; and being writing paper, if it is provided, as suggested in the first clause, that if it is foolscap it shall be of a weight of not less than seventeen pounds to the ream, and, if it is large post, not less than twenty-nine pounds to the ream, I think it will be very difficult, unless a person tries to do it by main force, to mark the paper so as to show on the other side. I have enquired and I find that the additional cost of providing paper of this kind will be very trifling indeed, almost nothing. I have had a number of letters from returning officers making various suggestions—and I am glad to say that, as far as this Bill goes, it has met the approval of every one who has written me—and among the suggestions is one that the Government should furnish the paper to the returning officers for that purpose—a suggestion which I think might very well be considered. However, if it is provided that a certain quality of paper is to be used, they will know what to do and how to do it. I fancy that most returning officers know little about the quality of paper. They go in a hurry to the printing office in the county and take any paper which is supplied to them. Then there is

another mechanical arrangement in connection with the marking of the ballot which is very important. I have myself seen in the polling-booths a rough, unplanned board used as a desk or surface upon which the voter was called upon to mark his ballot, because the pencil was placed upon it and he was shown nothing else to mark it upon. Now, I defy any person to mark a paper on a rough surface like that without showing the mark distinctly on the other side. If the surface be a soft one, such as a desk covered with cloth, the mark would show on the other side, so I suggest in section two a provision that a table or desk with a hard and smooth surface shall be provided upon which the voter may mark his ballot paper. Now, I do not think any hon. member of this House will dispute that those simple provisions will make a vast difference in securing the secrecy of the ballot. Then, by section three it is proposed to add a clause to the 42nd section of the Act to make the law clear that deputy returning officers and poll clerks are not disqualified from voting at the elections. I know that very eminent lawyers in Ontario have taken different views of the law on that subject. I think there is something to be said in favor of preventing deputy returning officers and poll clerks from voting, now that the returning officers are not officials, but are appointed by the Government of the day from among their partisans or any others whom they may choose to appoint. It is of course placing considerable power and patronage in the hands of the Government when they are able, at every polling subdivision, to pick out a couple of voters, and, by employing them for so many dollars a day, secure their votes and influence. But, on the whole, I think it would be a great pity to disqualify two electors in each polling sub-division who possess the intelligence requisite for the positions of deputy returning officer and poll clerk. So I suggest that the words be added to section 42 which are now in the Ontario election law, under which, until 1885, all the Dominion elections in Ontario were held. I cannot understand why those words were left out, unless it were to disqualify the deputy returning officers and poll clerks.

Mr. LANDRY. What about constables?

Mr. EDGAR. Very likely the same arguments would apply to constables. That is a matter which I think the House might very well consider in committee. But, as deputy returning officers and poll clerks are the two officers in reference to whom legislation has been enacted before, I thought it well to deal with them alone in the Bill as introduced. The clause I propose to add to section 42 is this:

"The preceding provisions shall not apply to disqualify deputy returning officers and poll clerks appointed under this Act, and receiving as such the fees to which such officers are entitled thereunder."

While that clause was left out of the Act of 1885, Parliament still left in provisions enabling returning officers to give to the deputies and the poll clerks certificates entitling them to vote at other polling places than those where their names are on the list. Of course, by implication, that would give them the right to vote, and that was one of the considerations which influenced many eminent counsel to believe that they were authorised to vote by the Act. But the general language of section 42 has been held to disqualify them, and I suggest that it should be made clear that they should be allowed to vote. Now, though I can scarcely understand how it could have occurred, I think there is no doubt that in many elections held in February last, somehow or other, a large number of persons voted at certain polling places on certificates from the returning officer that they were agents of the candidates and had a right to vote at a poll where their names did not appear on the list. It is said that a number of people obtained those certificates, and voted at polling places, whose names were not on the list of any polling place at all—that blank certificates were given and were used. If that be so, and I am

Mr. EDGAR.

satisfied that it is so, it would be well I think to prevent the possibility of any such thing occurring in the future. It certainly was not intended by the law, and elections carried by such means could be set aside. Now, I suggest, as there are only two agents allowed to any candidate at each polling place, only two electors should be authorised to vote at any polling place other than their own as agents upon certificate of the returning officer. Therefore, I propose to add to section 44 the following words:—

"And no more than two agents of any candidate shall have the right to vote at any polling place under such certificates."

I think there can be no possible objection to that, because it is a decided improvement in the law, which I am told has been strained as I have indicated. Now, section 58 of the Election Act refers to the preparation of the statement of the result of the poll, not simply to the counting of the votes, but to the preparations of the statement of the different votes cast and all the rejected ballot papers, and various matters which are intended to close up the business of the day. Then, it is provided that the poll box, with all those papers in it, should be sealed and sent to the returning officer, and the election is over, unless there is a recount or a scrutiny held. I suggest that it should be provided that the deputy returning officer shall forthwith, after the completion of the counting of the vote, after the closing of the poll, do this, because we have heard of cases in which the deputy returning officer did not always complete this business of making statements and putting them in the box and sealing the box at the close of the poll. It is evident that if all that is not done in the presence of the candidate or fully accredited agents, there is a large loop-hole left for fraudulent practices. It is provided in this section that after these statements have been made and placed in the box, it shall be locked and sealed, but the section does not say by whom or how the box is to be sealed. I suggest that after the word "sealed" the following words should be inserted:—

"With the seal of the deputy returning officer and the seals of such agents of the candidates as desire to affix their seals."

That, surely, is another safeguard, if the agents choose to affix their seals in addition to that of the returning officer, and that is a provision in the Ontario Election Act under which the Dominion elections were so long held. There is an extraordinary provision in the Act, and I do not see how it has been got over by the deputy returning officer in the last elections in a great many cases. The deputy returning officers are placed in an exceedingly awkward position by the law as it stands. The last provision of section 58 says that this statement, which is to be put into the ballot box at the close of the poll, shall be authenticated by the oath of the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk. The forms of those oaths are given, and it appears, by reference to the forms "AA," at the end of the Act, that the deputy returning officer (page 129 of the Act) is only authorised to swear to this statement, which he has liberty to put in the ballot box at the closing of the poll, before he seals the box, before a justice of the peace or the returning officer himself. In rural districts, the returning officer can clearly only be present at the close of one poll, and a magistrate is not always loafing around a polling place at its close to take this oath voluntarily, and unless the deputy returning officer had sufficient foresight to secure the attendance of a magistrate at the close of his poll, there is no possibility of his complying with the law as it stands. I do not know what the deputy returning officers have done when there have been no magistrates present. They must either have closed up their boxes without taking the oath required, which is a serious matter, or they must have carried off the box and hunted up a magistrate. We should certainly make provisions that the deputy returning officer be allowed to take the oath before the returning officer, or a justice of the

peace, or the poll clerk. This provision is in the Ontario Act, and I think it must have been a clerical omission when it was left out of this Act. Section six merely proposes to add the words "poll clerk" as a party who may administer the oath in form "AA." I think these are amendments to the law that are all in the right direction, all maintaining the secrecy of voting and preventing frauds. I am sure the House would be only too glad to have an opportunity of considering the Bill in committee, and I dare say other and perhaps more valuable suggestions will be made from the wisdom and experience of the House. I move that this Bill be read the second time.

Mr. THOMPSON. I presume the House has been interested in the statement of the hon. gentleman, inasmuch as he has pointed out to us a number of defects which have been the subject of a good deal of observation since the last general election. The hon. the First Minister asked the hon. member, when the order to introduce the Bill was called, to allow the matter to stand over for the present, at any rate, and I desire only to say a few words at this stage with the view of repeating that request. The hon. gentleman has addressed to us a number of observations pointing out what he considered to be defects of the Election Act. It must be within the observation of hon. members that since the elections a number of complaints have been made, including not only those which have been presented by the hon. gentleman, but directed to a number of other sections of the Election Act in respect of which he has not proposed a remedy. I may say to the hon. gentleman that those who had to do officially with the conduct of elections have made on this subject, and are still making, repeated representations to the Government as to amendments which seem to be desirable to the Election Act. It has not been feasible to deal with the suggestions and to take up the subject of the revision of the entire Election Act during this Session. Indeed, since the hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill, representations on the subject of amendments which are considered desirable by persons who have given a good deal of attention to the subject, have been made and are under consideration. It is the intention of the Government to give the matter very careful study, and to present to the House at its next Session a number of amendments dealing with these points which the hon. gentleman has brought forward and with others which have apparently escaped his attention. With regard to one or two points in this Bill, it is the intention of the Government to ask this House to deal with them during the present Session. Considering, however, the fact that the defects that the hon. gentleman has mentioned are not the only ones in the Bill which require to be dealt with, and that, as regards some of those, they may be dealt with more appropriately than by legislation; as, for instance, by instructions, as to such matters as the quality of the paper that should be used, &c., it would be better than passing amendments now dealing with one or two isolated cases to give the subject thorough consideration at a period when it can be more fully dealt with. Therefore, in view of the fact that the Act requires a larger amendment than the hon. gentleman proposes, and that some of the defects he has referred to will probably be dealt with by a Bill to be introduced by the Government during the present Session, I hope the hon. gentleman will consent, having made his statement, that this Bill should stand. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice has stated that the Government intend during the present Session to deal with a number of the points which are suggested in this Bill, and, of course, if the Government intend to do that, undoubtedly the opportunity will be given to the House to consider all these points quite as well as if this Bill were proceeded with, and the object I have had in bringing this Bill before the House will have been fully attained. All

that I have aimed at is to try and perfect a law, which, I am sure, we all admit is defective. I know there are a great many other points which are not alluded to in this Bill, and in which the law might be improved, and I am very glad to hear that the Government are considering those points; but, on matters which are absolutely apparent, and which indisputably require attention, as some do which are brought before the House in this Bill, I do not see that there should be any delay to another Session. I hope, therefore, that the Government will bring down their measure at an early date, and I, for one, will assist them in every way I can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Government ought to bring this matter before the House at a very early day in order to give us the opportunity of considering the Bill. If it cannot be made as complete as is desirable, that is no reason why very serious defects in the law should not be dealt with. Besides those referred to in the Bill of my hon. friend there are many others which require attention. As to the naturalisation of aliens, for instance, we no longer recognise the principle of indefeasible allegiance, but we are aware that many persons who are British subjects by birth, but have become American citizens by naturalisation, return and are able to take the oath under this Act. They can swear that they are British subjects by birth although they have ceased to be British subjects in fact, and the oath ought to be so amended as to conform to the modern doctrine of allegiance, and to exclude those persons who have become American citizens under the law, and who have not again become British subjects under the law. Then again, with regard to the summing up of the votes, in order to avoid the expense connected with a recount, the law was amended by Parliament a few years ago so as to provide that, where a mistake was made, not by the deputy returning officers, but by the returning officers, the judge might sum up the votes just as the returning officer should have done. Take the case where the statement of the deputy has not been signed. The law provides that, if the ballot box is lost, then extrinsic evidence or outside evidence may be taken. You may take the certificates which have been given to the agents and use these, or you may send for the agents of the parties and of the deputy returning officer and examine them upon oath; but, if you get the ballot box back without the statement in it, there is no corresponding provision that you can send for these parties or take the statement furnished to the agents and use it for that statement which ought to have been contained in the ballot box. In that respect the law ought to be amended and simplified and made perfectly clear. There can be no difficulty in making it what it ought to be in these respects, and it seems to me, where you have a large number of elections contested, and where you are likely, in consequence of that contestation, to have vacancies, that you ought not to wait till next Session, but to amend the law at once, and remove those obvious defects which lead to serious difficulty and expense to the candidate without any corresponding advantage to any party.

Mr. DAVIES. There is one slight defect in the election law to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice. Where the returning officer opens the ballot boxes, if he finds the statement by the deputy of the number of votes, he adds it up; but I have known in my own elections several times where the ballots were returned, put in the envelope, and no statement put in the box by the deputy returning officer at all. Then the returning officer is absolutely powerless. If the ballot box is lost, he may take extraneous evidence, he may take the certificates given to the agents, and so on; and may ascertain in that way what vote has been polled, but if the box is returned and the statement, by accident or otherwise, is omitted to be placed in the box, the whole poll has to be thrown out, and the

only remedy is a recount before the judge. I should think it might easily be provided that, in cases of that kind, it should be in the power of the returning officer to open the sealed ballots and count them himself, or to send for the deputy and resort to extraneous evidence. The certificate given to the agents, for instance, might be taken as *prima facie* evidence. I know that in two or three elections in which I was engaged large polls, two or three hundred votes, were thrown out, and there was no remedy.

Mr. IVES. At the same time, I think, Mr. Speaker, that frequent amendments to the election law are to be deprecated. We have just got a consolidation of these Acts in the Revised Statutes. I do not know that they will be of great use to the public generally, because there is no circulation of the Revised Statutes except for a material consideration, which will rather tend to restrain the circulation. If there are serious defects in the election law, I think it would be desirable that time should be taken to cover all those defects, if possible, in one and the same Act, and that is the chief objection I have to passing the Bill which is now under consideration. It is admitted that this Bill does not cover all the defects that exist. The hon. gentleman who moved it, admits that there are other defects. I know it is a serious trouble to the non-professional public who have to administer and deal with this law, that there are so many amendments, and that the law has to be sought for in so many different statutes; and it is very desirable, if we interfere with the present law, that it should be done by a very carefully prepared Bill, which should, in one and the same Bill, remedy all the defects which are supposed to exist. So far as the objections which are proposed to be covered by the first two sections of this Bill are concerned, I think the remedy might be applied by the Government without any legislative action. The Government, I fancy, could furnish the paper on which the ballots are printed without any special authority from the law, and certainly in the regulations they issue to the deputies or to the returning officers, they could prescribe the sort of table which has to be used. I think, however, in that case they would have to make a little more liberal allowance to the deputies before they could expect them to use a black walnut or mahogany table. This year they were very economical, and I know that, instead of supplying them with a screen or something of that sort, they supplied them with a yard and a half of cotton behind which a man was to go to mark his ballot. I found in my constituency a large number of men who were unable to conceal themselves behind this screen and could not use the device. I think, therefore, that the proposal of the Government to take this matter up is to be commended, even if it were not to be taken up this Session. If all the defects that exist were to be remedied by one and the same Act, it would be much more desirable than for an individual member of the House to cure one or two defects, and another member to cure some other defects, and so on.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it not be a much more simple way in view of all the objections that have been pointed out against the Act, and which took up so much of our time two or three Sessions ago, to wipe it out altogether and adopt some other simple way? It strikes me that is the proper thing to do, and I would suggest to the Government, if they are going to give their attention to this matter, that they take that view.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If we cannot get the Act wiped out altogether, which we propose trying to do pretty soon, we should remedy some of the defects already in the Act. A change was made, I think last Session, that was liable to lead to grave irregularities in the conduct of elections, I mean the mode that is pursued under this Act of collecting the ballot boxes. It leads to great delays and is liable to create irregularities of a grave character. Under

Mr. DAVIES,

the old system the deputy returning officer returned the ballot boxes to the returning officer the day after the election. This was not as expensive as the present system where the returning officer sends out people to collect the ballot boxes from the deputies. Under the old system every ballot box in my riding, at least, was in the hand of the returning officer the day after the voting.

Mr. BOWELL. That could not be done in many constituencies, Ottawa county for example.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are very few constituencies in which it can not be done. We have a large net work of railways in almost every constituency in Ontario, and if not they are not so far away that it would be impossible to collect them. In the riding I have the honor to represent, after the system was changed and messengers sent out by the returning officer, in order to collect the ballot boxes, the result was that they were not in the possession of the returning officer until, I think, ten days after the election. Any person can understand what an opportunity this gives for the commission of fraud, and I hope when the Government reconsider this matter, they will revert to the old system. I believe the expenses will not be any greater, and there will be greater safety secured. Now, there is another matter in connection with the ballot. I understand that in some elections ballots had no counterfoils attached to them. On the back of the ballot were the initials, and on the opposite side a short strip for counterfoil, and the returning officer who put the initials on the ballot put them on the back, with the number in front, so it was impossible for him to see, unless he opened the ballot, whether that was the exact ballot he had sent out and given to the voter who took it behind those hiding places mentioned by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). Now, there should be a new form of ballot, a new form of counterfoil. That of itself is very important, because it may lead to very grave abuses. I hope this and other matters to which I have referred will be considered by the Government in the sense I have indicated.

Mr. FREEMAN. There is another difficulty in recording the ballot, and that is in respect to making the cross. I find that there is great difficulty in ascertaining what a cross means. The man who is to record his ballot is required to make a cross, and if he does not make it in a particular place, if he does not make it in some particular shape, the cross is good for nothing. There are many men in the country who find considerable difficulty in making the cross just as it ought to be made, though to us it seems a very small matter, there are many men that do not quite understand the making of a cross, and in their desire to make a particular cross, they make something which cannot be called such. Now, I think we can find quite a number of volumes in which are descriptions of what a legal cross is. I think if the matter goes on, you will have to enlarge your library to contain the books to define just what a legal cross means. Now, if the Government contemplate dealing with this matter there should be some simple way devised by which a man can make his cross signify which way he wants to vote without having it questioned by lawyers, so that if a man makes anything that is like a mark, whether it is a cross, or whether it is an o, or whether it is a straight mark, provided it is made within the lines made for the candidate's name, I think the law should accept that as legal, and his vote should not be thrown away. I trust, therefore, when the alterations are made in this law, or when the defects are remedied, when the new Bill is brought in, that it will simplify the mode in which the voter is to signify who he wishes to vote for.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 52) to empower the employes of Incorporated Companies to establish Pension Fund Societies.—(Mr. Hall.)

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9:35 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. SMALL. I beg to move that at 4:30 p.m. the Speaker leave the Chair, and the House take recess until 8 p.m., in order to give members an opportunity of being present at, and joining in, the reception to His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand, Sir, that motion cannot be put without the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection is well taken. If any hon. member takes objection to the presentation of the motion, it cannot be put.

Mr. BLAKE. I take objection.

QUEBEC RIVER POLICE.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Why the Government have taken, this year, as a constable in the River Police at Quebec, Fraser Blackburn, in the place and stead of Louis Blouin, of St. Jean, Island of Orleans, County of Montmorency, who was dismissed? Is there any report against the said Louis Blouin from the Chief of the River Police, or from J. U. Gregory, Esq., Agent of the Department of Marine at Quebec?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have not taken on a constable named Fraser Blackburn in the River Police at Quebec in the place and stead of Louis Blouin. It is the custom of the Department to engage the River Police Force at the opening of navigation in each year, and to disband it at the close of navigation. Changes are made in the force from time to time as may be found necessary, but no constable has any claim for re-engagement from year to year, and Louis Blouin was not employed this season. No report has been received from the Chief of the River Police, or from the Agent of the Department at Quebec, against Louis Blouin. No constable of the name of Fraser Blackburn is engaged on the force, but there is a constable named Malcolm Blackburn.

NORTH-WEST REBELLION LOSSES.

Mr. FISSET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for the payment, immediately or at an early date, of the losses incurred owing to the rebellion in the North-West; as ascertained by the Commission appointed to enquire into these losses?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). A sum will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to meet these losses.

DEATH OF MR. CAMPBELL (DIGBY).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise for the purpose of expressing my regret, which will be shared in by every member of this House without exception, at the painful news we received this morning of the sudden and unexpected decease of the hon. member for Digby, Mr. Campbell. That gentleman had but recently become a public man, he had not had the opportunity of showing that the confidence and respect which was bestowed upon him by the constituency which elected him was justly earned, but I understand from all those who have known him that his life was in every respect one of great promise. Respected as his family were before him, respected for all the civil and civic virtues, they have been prominent members of society, social and commercial, and the probity and ability and earnestness which distinguished his private life showed that, when he took the responsibility of becoming a member of Parliament, they would gain him the same respect in this House and in the country as they had gained him in his own house and in his own locality. He has been cut off in the flower of his youth or early manhood, when everything seemed to betoken long life, physical endurance and capacity, of which he has shown the effect in his business relations; and yet, such is the uncertainty of human life that he has been carried away after a few days' illness, and we are left to lament his early and regrettable decease. I am sure that every member in this House will join in sympathising with those who are bereaved by the loss of so good a man as Mr. Campbell, I believe, is acknowledged to have been.

DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY ACTS.

Mr. WATSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:

1. That under the terms of Union each of the Provinces of the Dominion as existing in 1881, at the time of the confirmation by Parliament of the charter granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, had full Legislative authority to provide for the construction of local railways running from one point to another within the limits of the Province.

2. That by section 15 of the charter it is provided as follows, viz.:—
“For twenty years from the date hereof, no line of railway shall be authorised by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such line as shall run south-west or to the westward of south-west, nor to within fifteen miles of latitude 48°, and in the establishment of any new Province in the North-West Territories, provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition after such establishment until the expiration of said period.”

3. That during the debate in the House of Commons on the Act to confirm the charter, objection was taken to the monopoly and limitation proposed to be created by the said clause.

4. That during the debate in explanation of its real meaning and effect, and of the policy of the Government on the subject, and with a view to obviate such objection, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, then and now First Minister, used the following language:—

“In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament, we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence.”

5. That thereafter in the course of the debate, Thomas White, Esq., then a supporter and now a member of the Government, with the same object used the following language:—

“But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any railway into this country. To what does that apply?—simply to the Territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organisation to build a railroad from Winnipeg to West Lynn on the boundary, and after this agreement is ratified. This provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses. In fact this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract, is that the traffic shall not be tapped far west on the

prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line. But there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. That is the position with respect to this matter."

6. That on the explanations made Parliament confirmed the charter.

7. That three Provinces of the Dominion, viz:—Manitoba, Ontario, and British Columbia, are or may be affected by the construction to be placed on the said provision and the policy of the Government in regard thereto.

8. That since the confirmation of the said charter, the Local Legislature of Manitoba has passed several Acts creating companies for the construction of railways within the Province.

9. That some of these Acts have been disallowed, on the advice of the Government of the day, on the ground, as expressed in the report of the Minister of Justice, of date January 4th, 1882, approved by Order in Council, January 12th, 1882, that the Acts conflict with the settled policy of the Dominion as evidenced by the clause in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which was ratified and adopted by Parliament.

10. That on the 5th February, 1884, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, in proposing to this House resolutions authorising a large loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with a view to induce the House to agree to the said loan and with the object of expounding authoritatively the policy of the Government on the subject, made the following statement:—

"I showed on a former occasion that the present Government had adopted the policy of their predecessors in regard to what is called the monopoly in the Province of Manitoba; that when the late Government undertook to carry on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, they felt bound to protect the traffic of the road from being drawn off to lines to the south of us in the adjoining Republic, and had consequently refused to issue a proclamation which would charter lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American lines to the south. I said that the present Government, when we came into power, adopted that policy; that we felt, as our predecessors did, that, grappling with so gigantic a work as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were bound to adopt every possible means of protecting our own line against having its traffic drawn to lines to the south—and, mark you, this was at a time when we did not contemplate, at an early day, carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway further than Port Arthur. I said, further, that when we made it obligatory upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend, at once, the line north of Lake Superior, giving us an all-rail route from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, or from Callendar to the Pacific Ocean, we felt obliged to give to that company, upon which we imposed such onerous obligations, all the security that we had considered necessary, and that our predecessors in the Government had considered necessary, for the protection of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I am glad to be able to state to the House, that, although true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and, by the inherent power of its own advantages, to maintain its position, notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected, we are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition within the Province of Manitoba, and I am glad to be able to state to the House, that, such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

11. That upon the said explanation and statement Parliament agreed to the loan.

12. That the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been constructed north of Lake Superior.

13. That by an Act passed by the Local Legislature of Manitoba on the 3rd June, 1884, entitled "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba Central Railway Company and amending Acts," power was given to the Manitoba Central Railway Company to construct a railway as follows: "From the town of Morris southerly to the boundary line of the said Province between the Red River and the first principal meridian within the said Province," and providing that no portion of said railway should be built in the portion of territory added to the said Province in the year 1881 in such a way as to contravene the terms in which said territory was added to the said Province.

14. That the authentic copy of said Act did not reach the Secretary of State for Canada until after the first day of April, A.D. 1885, about ten months after its passage.

Mr. WATSON.

15. That the said Act was, notwithstanding the premises, disallowed on or about April, 1886.

16. That discontent has been created by reason of the said policy of disallowance, and that the rights of the Provinces, the interests of Manitoba, and the declared policy of the Government, all point to the propriety of no longer persisting therein.

17. That a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, setting forth the preceding resolutions, and praying that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to effectuate the altered policy stated to the House of Commons on the 5th February, 1884, as in the 10th resolution set forth, and in pursuance thereof to leave to their operation any Acts of the Local Legislature, not otherwise objectionable, which have been or may be passed for the construction of railway lines within the original Province of Manitoba.

He said: The discussion of this question has been delayed from time to time, and perhaps the present is the most opportune moment to take it up, because matters in Manitoba, to which this resolution particularly refers, have lately assumed a somewhat serious aspect. I may be permitted very briefly to call the attention of the House to the history of the legislation of this Parliament which, at present, has so excited the feelings of the people of Manitoba that they have to-day in that Province a unanimous Legislature, a thing which is scarcely known in any other Province of the Dominion. On this particular question of railway construction in Manitoba, we have to-day a unanimous Legislature, the members of which feel that though they may differ on other questions relating to Provincial or Federal affairs, they are united as to the necessity of railway competition in the interests of the people of that Province. I may say that there are various reasons why we should have competition in railways in that country. When the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was first proposed, the Province of Manitoba protested against certain clauses of that charter, viz, the clause which is commonly known as the monopoly clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, clause 15. They protested at that time against the clause, because it would seriously affect Manitoba and the North-West Territories. But after the explanations made by the First Minister and by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), now Minister of the Interior, the representatives from that Province supported the contract. Later on we had pledges from hon. gentlemen opposite, notably a pledge in 1884 from the Minister of Railways, now the Minister of Finance, that as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed north of Lake Superior, the Government would no longer disallow the local Acts of the Province of Manitoba. In 1880, when the contract was let to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Manitoba Legislature passed a resolution in reference to the matter. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it necessary to refer to these matters, because it is claimed by some that the people of Manitoba wish to break faith with the contract made by the Government of Canada with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I may also remark that so far as the monopoly clause is concerned, it does not apply to the old Province of Manitoba as it existed at the time that contract was let, and the people of Manitoba never agreed to submit to the monopoly clause as construed by some hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the press of the country. On the 22nd of November, 1880, the Local Legislature of Manitoba considered this contract, which was about to be let to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in so far as it related to Manitoba. At that time the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), who has now a seat in this House, was a member of the Manitoba Legislature. It was moved by Mr. Hay and seconded by Mr. Ross:

"That a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, praying that the terms proposed with the Syndicate may not be entered into, inasmuch as the said terms will be found unacceptable to the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, more particularly with respect to part of clause 11, and clauses 14, 15 and 16."

Clause 15 applies to the monopoly in the added territory ; clauses 14 and 16 apply to the exemption from taxation of the land, and the selection of land by the company. There was an amendment moved to that resolution by Mr. Norquay, seconded by Mr. Girard, as follows:—

"Whereas, it appears from a telegram dated 18th Dec., 1880, addressed by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Premier of the Government of Canada, to Thomas Scott, M.P. for Selkirk, that the Canadian Pacific Railway will have power to build branch lines anywhere ;

"And whereas, it is further intended, as appears from the publication of the terms on which the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate have agreed to construct, equip, maintain and operate the said Canadian Pacific Railway, to grant to the said company the exclusive right of building and operating branch lines of railway to the international boundary between Canada and the United States ;

"And whereas, it appears further that the said company have the right of accepting only such alternate sections of land as they may think proper, and it is deemed that the powers intended to be granted to the company would be detrimental to the best interests of the Province of Manitoba ;

"And while this House is of the opinion that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be entrusted to a private company, it views with alarm some of the terms of agreement between the Government and the Syndicate ;

"Therefore, be it resolved,

"Whereas, it appears, &c., that for the present the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate should have given to them power to build only the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that any other line or branch line should be built by the Syndicate or other company only after their obtaining power from time to time from the Parliament of Canada to build such line or branch line, and that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall not be allowed to approach at any point within fifteen miles of the international boundary line, and that Parliament should not abandon its right of authorising the construction of railways in any direction by other companies."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was passed by the Local Legislature, and in that resolution the Province of Manitoba entered a protest against the granting of the charter, with this provision, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. An objection was also made to it by the representatives for Manitoba in this House, but on the assurance of the First Minister, who was also First Minister at that time, and after the explanations made by himself, and the hon. member for Cardwell, (Mr. White), the Manitoba representatives consented to the letting of the contract. For the information of the House I will read what the First Minister said :

"In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament, we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

So, at that time the First Minister did state that the Province of Manitoba would not come under this provision, clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. The hon. member for Cardwell, now Minister of the Interior, also stated :

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railway into this country. To what does that apply?—simply to the Territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organisation to build a railroad from Winnipeg to West Lynn, on the boundary, and after this agreement is ratified. This provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses. In fact this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract, is that the traffic shall not be tapped far west on the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line. But there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. This is the position with respect to this matter."

Nothing could be plainer than the statements made at that time by the First Minister and by the member for Cardwell, the present Minister of the Interior. They correctly

interpreted the powers of the Province as they are laid down in the British North America Act, which sets forth that the Province shall have the right to charter lines of railway to run entirely within its own borders. But those solemn pledges made to Parliament at that time by gentlemen occupying those high positions, have been violated. In 1882 Acts were passed by the Manitoba Legislature for the building of railways to the boundary line; and they were disallowed. In 1883 other Acts were passed granting similar charters; and they were disallowed. Protests were entered, notwithstanding which the Dominion Government persisted in disallowing such Acts, and the country has suffered seriously by the action of the Government in making such disallowance. The action of the Government has been the means of ruining certain portions of the Province, and from the evidence presented within the last few days of the fact that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is in a position to intimidate and coerce the people of the city of Winnipeg; and the Province of Manitoba, it is evidently time this House took action in the matter. All we ask in these resolutions is a fair measure of Home Rule for Manitoba. I do not know of any case wherein intimidation could be made any stronger than it was in the telegram sent by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, and I will take the liberty of reading that telegram. It is a message which should be placed on our records, so that in future ages the people may look back and see the position taken by presidents of railway companies :

"MONTREAL, 18th May, 1887.

"TO HON. JOHN NORQUAY, Winnipeg, Man.

"I am informed that negotiations are in progress, if not already completed, between your Government and others and the Northern Pacific Railway Company, with the view of giving that company an independent connection with Winnipeg. I cannot but regard this as an act of undeserved hostility towards the Canadian Pacific Railway, which in the end will do nothing but harm to Manitoba and the North-West; and further, I consider it a breach of faith towards the holders of the one hundred and thirty-four million dollars of private capital invested in Canadian Pacific Railway securities. If the mischievous agitation in favor of diverting the business of the North-West into American channels is continued, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is treated as a public enemy by the people of Winnipeg, the company will at once take steps to establish their principal western shops at Fort William, which, from an operating point of view, has many advantages, leaving nothing at Winnipeg but the ordinary division shop. Pray do not be mistaken; this is not an idle threat; it is a fixed purpose taken after full consideration.

(Sd.) "GEO. STEPHEN,

"President C. P. R. Co."

That telegram had not the effect which was expected by the president of the company, because when it was read in the Local Legislature, which is now in session, it was answered in the following terms:—

"Cannot understand how your company can construe the contemplated action of the Provincial Government to build a railway to the southern boundary, as a breach of faith to the holders of Canadian Pacific Railway securities. The Government is acting on behalf of the Province uninfluenced by Winnipeg's attitude toward the C.P.R., or the C.P.R.'s contemplated removal of workshops.

(Sd.) "J. NORQUAY."

It has been intimated that the agitation going on in Manitoba, as represented by the action of the Local Legislature, was merely a Winnipeg movement. That is not the case. The Legislature, which includes representatives from all parts of the Province, is unanimous on this question; and although Winnipeg, for the sake of retaining the main workshops of the railway company, might desire to sacrifice the Province and accordingly seek to retrace its steps, it could not do so. As regards the position of the western portions of the Province, the workshops might as well be placed at Fort William as in Winnipeg, so far as they are concerned. Besides, the president of the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company signed a solemn undertaking with the city of Winnipeg, on receipt of \$200,000 of bonus, to establish and maintain there the main workshops of the company, and also all the branch lines in Manitoba, for all time to come. He, nevertheless, now attempts to intimidate the Local Legislature and the people of the Province by sending that telegram. This is an opportune time to discuss this matter. I regret that the Government have seen fit to take the steps they have taken in the past in disallowing our local Acts, which they pledged themselves not to disallow, for the construction of lines of railway to the boundary, lines suggested by the First Minister and the present Minister of the Interior during the debate of 1879-80. It was maintained by some persons that such charters would conflict with clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's contract, inasmuch as they extended beyond the old boundary of Manitoba to the west. The Local Legislature of Manitoba have been very careful, in every Act they have passed, not to grant any charter that would conflict with clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. They made provision, in all the charters for the purpose of building lines in Manitoba, that they should not interfere with the territory added to the old Province of Manitoba in 1881, and there was a clause inserted in each and every one of those Acts, providing that those Acts should not interfere or extend beyond the boundaries of the old Province. The different Acts vetoed and disallowed contained this saving clause, and in all cases the Acts disallowed were for roads within the boundaries of the old Province of Manitoba and entirely within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature as laid down by the British North America Act. When the contract was let to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company they received from the Dominion large subsidies, a large cash subsidy and a large land grant. It was thought at that time that the company were receiving valuable franchises; and from the evidence we have to-day they did receive valuable franchises, because, according to their annual reports, they have made a lot of money out of the construction of the road. So far as the undertaking is concerned, I am not here to decry the road as regards its construction or equipment. It is a good road and well equipped. But a railroad which is built entirely by the public money of Canada, ought to benefit the people of Canada, and this road has not had the desired effect, and has not accomplished the object which was stated to the country it would accomplish when the contract was let. We were informed at that time that by letting this contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the company would use their best endeavors to have that country settled. We had some very exaggerated statements as to what the population of that country would be within a certain number of years, but those dreams—as I might call them—have not been realised. Certain reasons, I think, can be given why we have not more people in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories than we have, and one of them is the fact that we have a monopoly railway. We are told by some that we are trying to divert the trade of Manitoba and the North-West into American channels—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." But, if we are doing that, we are doing exactly what hon. gentlemen opposite told us we could do, when the contract was let and when the matter was under discussion. We have no wish to divert trade into American channels. We wish to have competition in that country; we wish to have another great Canadian railway there, namely, the Grand Trunk. The people of the east are clamoring for connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because they have been subjected to a Grand Trunk monopoly. We, in the west, have been suffering from a Canadian Pacific Railway

Mr. WATSON.

monopoly, and we want to have the Grand Trunk Railway as a competing line—a road which I do not suppose anyone will say is an American railway. I believe its stock is owned entirely by British capitalists.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is all the worse for that.

Mr. WATSON. Probably it is, but we want competition. It is claimed that, by the construction of a road running to the international boundary line, the trade of Manitoba and the North-West will be diverted into American channels, that the eastern manufacturers will be deprived of the privilege of controlling the trade of Manitoba and the North-West. I have simply this to say: that if the protective wall which we have built up, and which, in the case of agricultural implements, amounts to 35 per cent—and they are the articles particularly referred to—if that wall is not enough to keep up the competition with a road to the south of us, then there is something wrong in the rates. We have to-day almost an entire monopoly in implements. I can assure you that the rates cannot break down this wall that is built up between us and the American manufacturers, and my view is, that by having competition into that country, the trade of the eastern manufacturers will be increased. The eastern manufacturers do not sit down and figure upon the fact that their market in the west is 1,200 or 1,500 miles distant from their factories, but they figure it upon the basis of so many dollars or cents per pound or hundredweight, and the lower you can reduce the freights the closer do you bring the Provinces together. I believe that with competition that country would grow rapidly, and the manufacturers in the east would be better served than they are to-day. I am satisfied that such is the case, from conversations I have had with manufacturers in the east, who tell me that they want competition for their freights into the North-West. The results which were promised by the Government from the letting of the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been realised, so far as immigration is concerned. We have in that country better natural advantages and greater inducements to offer immigrants than they have to the south of us. It is admitted on all hands that we have a better soil, a better climate and that we can show a better sample of wheat than in northern Dakota. But we are obliged to ship our wheat by a monopoly railway; and I say that to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position to make more money out of carrying the farmers' wheat from the Province of Manitoba to Port Arthur, than the farmers are in a position to make from growing it. The rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway on wheat carried out of that country are so exorbitant that to-day the farmers are questioning whether it will pay them to produce that fine quality of wheat which our country is capable of producing. Coming to the question of population, we find that it has increased very slowly. The population of Manitoba in 1871 was 18,995; in 1881 it was 65,954, or an increase of 46,959—an increase of 4,696 per year, or less than 25 per cent. of an annual increase. In 1886 the population was 108,640, and taking from this the 10,000 people, which I think would be a fair allowance, for the added territory which was not included in the census of 1881, we have an actual increase of 36,686, or 6,587 per annum, equal to about 9 per cent. I will now refer to the assessment figures to show that the country is not advancing as rapidly as we think it should advance. It is not advancing to the satisfaction of the people of the east, and I can assure the House that no person feels this more than we do in the west. We know we have a good country, and that we should have had a large number of immigrants brought into that country that we have not received. Yet I have been accused of decrying the country, simply because I stated what are the facts, that the country is not progressing. For stating these facts I have been proclaimed disloyal. I say that the

facts ought to be stated, and stated publicly. If there is a disease we should try to suggest a remedy, and the quicker we apply that remedy to the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories the better it will be, not only for that country, but for the whole of Canada. The assessment values of 1882 amounted to \$101,000,000. In 1886 they amounted to \$63,903,648, or a decrease of \$37,000,000. Of course we must remember that in 1882 a large amount of property was at boom prices, but such are the facts as to the assessment. The rural population, including Indians, is estimated at 79,848; the population of towns and villages, at 28,792. It was estimated by the Statistical Department in Manitoba in 1882 that the population was 135,500; it was estimated by the Dominion Government in 1884 that the population of Manitoba and the North-West Territories was 248,102. Taking from the last figures the number shown to be in the Territories in 1885, that is 48,362, there is left 199,740. In other words, there are now about 90,000 people less in Manitoba than there were in 1884. This is not as it should be, because we not only have the immigration into the country, but we have the natural increase as well, and the natural increase in Manitoba is large. The country has expended large sums annually on immigration, principally to the North-West, and what has been the result? We had a population of 65,000 in 1881, to which we must add 10,000 received by the addition of territory. This would make 75,000, yet to-day, according to the census, we have only 95,000 people in the Province of Manitoba. That is a very poor showing. I have prepared a list showing the comparative increase of the population in Dakota and Manitoba.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the population of Manitoba and the North-West is 90,000 less than it was in 1882?

Mr. WATSON. Yes; according to the Dominion Government estimate, in 1884 there were 240,000 people there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it was actually 90,000 less.

Mr. WATSON. We simply have the estimates of the Local and Dominion Governments in that year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I understood him to say that the population was 90,000 less at the present time than in 1882.

Mr. WATSON. According to the statement as made by the Dominion and Local Governments, I think those figures were properly stated by the hon. gentleman himself. In Dakota, in 1870, there was a population of 14,181, and in 1880, 135,177, being an actual increase of 120,996, or 12,100 per year; or, in other words, an increase at the rate of 85 per cent. In 1885, the population was 415,000, and a natural increase of 280,000, showing an increase of 56,000 per year, or 42 per cent.; that is in northern Dakota. Other portions of the western States show about the same increase, and to-day, according to the returns, the State of Dakota should have at least 110,000 added to her population during the year. There is one notable fact to be considered in this connection, and that is in the States the prepaid fare for immigrants coming to that State is large, while there are very few people in Manitoba and the North-West who pay the fares of their friends in the Old Country, and I say there is no better immigrant in the world than the man who advises his friends to come and settle in the country where he resides. I was saying that we were led to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway would expend large sums of money to induce settlers to come to that country, but we have obtained returns and fail to find where the Canadian Pacific Railway have organised that great immigration policy it was predicted they would put into operation. Certainly the results give no evidence of

the working of any such policy. I will give you, Sir, some of the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, to my mind, are exorbitant. This cry of monopoly has not been raised for nothing. We find that the Canadian Pacific Railway are in the position to make more money out of the wheat grown by the farmers in Manitoba than the farmer is, and I see, by an interview with the president, Sir George Stephen, that he suggested it would be much better for the people of Manitoba if they would take off their coats and do a little more ploughing and a little less talk. I have no doubt if they did more ploughing and raised more wheat, it would be a great deal better for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but so far as the farmer is concerned, past experience does not show that it would be a great deal better for him to plough more land. I have reason to believe the Canadian Pacific Railway are charging every cent they can per bushel of wheat that will not absolutely stop production. I do not particularly blame them as business men for working for what they consider their own interests, but I think it would be more to their advantage if, instead of charging all they can, they would charge less rates and thus encourage the production of a larger quantity of wheat. If the people had the assurance that the rates would be reduced five cents to eight cents per bushel, there would be double the area of land broken in twelve months that there is, because farming would then pay. When you go 800 miles west of Winnipeg you find the rates are only some four cents or so per 100 lbs. higher than in Winnipeg, showing that the company have the farmer ground down to the last cent, because the increase is not a fair increase of rates, and they publish this rate for comparison as there is no wheat shipped east from points far west. I will give some of the rates charged for passenger traffic, which will show you the disadvantage under which the people of the North-West are placed, in comparison with the people living east. Passenger rates, as charged at the Canadian Pacific Railway depot at Winnipeg, from Winnipeg to Ottawa, are \$46.25; no second-class or return tickets are issued in Manitoba. Go into the Canadian Pacific Railway office at Ottawa and you can buy a ticket from Ottawa to Winnipeg for \$40 for first class, \$21 second class, and a return ticket for \$55. From Ottawa to Victoria a ticket can be purchased for \$75, but the Winnipeg man who wants to buy a ticket to Victoria in Winnipeg has to pay \$80, or \$5 more for half the distance than a man in Ottawa, simply because he lives in a country where the Canadian Pacific Railway have a monopoly. From Ottawa to San Francisco and return the rate is \$90, while \$30 is charged from Winnipeg to Victoria. These are facts that cannot be contradicted. These are the rates everyone, with the exception of a favored few who secure passes, has to pay. I will give you some of the freights charged and make a comparison, not such as has been made by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from figures published in the *Montreal Gazette*, but from figures such as we receive from each end of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, comparing the western portion with the eastern portion; and, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be argued for a moment that we have not as good a road-bed, or a railway as easy to operate in the west as in the east. On green lumber the rate by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Rat Portage to Winnipeg, a distance of 123 miles, is \$4.50 per 1,000 feet, while the rate by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Ottawa to Montreal, a distance of 120 miles, is \$1.00 per 1,000 feet. In other words, the company charge four and a half times as much for carrying a thousand feet of lumber from Rat Portage to Winnipeg as from Ottawa to Montreal. Now, we have started some industries in the North-West, among them a linseed oil mill at Winnipeg. As the country is adapted to raising linseed, the people who started that mill thought they would be able to ship oil and cake to the west

at a profit. But on that article the Canadian Pacific Railway charge \$1 per 100 lbs. from Montreal to Vancouver, and they charge just the same rate from Winnipeg to Vancouver, a little over half the distance. On confectionery, from Montreal to Vancouver, they charge 90 cents per 100 lbs., and from Winnipeg to Vancouver \$1.89 per 100 lbs. This figure, I may say, is not on the regular list, but it is a rate given to the manufacturers, and can be substantiated by the invoices. Now, we will make another comparison of the rates charged for carrying from Ottawa to Montreal, 120 miles, and the rates for carrying from Winnipeg to a point an equal distance westward :

	1st class.	2nd class.	3rd class.	4th class.	5th class.	10th class.
Ottawa to Montreal.....	\$0.15	\$0.13	\$0.11	\$0.10	\$0.09	\$0.05
Winnipeg to 120 miles west- ward.....	.55	.47	.38	.30	.27	.15½

Now, this comparison shows that these rates are not fair to the west. But we are told that there is a saving clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, providing that the Dominion Government can interfere with the freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as soon as their profits exceed 10 per cent. But what protection is there for the people in the west so long as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company insist on carrying freight and passengers at less than cost where they have to contend with competition? They carry passengers from Ottawa to California and back at a rate which I do not believe is a paying one, but they make up the loss on the poor man who lives in Manitoba, who is obliged to travel on the Canadian Pacific Railway, because he has no other means of getting out of or into the country. They make up their 10 per cent. of profit on that portion of the country where they have an entire monopoly. I have some figures here which show the discrimination made by the company against the wholesale houses in Winnipeg, and in favor of the wholesale houses of the east; but, as that matter was thoroughly gone into by the deputation from the North-West, who laid their case before the Government, I will not take up the time of the House in going over the figures. Now, I will give a few comparisons of rates on freight charged by the different lines of railway. In the first place, I will give you the difference in the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-West and in Ontario. I am going to deal particularly with the rates charged on wheat, because it is of the greatest importance, in considering this matter from a Manitoba point of view, that we should consider specially the rates charged on our natural product. I have not been able to secure the rates for distances less than 400 miles, but I will give them on the longer distances. For 425 miles the Canadian Pacific Railway charges 28 cents per 100 lbs. in the west and 21½ cents in Ontario, and the Grand Trunk Railway in Ontario charges 20 cents. For 500 miles the Canadian Pacific Railway charges 30 cents in the west, 23½ cents in Ontario, and the Grand Trunk Railway in Ontario, 20 cents. For 550 miles the Canadian Pacific Railway charges 30 cents in the west, 28½ cents in Ontario, and the Grand Trunk Railway in Ontario, 22½ cents. Now, I find that the Lake Shore Railway carries wheat 420 miles for 15 cents a bushel, and all the roads competing between Suspension Bridge or Buffalo and New York carry grain at a much less rate. The four lines of railway running between those points carry grain 500 miles for 15½ cents per 100 lbs., and 450 miles for 13 cents. I also find that the Wabash Railway carries wheat 425 miles for 13 cents per 100 lbs., against 28 cents per 100 lbs. by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west. The Wabash Railway carries wheat 500 miles for 15 cents per 100 lbs., exactly half the rate of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the same distance in the west. Now, it might be interesting to the House to give an approximate estimate of what a farmer in Manitoba contributes to the Canadian Pacific Railway for shipping his crop, not to

Mr. WATSON.

Montreal, but from a central point in the Province of Manitoba, say the town of Portage la Prairie to Port Arthur, a distance of about 500 miles. For carrying wheat that distance the company charge 30 cents per 100 lbs., which amounts to a very large percentage of the farmer's crop. For instance, a farmer who raises 25 bushels to the acre, has to pay to the company for carrying his wheat to Port Arthur, at the rate of \$4.50 per acre, and for carrying it to Montreal, \$7.50. When we look at the matter in that way, it appears to me that it must be very plain to all hon. gentlemen in this House that those rates are exorbitant. The rate for carrying wheat from Portage la Prairie to Port Arthur, is about three times as much as the land would rent for, so that it is becoming very questionable with the people of Manitoba who really own the land—whether it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the farmer who holds the Patent, occupies it. Now, I find that the Grand Trunk Railway carries wheat from points west of Stratford to Liverpool for 30½ cents per 100 lbs., which is only one-half a cent per 100 lbs. more than the Canadian Pacific Railway carry it from Portage la Prairie to Port Arthur. In regard to local freight, I will give you an instance of a gentleman who bought a buggy in Winnipeg and wanted to ship it to Portage la Prairie, a distance of 57 miles. The freight asked was \$14. The man was able to ship that buggy by the Express Company for \$10.50. You can actually ship as large an article as a buggy for a less rate by the Express Company than by the Canadian Pacific Railway as freight. There is a case of a man with a farm of 320 acres, producing about 31 bushels per acre, which is a fair average. This is given as the experience of one farmer during the last season. The products of his farm in wheat he shipped to Port Arthur at a rate of 30 cents per 100 lbs., and he contributed \$1,760 for freight, on the products of 320 acres, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for carrying his crop a distance of less than 500 miles. I say it is too large a sum, and the people of that country are commencing to feel that they cannot pay the rates that have been exacted from them. We have men in that country, not disloyal Grits as they are sometimes spoken of, but men who are known to be good Conservatives, who use very strong language in connection with the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the treatment they receive. I do not know that I can do better than read to you the language used by the gentleman who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in the Local Legislature of Manitoba, during the recent Session. The Government of Manitoba is known to be Conservative, but this gentleman felt compelled to use the following language:—

"Mr. Kirchoffer, who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, said Mr. Van Horne had promised the building of an extension of the Souris branch. Lately, on being reminded of that promise, he treated Mr. Kirchoffer to a lecture on the attitude of the Province with respect to disallowance, and further intimated that not one foot of branch lines would be built here until the question of the taxation of Canadian Pacific property was settled. Mr. Kirchoffer closed his address as follows:—'Let us be true to ourselves by patriotic firmness, let us succeed in removing the disabilities under which we labor, let this grinding monopoly which is squeezing our heart's blood out of us be broken up, and free trade in railways be established within our borders. By proper and judicious assistance let branch lines be extended so as to meet the requirements of our settlers, and, Sir, I predict that within a very brief period we shall see confidence in this country restored, emigration increasing, old world capital flowing in upon us for investment, until, in a few short years, we shall see this noble Province, the home of our adoption, occupying a position, financially, commercially and politically, as the centre and backbone of our great Dominion.'

The mover of the Address was forced to use that language a few weeks ago in the Local Legislature of Manitoba, and the Local Legislature felt that such a pressure was being brought to bear upon them that it was necessary for them to adopt the very unusual procedure of passing two local Acts, two charters, to build two railways to the boundary

line before considering the Address. These charters have been granted, but the Government of Manitoba have been afraid that the Dominion Government would proceed in the policy of disallowance, and they did not wish to risk the building of a line under these charters, but passed resolutions through the House taking \$1,000,000 to build a railway to the boundary line as a provincial work. It will be granted that this is to be regretted, because we feel satisfied that outside capital can be secured to build a road providing authority to build a road is granted. It is a burden that our Province can ill afford to bear, but, as a matter of self-preservation, the Province feels it necessary to take this unusual course in order to get competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so it has passed this resolution and contemplates going on and constructing this railway, providing the Government here will not yield on this point. In order to maintain the feeling which has existed in the past, between Manitoba and the Territories in the west, and the Provinces in the east, it would be wise on the part of this Government to pass the resolution now before the House. We do not ask for any assistance; we do not ask the Government to grant a large subsidy to a railway to the boundary line; we simply ask permission to build a line of railway under a local charter. In other words, we ask that the Government will let us alone and will let us build this road. I do not think the eastern Provinces should fear that any trade will be diverted to the south. In fact, I know that the largest shippers, and the largest manufacturers from the east, are in favor of having an extension of the Grand Trunk Railway into the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. They feel that, by having a competing line, they would be able to obtain cheaper rates, and would bring the North-West markets nearer to them than they are now, as the cost of freight is considered rather than distance. Not only that, but we would have cheaper rates from our Province for our produce, and it is most important that we should have cheaper rates in that direction, because we are beginning to realise that the produce which goes out of the country is not equal to the amount of money which comes into it. We have no resources except our swamp lands in that Province, and we will be reduced to direct taxation to provide for those public works if the Province has to build them herself. It is in the interest of the whole Dominion that the Province of Manitoba should be allowed free competition in railways. I have given you some freights between Winnipeg and Port Arthur and between the Portage and Port Arthur. For fear some members in this House might imagine that we are dealing entirely with local freights between local points, I will give you the experience of a lumber merchant in Brandon. The freight rates on lumber in car loads from Duluth to St. Paul, 140 miles, are seven cents per 100 lbs., or one cent per ton per mile. From St. Paul to St. Vincent, 400 miles, the rate is 16 cents per 100 lbs., or four-fifths of one cent per ton per mile. From St. Vincent to Brandon on the Canadian Pacific Railway, 190 miles, the rate is 19 cents per 100 lbs.—that is, three cents more per 100 lbs. for 190 miles than the St. Paul and Minneapolis road charge for 400 miles—or two cents per ton per mile. From Rat Portage to Brandon, 265 miles, the rate by the Canadian Pacific Railway is 21½ cents per 100 lbs., or 1½ cents per ton per mile. There are some other classes of freight, but, as I stated before, the classes of freight which more particularly interest the people of Manitoba are wheat, lumber and articles of that description. Now, I will give you some of the freights charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway on other articles, although they are not of as great importance as wheat and lumber, but there is a considerable quantity of coal shipped into that country. I will take the average of nine different shipments of coal by a hardware merchant in the town in which I live, Portage la Prairie, the average

cost of a car load delivered at Port Arthur, duty paid. It is true that now the duty is taken off anthracite coal, but, when the duty charged was 50 cents per ton a car load delivered at Port Arthur, duty paid, reckoning 15 tons to the car, cost \$86. The Canadian Pacific Railway charged for carrying that coal—and I am not speaking merely of the freight on that coal, I am speaking of the original cost of the coal with the transport from the mine in Pennsylvania, and the 50 cents duty per ton added—they charged \$86 for delivering it on the wharf at Port Arthur, while they charged for carrying that car of coal from Port Arthur to Portage la Prairie, a distance of less than 500 miles, \$108. That is one instance of the exorbitant rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, in reference to shipping generally. A hardware merchant who was purchasing his goods last fall had a certain class of freight which he was shipping from Montreal to Portage la Prairie, where he had an establishment, paid \$1.65 per 100 lbs. for that particular class of freight. He said he was surprised to find that he could ship that same 100 lbs. of freight from Montreal to Vancouver, over double the distance, for \$1.35, or 30 cents less, showing the disadvantage that the people are under from this railway monopoly. I have heard men claim that we were getting our tea much cheaper in the western portion of Canada, because it came from the Pacific coast. I have made enquiries as to the freight charged on tea, and I find that it is carried from Yokohama to Montreal for \$1.25 per 100 lbs. I suppose, under the ordinary mode of doing business, that tea would be dropped off at Winnipeg for \$1, but the fact is that they drop it at Winnipeg for \$1.75, so that, as a result of this want of railway competition, we have to pay 50 cents more in Winnipeg than do the people of Montreal; in other words, with competition we could re-ship it back from Montreal to Winnipeg as cheap as you can get it left at Winnipeg on the way out. Now, I have heard a good many members of this House on both sides claim that the people of Manitoba could not really be in earnest in this agitation, that it was the work simply of a few boomsters and speculators, as Sir George Stephen put it, who are trying to boom the country. I say such is not the case. The argument is used here that Manitoba has approved of the policy of the Government in respect to disallowance, by sending to Ottawa at the last general election four members to support the present Government. I have no doubt the Government will get the support of some of those gentlemen, but they will not get the support of others on this question. The fact is the people of Manitoba were led to believe that the policy of disallowance was to cease, that the people of Manitoba would have a right to build lines of railway within our bounds. We had in the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) a particular friend of the First Minister, or supposed to be, and I expect he is. We had him stating in Winnipeg that he was in correspondence with the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and was receiving cipher telegrams which he stated to be to the effect that the policy of disallowance was to be discontinued.

Mr. SCARTH. I rise to a point of order. I never made any such statement as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has alleged.

Mr. WATSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is simply a question of veracity between the hon. member for Winnipeg and myself.

Mr. SCARTH. It is not a question of veracity. Will the hon. member say that he heard me make such a statement? If he will, then it is a question of veracity, but not otherwise.

Mr. WATSON. It does not matter much. Suffice it to say that it was generally believed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WATSON. Well, all right. It was stated for a fact by the Government organ that the hon. gentleman made such a statement, and the day previous to the election the city of Winnipeg was placarded with bills stating that the policy of disallowance was to be done away with, and "vote for Mr. Scarth, you will have the Grand Trunk in Winnipeg by the 15th July." That was the inducement held out to the people of Winnipeg to support the Government candidates. I have no doubt that the part the hon. member for Winnipeg will take in the discussion will show you that he was pledged to the people of Winnipeg to vote even want of confidence in the Government on this particular question of disallowance, if the Government did not yield. I say that I can produce no better evidence than the member for Winnipeg's own actions. The member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) claimed that the same thing would result, that the policy of disallowance would be discontinued.

Mr. DALY. I never made any such statement, or anything of the kind.

Mr. WATSON. All right, Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen will have an opportunity of explaining their position when I get through. These interruptions do not at all bother me. But I expect that the part the hon. gentleman from Selkirk will take will justify my statement that the people of Selkirk did believe that the policy of disallowance was to be discontinued, and that the monopoly was a bad thing for the county of Selkirk. I say that every candidate who offered himself for election, in Winnipeg or elsewhere, had to declare on a platform that he was opposed to a policy of disallowance. I know my opponent claimed that he was opposed to disallowance; that he had actually got permission from Sir John A. Macdonald to vote against the Government on that particular question, so long as he supported it on other questions, and I suppose those gentlemen who will vote on this question will follow the same course. It was very kind of the right hon. gentleman to give him that permission, because, if it had not been for that permission, I would have been returned with a much larger majority than I obtained, because that was a burning question. The people said that, so far as the question of disallowance was concerned, one man was as good as another, but they have some reason to doubt that such is the case. I do hope that the Government will leave this an open question, and allow this resolution to pass, so that a certain measure of Home Rule may be granted to Manitoba, such as we asked for Ireland. In order to show that this is not an individual movement on my part, but that I am supported by the whole Province of Manitoba, I shall quote interviews had with members of the Local Legislature on this subject, which show that the Legislature is solid on this question:

"Mr. C. S. Douglas said he thought it was an insult to the people of this Province to insinuate that any corporation can have its own way.

"Mr. Hamilton said the public already had the opinion of the Government upon the question; they were going to build the road, and what more could be asked? The Government did not wish to introduce clap-net, but were resolved to build the road at any cost.

"Hon. Dr. Wilson thought it strange that the C.P.R. should threaten the Government to cut off Winnipeg. The Government was the Government of the Province, and not only of Winnipeg, so that the threat to cut off Winnipeg was somewhat absurd.

"Mr. Alexander considered that the C.P.R. was acting very meanly in the matter, and if they adopted such a policy as was threatened, the people of the Province—for it was purely a provincial matter—would be bound in defence to take a strong position against the company. The sooner we knew our position the better, so that we might be in a position to defend ourselves."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to make a suggestion. A large number of members of the House are anxious to leave a little earlier than usual. I, therefore, suggest that it be now declared, by common consent, six o'clock, so as to meet the case, and

Mr. WATSON.

the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity when the House resumes to continue his speech.

Mr. WATSON. If it is the wish of the House, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. No objection being offered, I declare it now to be six o'clock.

After Recess.

Mr. WATSON. When the House rose I was quoting from a report of interviews with different members of the Manitoba Legislature, and I feel I should give the individual opinion of those members, so that this House may know that it is not a feeling that exists in the minds of a few people of that Province:

"Mr. T. Gellay said it was merely an awkward attempt at bluff, to try and frighten the people here.

"Mr. Martin (Morris) said he hoped the company would start to-morrow to tear up their track. It was well that affairs had taken the turn they had, because the result could not fail to be of great benefit to the country. Van Horne would soon find out that he could not bulldoze the public.

"Mr. Macdonell did not think it would materially injure Winnipeg if the C. P. R. did pull up stakes. Another and more liberal corporation would soon be in the country, and if the C. P. R. could do without Winnipeg, Winnipeg could easily do without it. The city would then be in a perfectly independent position. There was no doubt that even with half-a-dozen roads into the Province the C.P.R. would compete just as actively for traffic. He considered that the interests of the country were in direct antagonism to the C.P.R.

"Mr. S. J. Jackson thought the Legislature should pass a resolution showing the syndicate that if they could do without Winnipeg that city could do without the railway. The city would be in better shape to-day if the C. P. R. had never entered it.

"Mr. Smart believed it was the best thing that could have happened under the circumstances. It would bring matters to an issue.

"Mr. S. J. Thompson believed the threat was a game of bluff. We knew now just where we stood. Instead of frightening us, it would only make us more determined to have a competing railway, no matter what the cost would be. The people of this country were loaded up the wrong way to pay serious heed to such threats.

"Mr. Kenneth McKenzie said there could be no two opinions on the question either in Winnipeg or throughout the Province. We had a right to build a railway, and if the C.P.R. was going to act in such a manner as indicated by Sir George it was just as well that we knew it at once. It was time this Province ceased to be a packhorse for the rest of the Dominion.

"Mr. Crawford thought it was a sign of weakness on the part of the C.P.R. Such a threat showed that they knew they were wrong, or they would not attempt coercion.

"Mr. Martin (Portage) said the C.P.R. thought that this was simply a Winnipeg agitation, but even if Winnipeg was scared, it would not make the slightest difference to the country at large. Long before Winnipeg took up the question, the country west of it was a unit on it. Winnipeg has not sufficient influence to secure the abolition of monopoly, and it is an absurd position for the C.P.R. to take.

"Hon. C. P. Brown smiled and said, Gentlemen, there ain't nothin' to it."

I suppose he was once Minister of Railways.

"Mr. Prendergast thought it was an outrage, but it would never be put into execution. The Canadian Pacific Railway was only a private company, bound by its interests and its contract, and couldn't bluff this Province out of its rights.

"Mr. Burke thought it was a — farce from the word go. "Mr. Greenway would not conceive that a business man like Sir George Stephen would send such a telegram, unless it were for some strange reason which we knew nothing of.

"Mr. Winram thought it was a great piece of impudence, which should be resented. It was not a question between Winnipeg and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but between the Province and monopoly. It was the Province that was seeking relief, and not Winnipeg. What did the Province care if the work-shops and every inch of track the company had in this city were removed?

"Mr. F. Young regarded it as an insult and thought it should be resented as such.

"Mr. Drewery thought Sir George must have wanted a competing road to the boundary built very badly or he would never have taken the course he did. If there was anything that would spur him on and make him determined to have his rights it was being bulldozed.

"Mr. Robinson would not be surprised if the company would do it. From a Manitoba point of view, such an act only intensified his feeling, because it demonstrated the fact that we were at the mercy of the monopoly.

"Mr. Marion thought it was simply a case of coercion.

"Mr. MacBeth regarded it as exceedingly bad taste, and very ill-timed. As a member of the House, he intended to do all he could to secure connection. He had no idea that such a threat would be executed.

"Mr. Kirchhoff did not consider that the C.P.R. controls the Province any more than any other corporation in it. He did not think the people would stand by and submit to such bulldozing.

"Mr. Gillies said that Stephen seemed to think that Winnipeg was the whole Province. It is the interests of the Province that we are thinking about, and we are going to have our rights.

"Mr. Leacock believed that Sir George had become so puffed up recently at his own greatness, that he had conceived the opinion that he could rule the earth. He would soon discover that while we would extend him every fair play, we would not submit to have a revolver held at our head.

"Mr. Smith considered it merely a bluff game to which Mr. Van Horne was accustomed from his long experience at the poker table."

Those are the opinions of the members of the Local Legislature of the Province of Manitoba; those conclusions they arrived at after due deliberation, and they at the same time proceeded to pass resolutions in the Legislature for the purpose of building a line of railway to the boundary. I may refer to other evidence to show that the people of Manitoba are in earnest in this matter, and I can produce no better evidence than the evidence fresh from a public meeting which was held in the city of Winnipeg last night. This morning there was a report in the *Citizen* which stated that a meeting had been called, that it was but poorly attended, and that there were present only three or four representative men from outside constituencies. I see by the *Free Press* that the meeting was called by telegram only last Saturday, so that only those places having telegraphic communication had an opportunity of being present. A full report of that meeting, with the telegrams read from the representatives of municipalities who were not present, is contained in this evening's *Free Press*, and as I think that it is important that this evidence should be before the House, and as I consider that this is a very critical time in the relations which have existed in the past, and are to exist in the future, between the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion Government, I will trouble the House by reading those telegrams, as well as the resolutions which were passed at the meeting:

"Winnipeg, May 26th.—(Special)—An immense mass meeting was held here last night, lasting till long after midnight. Over two thousand people were present, including some 25 mayors and Reeves of outside municipalities, besides Honorable John Norquay, Premier, and Mr. Greenway, leader of the Opposition, and all the members of the Legislature. The wildest enthusiasm prevailed on the railroad question, and not a dissenting voice was heard. The following telegrams were received from outside municipalities:—

"From Louise.—The Louise council fully concur with you in expressing their strongest disapproval of any further interference with their rights, as expressed in your circular, and have telegraphed Mr. Greenway to act as a delegate.—M. Young, Reeve, Clerk of the Municipality of Louise.

"From Glenboro.—I am duly in receipt of your circular inviting me to attend a meeting in Trinity Hall on the 25th of instant. I am very sorry indeed that press of business will prevent me attending, but I may say that the feeling in this municipality is thoroughly in accord with the efforts in favor of the abolishment of disallowance, and the enclosed resolutions, passed at a large and representative meeting held at Northfield school in this municipality on the 21st instant, show conclusively the opinions of the farmers here on the question.—FRANK BURNETT, Reeve.

"From St. Laurent.—At a public meeting of the municipal council of St. Laurent, held in the municipal chamber the 23rd day of May, it was unanimously resolved and adopted: 'That in view of the fact that a disallowance resolution will come before the House at Ottawa, on Thursday next, and as it has been clearly shown that this Province has the right under the constitution to grant charters for the construction of railways within the limits of this old Province, and it having been stated by the Minister of Justice that our provincial charters were disallowed as a matter of trade policy simply, we, therefore, express strong disapproval of any further interference with the rights of this Province under the constitution to construct competitive railways within the limits of this old Province, and express a firm determination not to longer submit to such wrongful interference.—J. M. J. MOLVAHILL, President and Reeve.

"From West Lynne.—I am instructed by the council of the town of West Lynne to inform you that at a meeting held this 25th day of May, 1887, it was unanimously resolved that this council strongly disapproves any further interference with the right of the Province under our constitution to construct competitive railways within the limits of the old Province, and expressing a firm determination not to longer submit to such wrongful interference.—H. TREHANT, Mayor.

"Emerson Resolutions.—Resolutions passed by the Emerson town council, 25th May, 1887:—'Whereas the policy of disallowance pursued by the Government of Canada in relation to this Province has already worked serious injury to the development and progress of the Province; and whereas further continuance of such policy is neither just to the Province nor in accord with its legal rights as a member of Confederation, and is intolerable in view of its past effect; and whereas a monopoly in the carrying trade of the Province is detrimental both to the Province and to eastern Canada, as checking development and settlement, and it is absolutely necessary that competition in freight rates eastward should at once be secured which can only be obtained by the construction of an independent line of railway to the international boundary line; be it resolved, that this council representing the citizens of the town of Emerson do most earnestly protest against further continuance of such monopoly and strongly urge upon the Provincial Government to proceed forthwith to construct an independent railway line to the international railway boundary, there to form connection with the American system giving competition eastward to this Province.'—Carried.

"From Emerson.—I consider railway monopoly detrimental to the progress and prosperity of the Province. Will assist in any way we can to have the same done away with.—O. R. IRWIN, Mayor.

"From Douglass.—Should like competing railways by all means.—HECTOR FINK, Reeve of Douglass.

"From Portage la Prairie.—Monopoly is a curse to this Province. We cannot get competition too soon.—J. P. YOUNG, Ex-mayor.

"From Pipestone.—I am heartily in accord with the Provincial Government measures re disallowance, and trust our Province will withstand all monopoly pressure. A competing line will not only reduce rates but encourage and increase immigration. While giving due credit to C. P. R. enterprise I think we should look to the interest of our Province rather than to those of a syndicate of capitalists.—W. MACDONALD, Reeve of Pipestone.

"From Westbourne.—A large majority in the country are opposed to the disallowance policy of the present Government.—R. E. SMALLLEY, Reeve of Westbourne.

"From Morris.—I am heartily in accord with the decision of the Provincial Government to build a line to the boundary in order to relieve this suffering Province from the curse of monopoly. I think that Sir George Stephen's insulting telegram most opportune, and to have no other effect than to confirm the people's intention to build the railway. I am convinced that the people of the Province are united on the question, and believe if ever there was a time when we should stand to our guns as men and wrench our rights from the clutches of monopoly that time is now.—J. S. CAMPBELL, Reeve, of the Municipality of Morris.

"From Birtle.—Railway monopoly is unjust to old Manitoba. During the passage of the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill I was in Ottawa, and gathered from members and supporters of the Government that we would be exempt. North-Western Manitoba is strongly in favor of another outlet.—J. S. CRAWFORD, Mayor of Birtle.

"From Gladstone.—I believe it to be injurious to all business interests in this Province, preventing the investment of capital. That speculators are the cause of the present agitation is untrue.—JOHN L. LOUIS, Mayor of Gladstone.

"From Lansdowne.—Dead against monopoly. People are a unit on that question.—JOHN MCGREGOR, Reeve of Lansdowne.

"From Rosedale.—Put me down as sound on anti-monopoly. No difference of opinion on that point here.—J. CRAWFORD, Reeve of Rosedale.

"From Deloraine.—There can be but one opinion in reference to railway monopoly, and that is that it is a curse to the country and should not have been tolerated so long as it has.—JOHN RENTON, Reeve of Deloraine.

"From Morris.—I consider the monopoly ought to cease.—R. F. McTAVISH, Mayor.

"There was in fact not a single dissenting voice from any part of the Province, and in every municipality meetings will shortly be held."

There is an account here of last night's meeting in Winnipeg and the resolutions passed there:

"The mayor of Brandon moved the first resolution; the Reeves of Lorne and South Dufferin, the Reeves of Youville and St. Francois Xavier, the sixth and seventh. Messrs Leacock and Gillies, Conservative M. P. P.'s moved one resolution, and leading citizens of Winnipeg the remainder. Mr. Leacock declared that if Premier Norquay show the least sign of wavering, himself and the others would vote against him as the Legislature insists on this question. Messrs. Norquay and Greenway spoke with great determination. The following resolutions, among others, passed:

"Whereas, competition in railway carriage between Manitoba and the North-West Territories and other Provinces of the Dominion is essentially necessary to the natural development of the inter-provincial trade, the fostering of Canadian manufactures, both in the eastern Provinces and in Manitoba, the encouragement of foreign capital to seek investment in the development of the North-West, the encouragement of immigration and natural progress of the Province generally, all of which would be of great advantage both directly and indirectly to every portion of the Dominion; and

"Whereas, it is clear and has been repeatedly declared by Sir John Macdonald and other members of the Dominion Cabinet that the C. P. R. Company have no right under their contract with the people to the maintenance of monopoly in the old Province of Manitoba; and

"Whereas, it has been recently again declared by the present Minister of Justice to our Local Legislature, and to a deputation of citizens who recently visited Ottawa, that the question of the disallowance of Provincial charters was purely a question of trade policy and not a question of illegality or unconstitutionality, or breach of contract with the C. P. R. Company therein: Now, be it

"Resolved, in the unanimous opinion of the meeting representing as it does the whole Province of Manitoba, the interests of every portion of the Province demand free competition in railways for the cheapening of the necessaries of life to the settler, the lowering of freight rates for carriage of our wheat and other products to the seaboard, and above all the removal of the bar of monopoly which frightens foreign capital and immigration from our lands where the interests of the eastern Province demand it for the facilitating and fostering of their trade with the North-West and for a development of a larger market here for their manufacture. That the meeting recognise the telegram from Sir George Stephen to the Premier of the Province, recently published in the press, as the frank and natural product, and illustrative of the species of monopoly whereby free people are sought to be kept in a condition of serfdom to a tyrannical and grasping master. It brings forcibly home to people of the Province that while the monopoly is maintained the fortunes and future of themselves and of their children are at the mercy of unscrupulous men who are ready to do their best to ruin all who do not tamely submit to their tyranny. This meeting demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a faithful observance of the solemn contract with the city of Winnipeg, whereby in consideration of \$100,000 paid by the city to the company, land for station grounds and exemption from taxation, the company bound itself to establish and forever continue at Winnipeg its principal workshops for the main line and branches in Manitoba.

"This meeting denies emphatically the charge that the establishment of railway competition in the older Provinces would be a breach of faith towards the holders of private capital investing in Canadian Pacific Railway securities. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company never bargained for, and neither the Parliament of Canada nor the Legislature of Manitoba, ever agreed to give them a monopoly in the old Province of Manitoba. Not only is this evident on the face of its charter, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself has expressly declared on several occasions, on the floor of Parliament, by Sir John Macdonald, before the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was ratified; by Sir Charles Tupper when Parliament was asked to assist the company with a loan of \$30,000,000, and by Hon. Thomas White, and the Hon. Minister of Justice in response to a deputation. It is well known to the president and directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, and the meeting indignantly condemns the conduct of the officers of that company in persistently endeavoring to mislead and prejudice the people of the Dominion by contrary pretensions. That

"Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and those in league with them, assert that the people have elected supporters of the Government, having well known the policy of disallowance, and thereby proved that they were in favor of a continuance of that policy, now this meeting declares that the election by the Province of supporters of the Dominion Government in the recent election was secured by means of telegrams and communications from the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald to Government candidates and leading people, to lead them to believe that by electing them they might expect a cessation of the policy of disallowance. And the assertion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company above referred to is a base perversion of the truth as to the well-known and strongly expressed feelings of the people of this Province on this question.

"Resolved, that this meeting most warmly approves of the course of our Provincial Government and Legislature in the recent railway legislation with a view to giving this Province the much-needed competitive railway connection with eastern Canada, and this meeting solemnly pledges itself to stand by the Provincial Government and Legislature in their efforts to secure the immediate construction of the proposed railway to the boundary, and to urge upon them the great necessity for the immediate and speedy construction of the same, that without fail it may be completed during the present season; and this meeting looks with confidence to every member of the Provincial Legislature to stand firmly and loyally by the right of our Province, and at all hazards and in spite of any and all attempts at obstruction or interference from any source whatsoever, to forthwith carry to completion this important work to which they look to secure the rapid development of a great and fertile Province."

"In the speeches which followed the passing of the foregoing resolution many illustrations of glaring injustices in freight rates were produced, and Mr. Van Horne was charged with quoting grain rates for American roads for purposes of comparison which had no existence, and which he had manufactured."

Now, this is a somewhat lengthy document to read, but I do not know that it would be possible to lay before the House stronger evidence of the fact that this is a burning question in Manitoba to-day. I gave some comparisons of freights already, but there is one particular comparison that I forgot to mention, and it is in connection with the freights between Duluth and Port Arthur, giving the comparative rates on the Manitoba, Minneapolis and St. Paul Road, also a monopoly, and on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WATSON.

COMPARATIVE WHEAT RATES IN CENTS PER 100 LBS.

No competition.

Winnipeg to Fort William, Canadian Pacific Railway, 423 miles.....	28 cents.
Donaldson to Duluth, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba and St. Paul and Duluth Railways, 427 miles.....	22½ do
High Bluff to Fort William, Canadian Pacific Railway, 472 miles.....	29 do
Neché to Duluth, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, and St. Paul and Duluth, 470 miles.....	23 do

With competition.

St. Paul to Chicago, 431 miles, Burlington Railway.....	7½ do
St. Paul to Chicago, 410 miles, Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul.....	10 do

Compare Canadian Pacific Railway with Canadian Pacific Railway.

Calgary to Fort William, 1,259 miles.....	33 cents.
Winnipeg to Toronto, 1,287 miles.....	50 do

One great reason why we should have this competition, and why we should have connection with the Grand Trunk is the fact that the Grand Trunk runs through almost every constituency in Ontario and down to the Lower Provinces. We occupy the peculiar position in Manitoba of having four lines of railway tapping at our door for admission. The greatest immigrant agents that a country can have, as a rule, are the railway companies. The Grand Trunk to-day is an immigration agent for the western States, because they have no interest in our territory to the west, and you will find in their offices immigration pamphlets for north Dakota, Cheyenne, and Minnesota. The Grand Trunk Company state they have no interest in carrying passengers to the North-West, and consequently do not advertise the North-West. If we had railway competition, our country would fill up more rapidly. I would not like to prophecy, as the Minister of Finance did in 1884, that we should have a large immigration there in a very short time, but I believe that the population would double in two years. We have a better country than that to the south of us, and the reason we cannot get the immigration we should, is that we have not the inducements of free trade in railways to offer to the people which our neighbors have. The price we receive for our grain is not sufficient to induce farmers to raise larger quantities of it, as they would did not the Canadian Pacific Railway charge exorbitant rates for freight. The opinions which exist in Manitoba on this question are also held in the North-West Territories. It will be hardly necessary for me to remind the House of the fact that the representatives of the North-West Council who visited Ottawa two years ago, pressed on the attention of the Government as one of the greatest grievances they had to complain of, the freight charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find that the hon. member for East Assiniboia pledged himself on this question to his electors. He said he was strongly in favor of disallowance.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I beg to correct the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. I meant the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the Pericles of the west. I also find that the Conservative paper printed in the west claims that Mr. Davis made similar pledges to the electors in his section of the North-West. I hope the House will consider this resolution favorably. I have endeavored to place the matter before it as fairly and as temperately as possible, and I think I have produced sufficient evidence to show that this is a question the people will not permit trifling with. The people of Manitoba are determined to have competition in railways, and if they cannot obtain the right to

grant charters to build roads, they are going to burden themselves with a debt they are not able to bear. It is a question with them as to whether they should not rather carry a load of a million dollars and have competition, than do without it. Sir George Stephen has said that it is an agitation of Winnipeg speculators. This is the term he sees fit to apply to some of the best citizens of Manitoba. Men like Mr. Whitlaw, and Mr. Ashdown, and others of the same class, men who are known to be the best in the Province of Manitoba, who went there before there was a railway in the country and have now great influence—these are the men who are at the head and front of the agitation to-day. And they are not Liberals, they are not rebels and Grits, as some gentlemen please to call them, but they are the best Conservatives in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are more likely to be rebels than.

Mr. WATSON. They are treated as such by some of the red-hot Conservatives in the Province, but a large majority of the people say they are right, and they believe they are right, and they intend to back up the Local Legislature in building a railway to the boundary line. I believe there has been one resolution passed in the town of Selkirk in favor of monopoly, and it is the only one. I have seen a report in the press of that meeting, which states that it was held in Selkirk and that there were twelve electors present, and that they resolved that their representative should stand by the Government on this question of disallowance. The Conservative association that reported on this particular matter, that there were twelve electors present at that meeting, were also honest enough to state that the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) forwarded this particular resolution to be passed by that meeting from the city of Ottawa. Of course, I know nothing about that, but the anti-disallowance Conservative association of Winnipeg reports it as a fact. I have now the pleasure of moving the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Who seconds this resolution?

Mr. WATSON. Will the hon. member for Selkirk second it?

Mr. DALY. No, Sir.

Mr. WATSON. Then Mr. Armstrong will second it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I had the honor of holding the position of Minister of Railways at the time when the views were enunciated which the hon. member for Marquette has embodied in this resolution, the House will naturally expect me to make a few remarks in reference to this matter. I may, in the first place, be permitted to compliment the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) upon the ability with which he has presented his case to the House. I may say further that I believe there is not a member on either side of the House who does not sympathise very largely with many of the sentiments to which the hon. gentleman has given utterance. I am certain there is no hon. member in this House who would not feel extremely glad to be able to support the resolution which the hon. gentleman has moved, if he felt that it would not involve consequences of an injurious character to Canada. The hon. member has done me the great honor of embodying in his resolution a portion of a speech which I delivered to this House in 1884, when moving for a loan for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in order that they might be enabled to expedite the great work in which they were engaged. I will say in the outset that when I made that speech to the House, I did it in all candor. When I expressed the views that are there enunciated, I confidently

believed that at a very early date when the Canadian Pacific Railway would be completed north of Lake Superior, the Government would find itself in a position not to demand any longer a continuance of the policy of disallowance. But the hon. gentleman will see, if he reads with care and attention the statements I made, if he looks at the spirit as well as the letter of those remarks, he will see how carefully guarded they were. He will find in the first place, that I stated the fact that the policy of disallowance was not the policy of this Administration alone. I stated in the outset that that policy was originated by the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power, that when those hon. gentlemen were in a position which required them to protect the interests, not of one section of this country alone, but of all sections, that they should have regard first and primarily to the interests of Canada, over and above those of any section of our country, they felt obliged, no doubt reluctantly, to refuse to permit lines of railway to be constructed that would compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any portion of it which they were engaged in constructing. An Act had been passed which required a proclamation to be issued, an Act passed at the instance, if I remember rightly, of Mr., now, Sir George Stephen and his associates who were negotiating to build a line of communication to the city of Winnipeg; and the Government upon being applied to, to issue that proclamation, promptly refused, and they refused on the ground that it would not be just to the people of Canada, who were spending large sums of public money for the purpose of opening up and developing the great North-West and constructing a Canadian Pacific Railway, that means should be taken to tap our own line of communication and to carry the traffic away to the south of us into a foreign country. That policy was not only propounded, was not only established by the Government when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, but they reiterated it again in the most formal manner. I have in my hand a very important Bill that was laid on the Table of this House, respecting the policy of that Administration, by the then Minister of the Interior, the present member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). That time, in 1878, almost at the close of the period during which those hon. gentlemen governed the country, it will be found in that Bill that so determined were they to protect the Canadian lines of communication against competition, to protect the line which was being built by the public money of this country against being interfered with and its traffic being carried away, that the hon. gentleman used in his Bill, which was to embody the policy of that Government, the following words:—

"No company shall be incorporated under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway or any branch thereof, at a nearer distance than 40 miles."

So, Sir, this policy was not originated by my right hon. friend, or his Government; this policy of disallowance, of refusing to permit competition with a line of railway communication constructed by the public money of this country, was originally propounded by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite; and, Sir, in the spirit that my right hon. friend has always administered the affairs of this country, we have shown our readiness to copy the example of hon. gentlemen opposite whenever and wherever we found that it was conducive to the interests of the country. We believed on that occasion that they had propounded a sound policy and we adopted that policy. When, after great efforts had been made, and failed, to obtain the prompt construction of a line of Canadian Pacific Railway to which all parties in this country had committed themselves in the most unqualified and unhesitating manner, and when we were able to make a contract with a number of gentlemen, then called the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate,

for the purpose of constructing, within the period of ten years, a line that would accomplish not only that which was aimed at by hon. gentlemen opposite, in the near future, but that provided for the prompt construction of a line of railway from Montreal connecting the tide-waters of the Atlantic with the Pacific Ocean by a line of railway; when we undertook to make that contract we felt bound to give that company all the security that the Government of Canada felt bound to exercise itself in order to protect their traffic from being tapped or drawn away by remote or hostile lines, by what the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House properly termed as competitive lines. It is not necessary that I should go over, at length, this matter which is familiar to the House; but I may say that it was with no little pleasure that I learned from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the policy they had felt obliged to ask us, in the interest of that great work, to pursue, of disallowing railway charters passed for the purpose of tapping the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Winnipeg, and carrying it away to the south and to another country—the belief they then held that the rapid development of the North-West, the rapid establishment of business on their own line of communication, would be such as to enable them at an early day, or when their line was completed, to relieve the Government from the obligation that they felt they might fairly claim on their part, viz., that we would disallow those railway charters. I never made a more candid statement to the House, I never made a statement with greater pleasure than when, with the authority of the company and the consent of my colleagues, I found myself in a position consistent with the policy we had pursued, and the policy we had adopted of preventing competition, while at the same time we encouraged Canadian interests, to be able to state that the time was near at hand when we would be enabled to be relieved of that obligation and not feel it necessary in the interest of Canada longer to continue that policy. But if the hon. gentleman will read the statement over with care he will find running through it, from the beginning to the end, that my statement is replete with the spirit of still maintaining whatever protection was necessary for the assistance of our great transcontinental highway, and our own line of communication. All a government can do and all a government can be expected to do when enunciating questions of public policy, is not to be bound by a hard and fast line or by a cast-iron rule, but the Government are bound to state what, at the time the statement is made, they believe the interest of the country involves; they are bound at the same time to keep their minds open and place themselves in a position to change or vary that policy from day to day, or from time to time, as the interest of the whole country demands. If there ever was a government that could lay claim to the confidence of the people of the city of Winnipeg and Province of Manitoba it is the present Administration. If there is one man in this Government more than another who can claim the confidence of the people of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg, that person is myself. I need not remind the House that when I had the honor of being charged with the administration of the Railway Department, one of the first acts I submitted for the consideration of my colleagues was an act on which the existence of the city of Winnipeg as it stands to-day depends. On entering on the administration of the Railway Department I found that my predecessor, with the best intention, no doubt, with the most patriotic intention of doing that which he judged would be best in the interest of the whole country, had located the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway twenty miles to the north of Winnipeg. I ask hon. gentlemen where Winnipeg would be to-day if that policy had been carried out—and that was the policy of this country, adopted after the fullest consideration, adopted

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

upon the advice and concurrence of the chief engineer, Mr. Sanford Fleming, and maintained with the most unflinching determination by the hon. gentleman who filled the position I subsequently filled as Minister of Public Works and Railways. The hon. gentleman opposite need only turn—it is not worth while going back over this whole history—but let him read the debate in the Senate (I will not take time to do so now) and he will find that the leader of the Senate treated with the most supreme contempt the idea that the village of Winnipeg was to deflect the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway away from the course that, in the judgment of the Government, had been decided to be the right and best one. Is there any person in Winnipeg or in the Province of Manitoba who does not feel that the greatest benefit which could be conferred on the Province of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg was conferred when the Government to which I belong deflected that line from the position assigned of twenty miles to the north of Winnipeg, and brought it down to Winnipeg and made that town the great *entrepôt* for the traffic and business and communication of the whole of that vast country. I may say, in passing, that that act was my own act, that the policy was one arrived at by myself in opposition to the views and sentiments of the gentleman on whose opinion in such matters I was obliged, to a great extent, to rely, and that was the chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for every one knows how rigidly he held to the adoption of the line he had first propounded, and how reluctant he was to have that line diverted. But my colleagues and myself took the view that the interests of the country, as well as the interests of the rising city of Winnipeg, demanded that that change should be made, and we made it. I mention this to show that from the first all that a government could do for a Province or a city has been done by this Government in the interest of the Province of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg. Many a battle have we fought on the floor of this House; it has been almost a continuous battle from the hour we undertook the development of and settlement of that great North-West country, for the interest of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, and the construction of that transcontinental line of railway. If the Government felt bound when there was no prospect of a line being constructed north of Lake Superior, and that was the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, for they were not to undertake the construction of a line north of Lake Superior at all, but they relegated it to the remote future (and it would be in the remote future to-day but for the fact of this Government coming into power and changing the policy to which the country had been committed), if, when there was no intention of putting in those 1,000 miles of railway between Winnipeg and Ottawa, when the district north of Lake Superior was intended to be left as an unpeopled desert, when no line of communication existed between the old Provinces of the Dominion and the city of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories—if I say at that time these gentlemen felt that they owed it to Canada, they owed it not to this section or to that section, but owed it to their country, to take the line of policy that they must maintain and protect the traffic of their own lines which were being constructed there from being tapped and diverted and carried away to the south, how much more incumbent was it upon us to provide such protection for a company who, in the face of unheard of difficulties, grappled with that gigantic project and have carried it with success to a conclusion of which every man, I care not on which side he sits—he may admit it or not admit it—but I say there is not a man in this Parliament to-day who does not feel a sense of pride in his heart when he recognises that that company have been able to carry out that gigantic work of building this great transcontinental line in the manner in which they have

carried it out. As I said before, in all frankness I stated to the House that we anticipated at an early day that we would be in a position not to hold to that hard and fast line of protecting the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway from being tapped and carried away to a foreign country to the south. The hon. gentleman will find that while that frank and candid statement of opinion was made, it was only a statement of opinion—only what under existing circumstances, and viewing everything in the light of the facts as they then existed, we hoped we would be able to do, and nothing more. The hon. gentleman will recollect that he has himself relieved me from the principal part of the argument that I would otherwise have felt it necessary to address to the House by the long and succinct story of the disappointment of the present Administration in regard to the position of the North-West and the Province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman has himself shown that the roseate colours with which the future of that country was surrounded in our estimation were to a considerable extent fallacious. But he has not adverted to one of the most striking historical facts bearing upon this question, and one that he knows had an immense influence in regard to it. He knows that when that statement was made by me, when I held those views on the floor of this House, as to what I hoped we would be able at no distant day to do, no man in this House or out of it anticipated that, at an early period, a serious insurrection would take place in the North-West. No person at that time believed, no person at that time had any reason to suspect, that the tide of immigration to that great North-West would be suddenly and strongly checked by the fact that the country was under arms, that there was an Indian war, that, in fact, persons could not go into the country, except at the risk of their lives. I say that there is a single circumstance which largely accounts for the changed condition of things. I will not avert to other circumstances at any length, because I do not wish to say a word which would be damaging to the future of that great country, in the future of which and in the development of which I have the same unqualified confidence that I have always had. But every person is aware that we have had bad seasons there. Bad seasons will occur in all countries; they have occurred in the western States where they have suffered perhaps to a greater extent than we have suffered; and every person knows that the progress, the development, and settlement of the North-West have not proceeded at that rapid ratio that we had the right to expect, judging from the data as they existed at the time these statements were made. The hon. gentleman has drawn a picture which I will not repeat, because I do not wish to give it greater publicity than necessary; but he has drawn a most gloomy picture of the condition of the North-West, and if there be any truth in his statements, with regard to not only the want of progress but the retrogression of that country, I think he might find abundant justification for the Government not staying its hand from the adoption of a policy which our predecessors felt was necessary in the first instance, and that we, coming after them, felt that we were bound, in the interests of the country, to adopt. Under these circumstances we are in a different position; and, more than that, I say that no person anticipated, at the time these statements were made, that at this moment Canada would find itself in a position that gives greater importance than anything else in the world could give to its own line of intercommunication. No person could have supposed that we would find ourselves in such a position that at any moment it may be of the most vital consequence to the people, not of the city of Winnipeg, great and prosperous as it is, or to the prosperous Province of Manitoba—no person could have supposed that, in the interest not only of that section, but of all Canada, we might find ourselves in the position in which the very life, the very essence of the progress and prosperity of our country,

would depend on the perfection and completion of our own independent line of intercommunication for travel and traffic. Now, I say that under these circumstances we have not the slightest hesitation in saying that, gratifying as it would be to the city of Winnipeg, gratifying as it would be to the Province of Manitoba, if we could meet their wishes, I believe they have been greatly misled; I believe at this moment, instead of having their interests bound up and identified with obtaining this communication, and in fact making the city of Winnipeg a source of revenue to the Northern Pacific. I believe the interests of Winnipeg to-day, the interests of Manitoba to-day and the interests of the great North-West of Canada to-day, are running on all fours with the interests of the other Provinces. I say it is in the interest of the whole of Canada that we should build up our own lines of intercommunication, that we should keep the traffic of those lines and develop them, and by that development enable the parties who control them to steadily reduce the cost of travel and traffic over those lines of communication, instead of throwing our resources into the pool of a rival enterprise, the Northern Pacific Railway, and that is the position in which the question stands to-day. To-day the hon. gentleman finds it convenient to talk to us about the Grand Trunk. Well, it is not saying much for the Grand Trunk when the hon. gentleman said that, while the Canadian Pacific Railway has its emissaries all over the continent of Europe, in England and everywhere else, attracting travel and traffic to the heart of Canada, he at the same time brought up an armful of pamphlets from Minnesota and Dakota, and the western States, and said that all the energies of the Grand Trunk are concentrated, not in bringing people to Canada to build up Canada, but in bringing traffic and travel and immigrants into the great north-western States of the Republic to the south of us. I do not think that that established any particular claim; and it is a delusion to suppose that this is a question between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a question between the Northern Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the men to the south of us, the men who think that, regardless of everything else, setting patriotism aside, setting the development of their own country aside, it is to the best interests of Canada to build up a great rival line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, must expect to have their views put before an intelligent people, not in a small Province, not before a comparatively small population of this Dominion, but broadcast over the whole of this country. It must be understood, and it may as well be understood at once, that this is not a question between two great Canadian companies, but it is a question between a great transcontinental highway, binding all these Provinces together and giving us easy and rapid communication with each other, and a rival line of railway that has spared no effort and is prepared to spend any amount of money in order to undermine that serious competitor for the traffic of the east that the Canadian Pacific Railway has already shown itself to be. Under these circumstances, I feel that this House will not hesitate. Gratified as every man here, on either side of the House, would be to meet the views, even the erroneous views, and to satisfy the prejudices of the rising city of Winnipeg and the important Province of Manitoba; anxious as this Government has shown itself to be by every act by which a Government could evidence its anxiety to develop and promote the interests of the Province of Manitoba and the great North-West, notwithstanding all that, the time has come when we must choose between what I believe to be the prejudices of a section of the community and the interests of the whole of Canada. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has spent a good deal of time in elaborating the question of the immediate interests of the population in that section of the country. But, Sir, that is not the only thing to be considered. Have not the older Provinces of this Dominion

done something to promote the interests of Manitoba and the North-West? Why, Sir, let the hon. gentleman turn to the Public Accounts, and he will find that within a comparatively few years, there has been spent by the late Government and by this Government over \$71,000,000 of hard cash of the people of the older Provinces, in order to build up and to give this great line of intercommunication to the people of Winnipeg and the Canadian North-West. Does that establish no claims? What have we been obliged to say in asking this House day after day for such aid as our predecessors asked when they were expending the public money for the same purpose? When they committed themselves to the policy of building a Canadian Pacific Railway by public funds, what did they say? Did they say that they intended that all this expenditure should be exclusively at the dictum and in the interests of one Province, or that one small portion of the population should be alone considered? No, Sir; they asked every Province, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, freely to contribute whatever money was necessary to build this great transcontinental highway, as the means not of promoting the interests of a section, but as the means of building up a great British nationality in this Canada of ours. I say the response to those appeals has been most generous. The people have shown their appreciation of this policy, and the Public Accounts testify how generously they responded, in revealing the fact that no less than \$71,300,000 has been expended by older Canada for the construction of this great national highway. I say, Sir, that under these circumstances there is not a man in this House but must feel that it would be a gross breach of faith, after that enormous expenditure, after we have risked even the credit of this country in order to accomplish this Herculean task, I say there is not a man on either side of this House but must feel that these older Provinces would have a right to say we have been deceived and misled, if you permit a policy to be adopted that is going to take the traffic away from the line to the north of Lake Superior, and divert it into foreign channels, even at the bidding or in the interests of a certain section of the population of Canada. That trade we have all looked to, not only as the means of benefiting the older Provinces, but of establishing close intimate commercial relations between the people of Winnipeg, of Manitoba and the great North-West and the people of those older Provinces. If we are to be knit together, if we are to become a nation, if we are to have patriotic aspirations, these things will be found in the policy of standing by each other, not in a single Province asking that everything shall be conceded to it, regardless of the interests and feelings of the other Provinces who have borne the burden of this great undertaking. They may take the bit in their teeth and say, after all you have done for us we will turn our backs upon you; we will use our traffic to suit ourselves; we will consult our own interests, even if our doing so should have the effect of building up a rival country and a rival line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has cost the people of this country such a vast amount of money. Now, Sir, as I said before, I do not intend to labor this question. It only requires to be stated fairly and frankly to commend the position I take to the judgment of every man in this House. I want to ask the representatives of the Province of New Brunswick, without reference to the party to which they belong or the side of the House on which they sit, what they think of this proposition. But yesterday the Government of Canada came down here and asked this House to vote something like \$4,000,000—for what purpose? For the purpose of securing connection with Canadian ports and an eastern terminus of this great Canadian Pacific Railway. Will these gentlemen—I care not on which side of the House they sit, coming from New Brunswick—will these gentlemen, coming from the city of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

St. John, opposed to the present Administration as they may be, after we have obtained a grant of \$4,000,000 to bring St. John 280 miles nearer Montreal, the commercial centre of this country, than it is by the Intercolonial Railway—will these gentlemen turn around and say: notwithstanding all this, we are willing to divert this traffic—which you have shown your determination shall be Canadian traffic, intended to build up Canadian lines of communications and Canadian ports—we will turn our backs upon you and assist in diverting that traffic to the south, so that it will go to Chicago and St. Paul and on to the sea, by another route. I do not believe it. As the hon. member for Marquette has said, one or two of our friends in this House impelled by the strong overpowering interests that surrounded them, felt it necessary to pledge themselves to give a vote against the present Administration on the question of disallowance. But, Sir, I appeal from those gentlemen, who in their extremity were obliged to dis sever and dissociate themselves from their friends on this question—I appeal to the independent sentiment of members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, and I ask them to discharge their duty, not to their party, but to their country, in supporting a policy which in this regard is essentially a national policy—in supporting a policy that is going to maintain faith with the older Provinces—that is going to realise to the older Provinces that the most intimate and easy and rapid means of communication shall be kept up between St. John and Halifax, between the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and Ontario on the one hand, and Manitoba and the Great North-West on the other. I say there is not a man in this House, I care not on which side he sits or what his political proclivities are, who will not say that as we stand to day in the presence of a threatened danger, the danger of having our own lines of communication on which we have expended so large an amount of public money, embarrassed and paralysed—there is not a man to whom I cannot confidently appeal on such an occasion as this, to stand by the whole country. It is a painful position for me and my colleagues to occupy, after all we have done for the Province of Manitoba, and the city of Winnipeg, and the Great North-West—after the support they have unanimously given us at the recent elections, it is an embarrassing position to stand for a single moment in conflict with the hopes and sentiments, or even the prejudices, of any considerable portion of our friends; but we owe something more to Canada than to any personal consideration for ourselves, and that debt can only be discharged by independently, at any cost—aye, at the cost even of alienating the political support of these gentlemen which we have had the good fortune to obtain, and which we value so highly—even at that cost, we owe it to ourselves and to our country, straightforwardly and unflinchingly to pursue the course that, not our expectations of a couple of years ago, but the present exigencies of the country demand at our hands. Now, the hon. gentleman dwelt very much upon the question of freight rates, and I call the attention of the House to the rather extraordinary fact that, instead of dealing with this question in the fair and candid spirit which the House had a right to demand at his hands, he should have assumed that no person in this House knew anything about the question of railway freight rates. Why, there is not a man in this country, who understands anything in regard to railway freights, who does not know that you cannot institute any comparison between the different portions of the same line of railway without you take the outside considerations into view as well. The hon. gentleman found it convenient to draw a comparison between a newly settled district of the North-West Territory, where there is neither population nor traffic sufficient to sustain a railway, with an old settled portion of the country where there is abund-

ant population and traffic. The hon. gentleman must suppose that we know very little of railway questions or railway intercommunication or railway freights, to address such an argument to us. I am not prepared to say that the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway are perfect and cannot be improved, but I say the Canadian Pacific Railway stands in a different position as regards this question of rates to that of any other railway in this country, because they are bound by their contract to submit their rates to the Administration of the day for revision, from time to time, as the Administration, in their judgment, consider necessary in the interests of the country. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman can show that injustice is being done by the freight rates or passenger rates especially established by the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have the power, under the contract, to revise them and force the company to do justice, if they are not disposed to do it without our intervention. But I will say the hon. gentleman does not, in my judgment, commend himself to the candid consideration of this House, when he undertakes to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be mad enough, would be so insensible to their own interests, as to adopt a policy whose effect would be to crush the life-blood out of the North-West. What future are they to have? What are they to look forward to? What are they to do for their shareholders and bondholders? What will be their position if they prevent and destroy settlement in the North West. The hon. gentleman knows that a very high authority—regarded as a very high and convincing authority years ago—said that it would be impossible to maintain the Canadian Pacific Railway until there were two millions of people settled in the North-West. If that be the case, if there be a scintilla of foundation for such an estimate as that, what are we to think of the estimate that the hon. gentleman has given of the present population of the North-West? And yet he does not hesitate, in order to excite a feeling of hostility in this House against the Canadian Pacific Railway, to contrast the rates in this unpeopled section of the country with the rates prevailing in the older settled portion of the country, where there is abundance of traffic and travel to sustain a railway. It is well known that railways are able just to reduce their freights in proportion to the amount of traffic they have to handle, and that if they are obliged to run trains through a sparsely settled country, it is impossible to give those low rates that in older portions of the country are known to exist. The hon. gentleman had an illustration at hand. He knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway lies a long distance to the north of the Northern Pacific; he knows there are two lines running across the continent, one having the advantage of being considerably to the south of the other, if that may be considered an advantage, and running through the fertile territories of Minnesota and Dakota. He had that illustration at his hand; he had the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway running through a comparatively settled country that has grown up with marvellous rapidity between the boundary line of Manitoba and St. Paul and Minneapolis. These railways would have afforded the hon. gentleman subject for comparison, and the House would have been enabled to form some conclusion as to whether the Canadian Pacific Railway were fools enough, because they would require to be first class idiots, at the very least, if they were to adopt such a policy as the hon. gentleman leads the House to suppose they have adopted. Their own existence depends on the settlement of the country, and the hundreds of thousands of dollars they have expended, to my knowledge, in circulating information in England, Ireland and Scotland, and all over Europe, as to the advantages of settlement and the cultivation of wheat in the North-West of Canada, is the best evidence that they are fully alive to the fact that if their great enterprise is to be crowned with that success which every

man in this House most earnestly desires should crown it, and which is in the interest of the country from end to end, irrespective of politics, should crown it, they would be not only insensible to their own interests, but simply idiots to adopt such a policy as the hon. gentleman has indicated. They have not adopted such a policy. When they brought forward their proposal, and, as obliged by law, came to us with their traffic rates for revision, we cut the rates down. We said to the company: You are wrong, these rates can be reduced, you are standing in your own light by fixing these rates so high, and we cut them down. But what has happened? There has not been a single instance in which the company have charged up to the rates the Government had allowed. The moment they got into contact with the public, the moment they came to do business with the freighters, they were convinced they would be studying best their own interests, not by charging up to the rates the Government permitted, but by largely reducing those rates. I will glance for a moment at a comparison that everybody will feel more just than that which the hon. gentleman has made. His was not a fair comparison, because the Northern Pacific Railway and the Minneapolis Railway both have greatly the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have larger sources of traffic, and larger sources of travel, than the Canadian Pacific Railway has enjoyed. Notwithstanding that, it will be found that all these comparisons are greatly in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are infinitely more favorable to the farmer, to the agriculturist, to all classes of people who are settling that country, than those of either of those great routes of railway communication with which I am comparing them. I hold in my hand a comparison of rates for equal distances on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Northern Pacific Railway, and this is not an old and antiquated table but a table which is in existence to-day, which was adopted on the 5th April, 1887, by both these companies. I may mention that the population of Minnesota, Dakota and Montana is not what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) described the population all told of Manitoba, the North-West and Winnipeg to be, but a population of about 700,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be more than that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The population I am referring to is that covering that line of railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are not dealing with the whole population of those States?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I am taking the distance from Montreal to Winnipeg, 1,423 miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I take the distance from St. Paul to Heron, Washington Territory, 1,429 miles, and of course, that runs through other sections besides Minnesota, Dakota and Montana. These distances are about the same, there being a very slight difference between them, and they are similarly situated. I find the rates for first-class merchandise per 100 lbs. is \$2 on the Canadian Pacific Railway and \$3.77 from St. Paul to Heron. For second-class merchandise the rate is \$1.70 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, while from St. Paul to Heron it is \$3.27. On third class merchandise it is \$1.45 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for the same distance from St. Paul to Heron it is \$2.77. On fourth class merchandise it is \$1.20 on the Canadian Pacific Railway and \$2.33 on the Northern Pacific Railway from St. Paul to Heron. Then I will take a comparison of the grain rates to which the hon. gentleman attached so much importance; and I may say here that the hon. gentleman did not inform us, when he was speaking of the great advantages that the people of Dakota and of Minnesota had over those who were settled in the North-West Territories,

he did not find it in his way to inform us that, notwithstanding the fact that they have any amount of competition that private capital is willing to establish—because, as you are aware, under the laws of Dakota and Minnesota, anybody can build a railway that can find the means—all they have to do is to register their company, find the means and build the line wherever they like, and therefore competition is unlimited,—and mind this, that it is competition which the hon. gentleman says is to be the cure for all this difficulty, and there is no limit to the competition that may take place in Minnesota and Dakota—notwithstanding this, what do we find? We find this extraordinary fact that the wheat which the hon. gentleman says cannot be grown in the North-West of Canada or in the Province of Manitoba, so that the farmer thinks it is more profitable to put on his coat and go to a public meeting to agitate than to take his coat off and plough more land for wheat—

Mr. WATSON. I did not say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says he did not say that. I do not desire to put words in his mouth which he did not say, but I think he showed us that the farmers were engaged in a very wild and fierce agitation, and also that in his judgment it was not worth the farmer's while in the Province of Manitoba to take off his coat and plough any more ground because he would be no better off by raising any more wheat. If that be the case, will the hon. gentleman explain how it is, if Manitoba is in such a deplorable condition under the iron heel of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that these farmers in Dakota and Minnesota hauled their wheat long distances in order to get into the Province of Manitoba, because they could there obtain a higher price than they could by sending it to the south or over their own lines of railway? I will give the hon. gentleman a comparison of the grain rates, and I will contrast the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific Railway, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway:

COMPARISON OF GRAIN RATES.

Miles.	Canadian Pacific Railway.		Northern Pacific Railway.	St. P., M. & M. Railway.
	Per 100 lbs. Wheat.	Grain of all kinds.	Grain of all kinds. Per 100 lbs.	Grain of all kinds. Per 100 lbs.
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
429	28	20	28	26
444	28	20	29	27
458	28	20	30	27
470	29	21	30	28
478	29	21	33	28
495	29	21	33	28
493	30	22	33	29
514	30	22	33	30
570	30	22	33	44
580	31	23	33	45
590	31	23	33	45
600	31	23	33	46
610	31	23	53	46
620	31	23	54	47
630	31	23	55	47
640	31	23	56	48
650	31	23	56	48
660	32	24	57	49
670	32	24	58	49
680	32	24	58	50
690	32	24	59	50
700	32	24	60	51
1269	33	25

If you run this table down, you will find that it is constantly in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in some cases more than double on these other roads what the rate is on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and yet the hon. gen Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tleman would lead the House to believe that all you want in order to remedy the ills under which the farmers of the North-West and the Province of Manitoba labor, is to introduce the competitive system, which is enjoyed to the fullest extent in Minnesota and Dakota. The Northern Pacific Railway figures are based on their special grain tariff, which applies only for 600 miles, and on their local distance tariff, which applies for a greater distance. The St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba tariff is based on their special grain tariff, which applies only for 514 miles, and on their local distance tariff, which applies for greater distances. I will now turn to the merchandise classes, and in regard to these the following is the rate per 100 lbs.:-

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Miles.	Merchandise Classes.			
	1.	2.	3.	4.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
25	25	22	20	18
50	50	45	40	35
75	65	56	50	40
100	75	65	55	45
200	1 10	95	75	65
300	1 45	1 30	1 00	90
400	1 75	1 60	1 30	1 15
500	2 10	1 90	1 60	1 40
600	2 27	2 02	1 69	1 48
700	2 43	2 15	1 78	1 53
800	2 61	2 28	1 85	1 59
900	2 80	2 38	1 91	1 62
1,000	2 98	2 48	1 99	1 68
1,100	3 00	2 50	2 00	1 75
1,200	3 33	2 83	2 23	2 00
1,300	3 67	3 17	2 67	2 25

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

25	24	20	16	12
50	35	29	24	18
75	45	38	30	23
100	54	45	36	27
200	80	67	54	40
300	1 02	85	68	51
400	1 23	1 03	82	62
500	1 43	1 19	96	72
600	1 62	1 35	1 08	81
700	1 80	1 50	1 20	90
800	1 97	1 64	1 31	99
900	2 15	1 78	1 43	1 06
1,000	2 28	1 90	1 52	1 14
1,100	2 42	2 01	1 61	1 21
1,200	2 57	2 14	1 71	1 28
1,300	2 70	2 25	1 80	1 35

ST. P. M. & M. RAILWAY.

25	23	20	16	14
50	38	32	27	23
75	53	45	37	32
100	66	56	46	40
200	96	82	67	58
300	1 16	99	81	70
400	1 36	1 16	95	82
500	1 56	1 33	1 09	94
600	1 76	1 50	1 23	1 06
700	1 95	1 67	1 37	1 18

(700 miles is the St. P. M. & M. maximum distance.)

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Miles.	Agricultural Implants.	Lumber.	Coal.	Coal mined on line of Railway.	Stone and bricks.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
25.....	14	10	9	6
50.....	25	15	13	10
75.....	29	18	14	11
100.....	32	20	15	12
200.....	50	25	25	18
300.....	70	45	35	25
400.....	85	50	40	30
500.....	1 00	60	55	45
600.....	1 10	71	62	50
700.....	1 19	80	70	57
800.....	1 28	90	78	64
900.....	1 38	1 00	81	72
1,000.....	1 48	1 13	84	80
1,100.....	1 50	1 15	90	80
1,200.....	1 70	1 23	97	87
1,300.....	1 90	1 32	1 03	93

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

25.....	9½	6½	7½	6½	6½
50.....	14½	9	9	8½	9
75.....	18½	11½	10½	9½	11½
100.....	21	14	11½	11½	14
200.....	30	18½	15½	13½	18½
300.....	38½	23	19½	19½	23
400.....	47	27½	23½	19½	27½
500.....	55	32	27½	19½	32
600.....	62	36½	31½	21½	36½
700.....	70	41	35½	21½	41
800.....	76½	45	40	24	45
900.....	83	49	45	49
1,000.....	90	52½	50	52½
1,100.....	97	56	55	56
1,200.....	1 03½	61	60	61
1,300.....	1 10	65	65	65

St. P. M. & M. RAILWAY.

25.....	9	6½	5	5
50.....	15	9	8	8
75.....	21	11½	11	11
100.....	26	14	13	13
200.....	38	19	19	19
300.....	46	24	23	23
400.....	54	29	27	27
500.....	62	38	31	31
600.....	70	44	35	35
700.....	78	49	39	39

(700 miles is the St. P. M. & M. maximum distance).

I will not weary the House with this, but I will take 700 miles and there you find that first class merchandise is carried for \$2.43 on the Northern Pacific Railway, for \$1.80 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and \$1.96 on the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, showing that on this road which the hon. gentleman denounces as a monopoly, which he says is a giant monopoly which he asks this House to interfere with and to forget what it owes to all the rest of this country, and to regard only the interests of the people for whom he professes to speak—the hon. gentleman finds that the comparison is all in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway and against the two other railways similarly situated, which I have named. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware that there has been a greater average decline in the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway than on the other roads. I have shown that the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway are much more favorable to the agricultural classes, and to all classes of the community, than are the rates on the

Northern Pacific, or the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, with which the former can be fairly contrasted. The average decline of rates in the last four years has been greater on the Canadian Pacific Railway than on either of the other two railways to which I have alluded. Then, the statistics of Manitoba and the North-West prove that the average price of produce has been better during the past four years, where the country was served by the Canadian Pacific Railway, than it has been where the country was served by the Northern Pacific or the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway. The hon. gentleman is aware that the most liberal arrangements made by any railway company in the world have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the millers who are engaged in grinding their grain, and under those arrangements grain is brought down without mixing from Manitoba to Goderich and Montreal, and is ground by the millers under terms more favorable than can be found at the great mills of Minneapolis. The milling-in-transit system is more liberal, as I have said, on the Canadian Pacific Railway than on any of the other railways. I will not occupy the attention of the House longer than to say that under these circumstances I feel that this House owes it to itself, and owes it to the whole people of this country, not to be led away by the very able presentation of his case made by the hon. member for Marquette, not to be led away by that natural sympathy which large communities invariably feel for smaller ones, not to be led away by the great desire that everybody on both sides of this House has to do everything that can possibly be done to advance the interests of the rising city of Winnipeg and the prosperous Province of Manitoba. This House has shown in the past, and this Government has shown, that there is no proposal which can be made in the interests of that important section of our country, with which we have not been ready to heartily co-operate. The hon. gentleman says that we ought to promote immigration into the great Canadian North-West. But, Sir, there sits before him a gentleman whose chief point of attack on this Administration the other night was that we spent money on immigration, and in endeavoring to bring agriculturists into that country to people the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said you failed totally to do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon gentleman must give us credit for good intentions. I frankly admit that we have not been as successful as we ought to have been. But, Sir, we have had more than usual difficulties to contend with; we have had an Opposition in this House who have obstructed and embarrassed our efforts in endeavoring to bring capital and immigration into this country, and under those circumstances we have not accomplished all that the money expended ought to have accomplished. But I hope that under the advice tendered to the late Minister of Finance by the hon. gentleman who has so ably presented his case to night, he will modify his views on that point, and that in the future we shall have the aid and co-operation of those hon. gentlemen, not in carrying people out of Canada, but in drawing people into Canada, and building up a great British nationality in a country which is better adapted for settlement, I believe, than any country in the world. So, Sir, I ask the House, without regard to party, without being led away by sympathy, and a desire to protect to the utmost extent those who are weak, to look at this question from the standpoint of what we owe the whole country, and to reject the resolution moved by the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman's intentions with regard to promoting immigration, and, in particular, promoting the settlement of the North-West, may have

been most excellent, but I have not forgotten what sort of a place is paved with equally excellent intentions. Now, Sir, I must say that it was with feelings of profound disappointment that I listened to the hon. gentleman, as the mouthpiece of the Government, disowning and repudiating that infinitely more statesmanlike utterance which forms an important part of the motion placed in your hands by my hon. friend. I think that if there ever was an occasion in which men confronted, as the present Government are, with the result of their own policy, as evidenced by their own official returns, ought to have come down to this House, and ought to have admitted, as indeed the hon. gentleman partly did, that their whole policy had been a failure, a fraud and a mistake, that they were being visited by their evil deeds, and that they were about to change their policy so as to bring about better results, it is on this very occasion. The hon. gentleman was good enough to preface his remarks by stating that he only carried out the policy of the late Government in disallowing Railway Acts in Manitoba. Now, I do not recollect that any Railway Acts were passed in our time by the Legislature of Manitoba which we disallowed, and if the hon. gentleman remembers any Acts of that kind, and will mention them, I will be pleased to accept his correction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I said we were following the policy of the hon. gentlemen who refused to issue a proclamation necessary to bring a charter into effect, and, consequently, disallowed it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that is a strict logical consequence, although it may suit the political exigencies of the hon. gentleman to maintain that on the present occasion. Now, I think that was a Dominion Act, wholly within our cognisance. We committed no usurpation of the territorial rights of the Province of Manitoba; we dealt with our own acts as the Parliament of Canada has a good right to do. Let the hon. gentleman point me to any disallowance of a railway charter passed by the Legislature of Manitoba in our time, and then I will say that the hon. gentleman may have some justification for saying that he is acting on the lines laid down by his predecessors. I recollect that we proposed to lease a branch which we had constructed to the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway Company, for the purpose, as the hon. gentleman must know, of giving railway competition to that Province. We were constructing at that moment our own line of railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, or rather to Selkirk, with a branch to Winnipeg, and the hon. gentleman opposed our lease of that identical branch—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—on the ground that we were giving a monopoly to the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the First Minister has the *Debates* for 1873 in his hands, and he can show the passage to his hon. friend beside him, for if he will look the matter up, he will find that the Minister of Finance opposed, and opposed very strongly, the monopoly which we were going to give the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway by leasing the Pembina Branch to them. I must say that I do not think the present Minister of Finance has made out a case of acting on the lines, be those lines good or bad, adopted by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). On the contrary, had the policy of my hon. friend been carried out, the people of Manitoba would have had direct competition by a very valuable competing line; they would have had the St. Paul and Manitoba with the Pembina Branch, and they would have had the line which we ourselves were constructing from Port Arthur or Fort

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

William at the same time. I am still more surprised to find the hon. gentleman arguing that the very liberal Railway Act introduced by the Minister of the Interior, which gave almost as great facility to all people in the North-West and Manitoba to build railway lines where they pleased, as they enjoy on the other side of the boundary, can be twisted by any perverse sophistry into a precedent of justification for the arbitrary refusal to allow the Legislature of Manitoba to charter lines or to construct lines in their own territory. What did this Bill propose, according to the very clause which the hon. gentleman read? It was not by formal agreement, but that the Government of the country should not permit railway lines to be constructed under that Act within forty miles of a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that is to say, the Government did not take the power, but it remained open to the House, if good reason could be shown, to construct such line at any moment. I must say that the hon. gentleman has been far from reading my hon. friend's Act with the care that he should, or he would never have pretended to quote that as any justification of the policy which the Government are now adopting. But I contend that, even had the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) laid down such a proposition as that laid down by the Government of the day, the cases are wholly and entirely different. What my hon. friend was doing at that time was this: He was constructing a railway to be, and remain, the absolute property of the people of Canada. My hon. friend never proposed, in my hearing, and I should like hon. gentlemen opposite to show any statement in which my hon. friend made the proposal, that a private corporation should be granted monopoly powers. He may have said at times that he desired for a short period to retain the control of the trade for a railway which was the property of the people of the country, which was to be worked by them and to be under their control in every shape and way, but I defy the hon. gentleman or his colleagues to show me that we ever proposed to grant these extraordinary and exaggerated monopoly powers to any private corporation whatever. I do not think they will find any utterance in any speech or proposal of the member for East York leading to any such conclusion as that. When the Minister of Finance talked as he did a little while after of the obligation they were under to disallow railway charters, surely he had lost sight of the facts recited in this very motion by quotations from the speeches from the First Minister and of the present Minister of the Interior, in which they say expressly—at least the First Minister does—that:

"In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament, we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To give the railway a chance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman mean by giving them a chance? Will he tell the House that he, the First Minister, had at that moment in his mind a pitiful evasion, that he was telling the House that in order to get this clause through, while all the time he had made up his mind to disallow all charters?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To give them a chance meant to give the Canadian Pacific Railway a chance, not the people of Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see. I confess I did not put that construction on it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will observe that his language will bear both meanings.

Looking at what was under discussion at the time, I thought the hon. gentleman was pointing out, as had been pointed out in the speech of the present Minister of the Interior, that they were perfectly safe because Manitoba, if it thought proper, could grant a charter. Said the Minister of the Interior:

"There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if you think proper, granting a charter from Winnipeg to the boundary line."

And then the Minister of Interior goes on to say:

"This provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses. In fact this Parliament does not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract, is that the traffic shall not be tapped far west on the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line. But there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side."

All I can say is this: that if ever language was used which was calculated to mislead Parliament as to the intentions of the Government with respect to the monopoly clause, it was the language used by the present Minister of the Interior and by the First Minister, on the supposition that he had then in his mind the intention of disallowing charters, and of interfering with the clear right of the Province of Manitoba to construct railways within its own territory. We, on this side of the House, have, to say the least, quite as earnest a desire to see Manitoba and the North-West developed and settled as hon. gentlemen opposite can have, and that the means we proposed to secure that end, when rightly understood, would have contributed infinitely more to build up a prosperous central province in that Province than the means which hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to adopt. But when the Minister of Finance tells us, if I understood him aright, that one main cause of the disappointment which has attended their exertions, of the miserable result which has flown from all the time, money and labor expended in endeavoring to settle the North-West arose from an insurrection which there was no sort of reason to expect and which no man thought would occur, I am sure the hon. gentleman has entirely forgotten if he ever heard or read the perfectly unparalleled list of warnings of every sort and description, from all kinds and conditions of men, which were displayed in the evidence laid before the House by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) time and again in the debates to which that unhappy insurrection gave rise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of February, 1884.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I, too, am speaking of February, 1884. I say that from 1879, from the time when the hon. gentlemen went into office up to 1884 and 1885, there was such a succession of warnings, such a succession of threatenings, such a succession of remonstrances and petitions from all sorts of people in the North-West, as never were hurled at the head of any Government before; and it is to be remembered that, even to this moment, we only have such portions of that evidence as it has pleased the hon. gentlemen to bring down. But we know from the evidence we have got that the warnings that they acknowledged to have received form but a part, and probably only a small part, of the total mass of warnings which ought to have taught them, long before 1884, that if they did not alter their course, most assuredly there would be an insurrection in the North-West. I wholly agree with the hon. gentleman that the interests of all Canada are to be considered. I wholly agree with him that, in discussing this question, we are bound not merely to consider the interests of Manitoba but the interests of all the

people of Canada. I wholly agree with him; further, I believe that the real interests of the people of Canada, the real interests of the people of Manitoba, and the real interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway are all at one if rightly understood. But I say that the hon. gentleman and his friends have been in the last degree unfortunate in the means they have taken to promote those interests. What, I would like to know, are the real interests of the people of Canada in this matter? Why, and why alone could Canadian statesmen on either side of this House justify the enormous expenditure which has been incurred, justify the enormous addition to the public burdens under which we are now laboring? Not, Sir, for the mere purpose of building a railway across this continent, not for the purpose of constructing an iron link from one part of Canada to the other; but for this reason, and this only: that it was a matter of the very first moment to stop, if we could, the enormous exodus which has been going on for very many years from this country to the neighboring Republic, and to find homes for our own people on our own soil. That, Sir, was the sole justification in my mind which ever warranted us in undertaking the construction of this road; and it is because the policy of the Government has resulted in utter and total failure, it is because they have entirely missed their way in this matter, because, as I said the other night, instead of being able to point out to us a prosperous central province, with five or six hundred thousand souls, as under wise government and wise tolerance—letting the people alone to make the best of the situation—we might easily have seen; it is because we have such miserable results as those which are revealed by the census papers laid upon the Table of the House a few weeks ago, it is because of that, because they have wholly failed to understand the interests of this country that they are called on to reverse their present policy. The rights of the older Provinces are to see that that vast inheritance is made available for the sons and brothers of all the people of the older Provinces, and at this moment, when we know that that has not been done, that from one end of the American North-West to the other we find, not tens of thousands, but hundreds of thousands of Canadian settlers that under a wiser policy and a wiser Government would have found homes in our own North-West—it is for that reason that we are justified to-night in calling upon the hon. gentlemen to consider themselves and reverse their action before it is too late. And it is in that way that we can best of all maintain good faith with the older Provinces. It is quite true that the older Provinces have not been kept faith with. It is quite true that not a single solitary one of all the promises made on the floor of this House by the First Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Finance, has even been attempted to be fulfilled. It is quite true that of all the tens of millions of land sales that they promised not one has been realised. It is quite true that when we come to look for inhabitants in Manitoba we find, as my hon. friend showed, that there are not nearly 120,000 of the people, who, according to those hon. gentlemen's own official reports, we were supposed to settle there at great cost to us. Now, I always believed that this policy of interfering with the Manitoba Legislature was a very great error. It may be, although I have my doubts of it, that this Government have the legal right to disallow Acts of that kind, passed by the Legislature strictly within their legitimate power. If it be legal, all I can say is it is high time that a power so liable to abuse, and a power which has been so persistently abused, should be taken away. I do not think it is a proper power for the Dominion Government to possess, and I say its existence is a great peril to the future of this Confederation. But, Sir, I say that so far from the hon. gentlemen being entitled to claim credit for themselves for the introduction of their monopoly clause, and for their perseverance in this monopoly system of theirs,

I say the true policy, if they could have risen to the level of the situation and understood their duty to the country, in the way of developing the North-West, was to encourage all roads which were willing to go in there. I say that this policy of attempting to seclude the North-West absolutely and entirely from all connection with the country to the south, is a policy which could have but one of two results. Either you will cripple Manitoba and prevent it from growing and being colonised as it ought to be colonised, or you will create a spirit of intense dissatisfaction amongst those people, who are debarred from the exercise of a clear natural right which this Government has no just cause whatever for taking away from them. I say it is an act of intolerance, of tyranny and usurpation; and I say that far from condemning the people of Manitoba for the indignation they have manifested, although somewhat late in the day, at the outrage that has been committed upon their liberties, if these hon. gentlemen would allow railroads to be constructed freely through that part of the country where they can be constructed, according to the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway—because, as the hon. gentleman has not ventured to deny, there is nothing whatever in the charter which warrants us in interfering with the privileges of old Manitoba—I say that those companies would be the best of all colonisers, and would aid us most materially in so developing the North-West that the trade we would obtain from it, if there was competition on the part of one or two American railways there, would be worth ten or twenty times over the trade we are ever likely to receive from them, as long as this miserable policy of isolation is persisted in. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that, having started five years ago with a population in old Manitoba of some 60,000 souls, the returns we have before us show that in the same old Manitoba there are hardly 90,000 white people to-day, and that if you deduct the natural increase from that, the total increase in five years would barely amount to 22,500 souls, or scarcely more than 4,500 families added to our population there in five years. It is true that, by the addition which has been made, a small additional number may be counted, but making even that allowance, all we can count upon is a paltry six thousand families in Manitoba, and three thousand families in the North-West. The hon. gentleman may well tell us that things have not turned out as he expected, that the roseate picture he drew has been sadly dimmed. I do not think any hon. gentleman on this side, even when we were criticising the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite most severely, ever dreamed that we would be confronted with such a state of things as the hon. gentleman's own census reveals to us. I say there is no possible evidence that could be imagined, no possible evidence that I, at any rate, can conceive, which shows more clearly and distinctly how total a failure the policy of hon. gentlemen has been in every respect, than these figures from the census returns of Manitoba. As my hon. friend behind me has said, under such a state of things, it is the duty of the Government to seek for a remedy. It is quite clear that their land policy, their railway policy, and I may add as regards Manitoba, their tariff policy, have been disastrous failures in promoting the settlement of that country; and when all that is required of them on this occasion is to let the people of Manitoba alone, not interfering with their plain right, surely with the evidence before us, we might have expected that the hon. gentlemen would have had the magnanimity to admit their mistake, and consent to allow the people of Manitoba to extricate themselves from the dilemma that their erroneous policy has placed them. We have had evidence again and again of the extreme danger of disregarding the remonstrances of the people of Manitoba and the North-West. The hon. gentleman from his official position has access to sources of information that I have not; but I believe from all the information that has come to me, that the people of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Manitoba are very deeply in earnest in this matter, and I think the hon. gentlemen opposite will find that if they persist in their ill-advised course, it may lead to results which we may all have to deplore; but, if it does, the responsibility must rest on them. We know what came of their persistent disregard of the discontent and dissatisfaction, among a very much smaller and less influential portion of the people of the North-West. I, for one, have no desire to see that unhappy tragedy repeated; but I think the hon. gentlemen will do well to bear in mind, if it be repeated owing to their misgovernment and mismanagement in Manitoba, that the consequences may be very much more serious than those which attended the late unhappy outbreak. Sir, the fact of the matter is this: that at this present moment one of the main reasons why immigration will not go to Manitoba, and why men are deserting Manitoba—though possibly the feeling may be overstrained—is the persistence of the Government in preserving this very monopoly. People at large do not like, and it is not reasonable to expect that they should like, to go into a country where the law is such that the Local Legislatures are deprived of the power of which I think they ought never to be deprived, of constructing railways at their own cost and charge in any part of the Province. At this very moment we know to our cost that an immense number of persons who went to Manitoba have left that country. We know that the tide has set the wrong way. All who have paid any attention to this matter know that there are vigorous colonies of Canadians scattered throughout various parts of the western States, and that they continue constantly to draw many of the best of our countrymen to them. If the hon. gentleman desires to put a stop to that unfortunate state of things, there is no one thing he can do which will be so likely to do it as to allow the people of Manitoba to manage their own affairs without let or hindrance. I do not ask, and no man on this side of the House has asked, that he should abrogate the bargain he has made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to the rest of the territory. But we do press upon him the duty of simply leaving the people of Manitoba alone. Now, I am well aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway has served two or three purposes of considerable importance. I am quite well aware, and the hon. gentleman has made a good deal of the matter, that it has provided a route which under certain circumstances may be very convenient and very valuable to the English people. All that is a very good thing in its way, but it is no justification for the enormous charge and cost which has been inflicted on the people of Canada. I say there is but one thing the hon. gentleman can do which would be of the slightest real service to the people of this country, and that is to contribute, as far as he can, to fill up this country. Why, Sir, what is the real interest of the people of the eastern Provinces? Their real interest, as I have said, is to have a large, prosperous Province built up there. The trade of such a province will naturally come to them. A little will go, perhaps, to the United States, but I do not think it will go to the interior of the United States. I think, on the contrary, there is every probability, should a competing line be established, that the grain would go, during the greater part of the year, to Duluth, and thence seek its way down through our canals to the sea; or, if the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is constructed, it will, in all probability, drawing with it a considerable portion of the grain of Minnesota and Dakota, find its way over Canadian territory by crossing the Sault Ste. Marie and passing down to Montreal or another port of shipment. I say also that the real interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway lies, as the hon. gentleman in one part of his remarks truly said, in filling up this country. But I tell them that they cannot hope to fill it up if they persist in retaining, against the wishes of the people, against the remonstrances of the

Legislature, and against the inclination of all incoming settlers, their absolute monopoly of all the lines of transport, within that country. I must say that I had hoped better things, not merely from the Minister of Finance, but from the gentlemen connected with the railway themselves. It was with very great regret that I saw that Sir George Stephen had recently addressed a telegram to the people of Manitoba, which I must characterise as being very unfortunate indeed. I do not see how that people, with any degree of self-respect, can allow themselves to be dragooned—because no other word will meet the case—into giving up their local rights under a threat like that; and I do trust that the gentlemen of that enterprise, who deserve a great deal of credit for the energy with which they have pushed it through, will reconsider what I regard as a hasty utterance. Now, Sir, in this matter I trust, for my part, that the Manitobans will stand firm. Not only are their interests at stake, but I believe the interests of the whole of Canada are at stake in their standing firm. When they stand up for their own local rights and liberties in this matter, they are really standing up for the local rights and liberties of the people of all the other Provinces, and a great many gentlemen who have stood forward in this House as the champions of the local rights and liberties of their own respective Provinces, will do well to remember that, if the example is set of trampling on the local rights and liberties of Manitoba, they may live to see that act made a precedent for similar acts committed at their expense. All that the people of Manitoba ask is simply fair play. They are not coming before us craving for subsidies or assistance. And here let me say, that it is not fair, or just, or right to pretend to charge the people of Manitoba and the North West with the whole cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A very large portion of the cost of that work could not be said to be undertaken in any respect for their benefit. They would have been quite as well served, as they are to-day, by the expenditure of a vastly smaller sum of money. In fact, I believe that with a smaller sum, judiciously expended, their position would have been infinitely better than it is to-day. Now, I do not charge hon. gentlemen opposite with being wholly responsible for the present unfortunate state of things in Manitoba. I am aware, and I have frankly admitted, that it results partly from causes that they could not foresee and could not control. It is quite true, there have been bad seasons there. It is quite true, the people of Manitoba, with the other people of this country, have been exposed to intense competition, arising largely from the introduction of Indian wheat into the European market. But over and above bad seasons and foreign competition, they have suffered from causes which could be removed. They have suffered from a bad railway policy, they have suffered from monopoly, they have suffered from bad laws, they have suffered from a great many other things which it is in the power of hon. gentlemen to remove. I would like to know how it is that, although it has been exposed to seasons almost identical with our own, Dakota, which started with a population some fifteen or sixteen years ago not one bit larger than that which Manitoba then possessed, has prospered and made headway to the extent that it has? I cannot admit, I never have admitted, that there is anything in the climate or the soil of Dakota which gave it a superiority to Manitoba, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will contend that there is. On the contrary, I say that in a very large part of our own country both climate and soil and all the natural conditions are quite as favorable to rapid settlement and to rapid development as those which exist to the south of the line; and what makes the matter clearer than anything else is this: that, as the hon. gentleman well knows, a very large number of those who are now contributing to develop and settle the northern territory of the United States are Canadian born, a great many of whom went to Manitoba, as the hon. gentleman's records show, and, finding them-

selves unable to obtain comfortable homes there, withdrew to seek them on the southern side of the line. The hon. gentleman was good enough to accuse my hon. friend behind me of gross unfairness in the matter of quoting freight rates, but I did not observe, and I think the House will do well to notice, that the hon. gentleman contradicted any statement which my hon. friend made. What he did, as far as I noticed, was to take other statements referring to other portions of lines running in different directions. It may well be that the hon. gentleman's statements are correct, but what my hon. friend pointed out, and what the hon. gentleman did not disprove, was that at this moment along the Canadian Pacific Railway line, going eastward, a distance of 400 and 500 miles, the rates were considerably higher than those which prevailed on the other lines of which he gave example. Nor did the hon. the Minister of Finance deny—I do not suppose it was possible for him to deny—the fact to which my hon. friend called attention, that in many articles of goods it was at present as cheap to send them from Montreal to British Columbia and then back into Manitoba, as it would be to send them, half the way, direct to Manitoba. It may be that it is impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to transport these goods over their long line, and through the sparsely peopled country through which it passes, for lower rates than the Government have seen fit to fix, but that is no ground whatever for refusing to these persons, who are endeavoring under circumstances of great difficulty to settle and develop Manitoba, an opportunity of obtaining reasonable rates; and I must beg the hon. gentleman to remember this, so far as the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway goes, that that line appears to have been wholly constructed out of the moneys furnished to the company by the people of this country, at any rate, if you include in the sums the hon. gentleman referred to the large amount obtained from sales of land granted by this Parliament. I do not think the hon. gentleman was quite justified in wholly ignoring that most material fact when comparing the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway with those charged by other railways which possessed no similar advantages, which obtained no similar contributions from the people of the United States. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance that the whole situation is one in which every man in this country who cares for the welfare of the country ought deeply to deplore. There is no doubt, whatever, that we have mortgaged the whole future of this country to an enormous extent for the purpose of constructing this road. There is no doubt, whatever, that a very heavy burden indeed, has been laid upon the people of the older Provinces, and, perhaps, more particularly on the people of the eastern Provinces, who can, from the nature of the case, derive comparatively little advantage, directly at any rate, from the completion of the road; and that being so, I say that the hon. gentleman is more than ever called upon to remove those obstacles which the people of the country, who live there, who have to make their fortunes there, feel unanimously are preventing the settlement of the country. It may be possible that they exaggerate the mischief which is being done, although I must say the evidence my hon. friend behind me presented goes very far indeed to make out an overwhelming case in the direction of hardship. But the hon. gentleman does not require to be told that that may operate to a very large extent in preventing the settlement of the country; the hon. gentleman does not require to be told that, from a variety of unfortunate causes, Manitoba is more or less under a cloud. I do not believe there is anything in the country itself; I do not believe there is anything in its climate or soil which, even yet, need prevent us seeing a very important Province developed there, a development, perhaps, at almost as great speed, if only they will give it fair play, as even the hon. gentleman in his visions of former years led us to believe. But if the hon. gentleman

and the Government with him persist in the policy that they have laid down, if they make it manifest, as I fear they are resolved by their vote to-night, that the people of Manitoba have no relief to hope from the consideration of this Government, and that this House is determined to maintain its policy of disallowance, if they are resolved not to allow the people of Manitoba to exercise their natural rights as free men, I warn the hon. gentleman he has to expect one of two things, that either the people will leave Manitoba, that he will find all our sacrifices utterly worthless, or that he will be compelled, as his colleagues have been, to do justice to these people by means which the hon. gentlemen will regret as much as I to see employed. I think the hon. gentlemen are acting with extreme folly in disregarding the plain, clearly expressed desire of the people of Manitoba on this question; and I believe in the interest, not merely of the people of Manitoba, but of the people of Canada, and for that matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway as well, the best thing they could do is to revert to the policy foreshadowed by the hon. gentleman as long as three years ago, and to allow these people to construct railways under the existing circumstances wherever they may deem it in their interest to construct them. I still hope that, before this House rises, the hon. gentlemen will see cause to withdraw from the position they have taken. I believe the situation is far more critical than they admit it to be, and I must say I dread the effects of this extended refusal on the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. I am one of the unfortunates who have been referred to by the hon. member for Marquette, and, by way of innuendo, by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, as being one of those who were pledged to their constituents during the late elections to vote against the Government on this question of disallowance. The hon. member for Marquette would lead the House to believe this afternoon that these people voted for me solely upon the pledge I gave on that matter, and that I led them to believe that I had the authority of the Premier for making my pledge to these people. Such a statement is utterly at variance with the facts. I expressed the same views on the question of disallowance three years ago, previous to my election, that I did on the different platforms throughout that election. I based my belief that the Government would not continue this policy of disallowance on the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland which is referred to in the resolutions in question. However the hon. member for Cumberland may seek to avoid that point, I have simply to tell him that the people of the Province of Manitoba believed, when he made that speech, that a new era would dawn and that the policy of disallowance would be discontinued. I had the honor and pleasure, some three years ago, of agitating the policy of building a railway from the border to the part of the Province in which I live, and I acted in that matter in conjunction with Mr. Greenway, the leader of the Opposition in that Province. We stood on the same platform, and together we advocated this policy, which was based entirely on the speech of the member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) which is alluded to in the resolutions, and we believed that, when the Canadian Pacific Railway had been completed to the north of Lake Superior, this policy of disallowance would not require to be pursued by the Government at Ottawa. Before going into this question of disallowance, I think it necessary to refer shortly to some of the statements which have been made by the last speaker (Sir Richard Cartwright), in reference to settlers going out of our Province into the State of Dakota; because, although I am going to vote against the Government on these resolutions, and although I intend to show, and I think I shall be able to show satisfactorily to the House, that I have good reasons for so doing, and that the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT:

people of Manitoba are right in pressing this view upon the Government, yet I cannot agree with some of the statements made by the last speaker. It is noticeable that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down seems to take occasion, whenever the opportunity offers, to try to throw cold water upon the condition of the people of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. He is a sort of general distributor of gloom throughout the length and breadth of Canada. I do not know whether or not he is interested in land speculations in that Province, which have not turned out as satisfactorily as he expected they would, but he always seems desirous to present the most unsatisfactory statement of the unfortunate condition of the people there as shown by the census. The census of Manitoba taken in 1836 shows a population in that Province of 108,640, but the hon. gentleman does not quote that. He continually refers to the white population as being 95,000, or 90,000 as he sometimes states, and so unfortunate was the statement he made in his speech on the Budget as to the population being only 95,000 that I see it is quoted in some of the American papers, though the population shown by the census is 108,640. In 1881, the population was 65,954, and that does not represent the true population of the Province at that time, because we must take into consideration that this number included the population of Keewatin and of the portion which was then known as the disputed territory some distance east of Winnipeg. That population was 3,694, which has since been added to the Province of Ontario, so that the population of Manitoba properly in 1881 was 62,260 and not 65,954. If you deduct 62,260 from 108,640, it shows that we have had an increase of population in these five years of 46,380.

Mr. BLAKE. That includes the addition to the west.

Mr. DALY. Certainly, and I include the addition to the west.

Mr. BLAKE. You knock off the portion to the east and include the addition to the west.

Mr. DALY. The population of that portion was 12,758 in 1881, and my statement includes that addition to the west. I say that the population of Manitoba in 1881, without the portion since taken away, but including the western portion, was 62,260, and if you deduct that from 108,640 it leaves an increase of population during that time of 43,330, or 74.5 per cent. increase of population. If we go on in the same ratio—and we expect to increase in a greater ratio in the next five years—we will have an increase of 150 per cent. in the ten years. It is not fair to compare the progress of Manitoba with that of Dakota in reference to our population, because, if you take the population of other States as well, if you take the population of Colorado, Dakota, Kansas, Minnesota and Illinois, you will find in the census returns of those different States during the different decades that they have gone up and gone down, and the fact that we have not such a large population in Manitoba to day does not rest, as the hon. gentlemen opposite would like the House and the country to believe, upon the fact that this Government which is now in power has not exercised a proper policy towards that country; but we must take into consideration that we had frosts in two succeeding years, and a drought last year, and the rebellion in 1885, and these four things alone would be sufficient to crush out immigration in any country. I think, when we take into consideration these things, and remember that we have increased 46,380 in five years, we have a pretty good showing. More than that, the hon. gentleman refers to the exodus from Manitoba to Dakota. During the late election, as my constituency runs down to the boundaries of that State, I had occasion to meet some of the farmers who had gone from Manitoba to Dakota, and all of them wished themselves back into Manitoba, without a single exception. The fact is that, instead of being, as

our people are in my constituency, along the line of the South-Western Railway, able to market their grain twelve or fifteen miles from their own doors, they have to go some sixty or sixty-five miles to Neche and Bathgate for a market. I am speaking of the people in Cavalier county, Dakota. They do not, however, go that distance for their market, but they smuggle their grain across the line into Manitoba and sell it along the route of the South-Western Railway. More than that, what is their condition in regard to taxes? The fact is that in Cavalier county, Dakota, their taxes last year were 5½ cents on the dollar—not 5½ mills, but 5½ cents. Everything they have is taxed, their threshing machines, their horses, their window-sashes, and all other personal property they have is taxed; and at the same time in North Dufferin, the adjoining municipality in Manitoba, the taxes were not more than nine mills, or at the outside one cent in the dollar. In other parts of Manitoba, in Brandon, for instance, where we have a debt of \$270,000, the taxation last year was only 14 mills in the dollar. More than that, I find that out of forty Canadian settlers in Cavalier county, Dakota, all except three are Grits. Last year a petition was presented to the Minister of the Interior, signed by twenty-six Canadian settlers in Dakota, asking him to open Township 1, Range 6, for settlement, and a number of those men came back to Manitoba and made their entries and are living there now, and they all regret that they ever went across the line. They did not go because they could not get land in Manitoba or because the policy of the Government as to the land laws was oppressive, but they went because during the boom they were able to get \$3,500 and \$4,000 for a half-section, and they sold their land and went to the other side of the line. When they got there, they found that instead of being able to get a homestead, as a young man can here, at eighteen years of age, and having only three years of residence to put in and a certain amount of settlement duty to perform, there a young man has to be twenty-one years old and put in five years residence before he can apply for his patent; and, instead of being able to come to the agent without any expense to himself, with two of his neighbors to make an affidavit as to his performance of his settlement duties, or instead of a homestead inspector coming to his land and deciding the matter, he has to publish for five weeks in a newspaper in Dakota his intention to apply for his patent, and has to give the names of the witnesses he is going to adduce to the land officer, and has to employ an attorney at a cost of \$25 or \$30, whereas with us a farmer simply goes to the land office, and so stringent are the regulations that they do not permit an attorney to have anything to do with the application for his patent. More than that, we find a great difference between the farmers in Manitoba and those in Dakota, as far as personal welfare is concerned. We have published by the Manitoba Government a letter or report by Mr. J. H. Wood, who was sent into Dakota in order to ascertain the condition of the Canadian farmers there, and he reports as follows, so far as the prices of certain articles are concerned:—

	Manitoba.	Dakota.
Tar paper, per cwt.....	\$3 65	\$4 00
Nails.....	4 00	5 00
Hoes.....	0 80	0 65
Shovels.....	1 00	1 00
Manure forks.....	0 80	0 90
Sugar, 14 lbs.....	1 00	1 00 11 lbs.
Tea.....	0 50	0 75

Clothing at least 30 per cent. less in Manitoba than Dakota.

Now these people who went into Dakota at that time were not aware of these prices, they were not aware of the oppressive nature of the land laws, and the oppressive taxation that existed in that State, and the best evidence of the fact that these men have seen that they made a mistake, is their anxiety to get back into Manitoba to-day. I have not the slightest doubt that, in the course of one or two years,

as soon as these men can sell out in Dakota, every one of them will come back into this country. But what do we find further in this report of Mr. Wood, in connection with these men? He says he finds that they are in the habit of reading the *Globe* and other Grit papers published in Canada; that they were really under the impression that Sir John A. Macdonald and his Government were sitting like leeches on the field of politics and drawing the life-blood out of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is true.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a true report, but it is a false statement.

Mr. DALY. That is the condition in which this gentleman found these settlers in Dakota. But suppose these men were not in that condition, is it a patriotic position for any man representing a constituency in Ontario or Manitoba, to come here and decry our country and to run it down? Although we have not got the immigration we expected, it is not the fault of the Government, but, as I said before, it is the fault of nature. But just as soon as we have one good harvest in the Province of Manitoba we will see more contentment among the people than we have ever seen before. More than that, the people in the northern portion of Dakota do not enjoy as good a climate as we do. I have heard men tell me that the people of Manitoba do not know what a blizzard is. They say: If you want to know what a blizzard is, come down to Dakota. Neither have we suffered from any cyclones in our country. There is no doubt, I think, that, so far as climate is concerned, Manitoba is better off than the adjoining states to the south. But the want of immigration in our country is largely due to utterances like that of the hon. gentleman who spoke last, which will be sent broadcast throughout the country. The *Globe* has shown sufficient interest in our country to send there a correspondent named Conant three or four years ago, and he could not write too harshly against that country. All these little things are taken up by the American railway companies and scattered broadcast among intending immigrants. Then as to the expenditure made by the Government on immigration, these gentlemen never take into consideration the fact that, so far as Dakota, Minnesota, and other states are concerned, they have been reaping for 25 or 30 years the results of the efforts made by their Government to attract immigrants. Literature has been sent to every portion of Europe to explain the capabilities of that country, as was stated by Mr. Eden, the Land Commissioner of the North-Western Railway Company, last year. It is not reasonable to suppose that these people would come to our country in face of the fact that their relatives have been coming to the United States for 20 years past. So far as Manitoba is concerned, we have not been in a position to receive immigrants until 1881, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed; and when you take all these things into consideration, I think you will come to the conclusion that our prosperity has been pretty considerable under the circumstances. Now, as respects the prosperity of Manitoba, I want to quote some figures from the last return of the Brandon Board of Trade, which will show that, so far as that place is concerned, the prosperity has been considerable, and the country about it is also prosperous as a consequence. Now, we find that the general trade of that town, last year, amounted as follows:—Articles not classified, \$1,159,000; grain, \$432,600; agricultural implements, binders, twine and fence wire, \$400,000; horses, cattle and pork, \$222,900; lumber, \$100,000; building contracts, \$50,000; fuel, coal and wood, \$31,500, making a total of \$2,426,300. Now, that shows a very prosperous condition in a town which did not exist six years ago, and the country around it is proportionately prosperous. Why, you can go into that Province to-day, and you will find men who came in there with four

or five dollars in their pocket, who are independent to-day. They have a quarter section or a half section of land paid for, and do not owe a dollar, with a team of horses, and the necessary implements to carry on farming operations, every one of them doing well. But the men who have not done well are those who expected to make a living by merely tickling the ground, or who came for the purpose of manufacturing wheat instead of growing it. But men who went there with a determination to grow up with the country, who were willing to go slowly, as their fathers did before them, are now prosperous, and as these men prosper, so does the country. All our country asks is a fair chance. We do not want to be decried by gentlemen living in Ontario or the other Provinces. I say that with only one good harvest, you will see such a state of things in Manitoba that even the most optimistic of us could not desire to see better. Now, as regards the question of disallowance, I trust the Government are impressed with the idea that there is a great feeling of unrest in Manitoba on this question. It does not exist in Winnipeg alone, but throughout the whole Province. The hon. gentleman for Marquette read to the House the resolutions which were passed at a meeting held in Winnipeg last night. At that meeting there were present the Premier of the Province, the leader of the Opposition, the mayors of twenty-five towns, and telegrams were read from various counties and from leading men, and all these telegrams and resolutions indicate that there is a general feeling throughout the Province that the policy of disallowance must be abandoned. Now, I do not speak thus because I made a pledge to my constituents, or because, as was insinuated, I made a pledge before I came here that I would oppose the policy of disallowance. We do not wish to interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we do not ask for the abrogation of clause 15, but we say we should be left in the same position as the other Provinces, and that we should be allowed, under section 92 of the British North America Act, to charter lines of railway within the bounds of our own Province. It is admitted by the Minister of Justice that there are no legal obstacles in the way whatever, that it is a matter of policy. It is said that if we are permitted to have an independent line of railway, the trade of the country will be diverted into United States channels. Now, Sir, in face of the National Policy, with the tariff that exists, I cannot see how that can happen. Our export trade consists of grain of all description and agricultural products, and every gentleman knows that the duties upon those articles in the United States, would exclude us from carrying these articles into the States. More than that, we have the fact that before the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed at all, everything that was brought into that country came by Duluth or the Northern Pacific; and under these circumstances we believe that so far as Manitoba is concerned, instead of this policy of disallowance having the effect of lessening the trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will increase that trade by the competition created by other lines, that a greater trade will be developed, that the price of produce will increase and consequently there will be more freight carried both by the Canadian Pacific Railway and this new line in connection with the Northern Pacific. Statements have been made as to the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the rates of other railway lines. Now, one is at a loss to know where to find the truth, because if you take up any paper published in Manitoba to-day, or the *Toronto Mail*, you will find certain rates quoted as charged by certain lines, and certain other rates quoted on another line, and you cannot find any comparisons of rates that agree one with the other. But setting aside the question of rates, it is an abstract question that we wish this House to decide to-night, namely, whether we shall stand in the same position that the other Provinces do with regard to local railways. The people of Ontario

Mr. DALY,

have a perfect right to grant railway charters for lines within their own boundaries, and we ask the same right. A question may arise as to whether we possess power to charter lines of railway that can connect with lines from the outside, and that is a question for the courts to decide hereafter; but in asking the right to grant charters for lines within our own boundaries, we are not asking too much. We simply want to be placed in the same position as the other Provinces. I desire to read to the House a resolution passed at a meeting held in Winnipeg last night, for it indicates the true feeling of the country on this question. The resolution is as follows:—

"Whereas, competition in railway carriage between Manitoba and the North-West Territories and other Provinces of the Dominion is essentially necessary to the natural development of the inter-provincial trade, the fostering of Canadian manufactures, both in the eastern Provinces and in Manitoba, the encouragement of foreign capital to seek investment in the development of the North-West, the encouragement of immigration and natural progress of the Province generally, all of which would be of great advantage both directly and indirectly to every portion of the Dominion; and

"Whereas, it is clear and has been repeatedly declared by Sir John A. Macdonald and other members of the Dominion Cabinet that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no right under their contract with the people to the maintenance of monopoly in the old Province of Manitoba; and

"Whereas, it has been recently again declared by the present Minister of Justice to our Local Legislature and to a deputation of citizens who recently visited Ottawa that the question of the disallowance of provincial charters, was purely a question of trade policy and not a question of illegality or unconstitutionality, or breach of contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company therein: Now be it

"Resolved, in the unanimous opinion of the meeting, representing as it does the whole Province of Manitoba, the interests of every portion of the Province demand free competition in railways for the cheapening of the necessaries of life to the settler, the lowering of freight rates for carriage of our wheat and other products to the seaboard, and above all the removal of the bar of monopoly which frightens foreign capital and immigration from our lands where the interests of the eastern Provinces demand it for facilitating and fostering of their trade with the North-West and for a development of a larger market here for their manufactures. That the meeting recognises the telegram from Sir George Stephen to the Premier of the Province, recently published in the press, as the frank and natural product, and illustrative of the species of monopoly whereby free people are sought to be kept in a condition of serfdom to a tyrannical and grasping master. It brings forcibly home to people of the Province that while the monopoly is maintained the fortunes and future of themselves and of their children are at the mercy of unscrupulous men who are ready to do their best to ruin all who do not tamely submit to their tyranny. This meeting demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a faithful observance of the solemn contract with the city of Winnipeg, whereby, in consideration of \$200,000 paid by the city to the company, land for station grounds and exemption from taxation, the company bound itself to establish and forever continue at Winnipeg its principal workshops for the main line and branches in Manitoba.

"The meeting denies emphatically the charge that the establishment of railway competition in the older Provinces would be a breach of faith towards the holders of private capital investing in the Canadian Pacific Railway securities. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company never bargained for, and neither the Parliament of Canada nor the Legislature of Manitoba, ever agreed to give them a monopoly in the old Province of Manitoba. Not only is this evident on the face of its charter, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself has expressly declared on several occasions on the floor of Parliament by Sir John A. Macdonald before the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was ratified; by Sir Charles Tupper when Parliament was asked to assist the company with a loan of \$30,000,000, and by Hon. Thomas White, and the hon. Minister of Justice in response to a deputation. It is well known to the president and directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, and the meeting indignantly condemns the conduct of the officers of that company in persistently endeavoring to mislead and prejudice the people of the Dominion by contrary pretensions; that,

"Whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and those in league with them assert that the people have elected supporters of the Government, having well known the policy of disallowance and thereby proved that they were in favor of a continuance of that policy, now this meeting declares that the election by the Province of supporters of the Dominion Government in the recent election was secured by means of telegrams and communications from the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald to Government candidates and leading people, to lead them to believe that by electing them they might expect a cessation of the policy of disallowance. And the assertion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company above referred to is a base perversion of the truth as to the well-known and strongly-expressed feelings of the people of this Province on this question.

"Resolved, that this meeting most warmly approves of the course of our Provincial Government and Legislature in the recent railway legislation with a view to giving that Province the much needed competitive railway connection with eastern Canada; and this meeting solemnly

pledges itself to stand by the Provincial Government and Legislature in their efforts to secure the immediate construction of the proposed railway to the boundary, and to urge upon them the great necessity for the immediate and speedy construction of the same, that without fail it may be completed during the present season; and this meeting looks with confidence to every member of the Provincial Legislature to stand firmly and loyally by the right of our Province, and at all hazards and in spite of any and all attempts at obstruction or interference from any source whatsoever, to forthwith carry to completion this important work to which they look to secure the rapid development of a great and fertile Province."

I think the House will see that, there is a determined feeling existing between the people of Manitoba that, so far as disallowance is concerned, this question must be settled once and for all. So far as my vote to-night is concerned, I say it is not given because this was made a plank in my platform simply at the elections, but because I feel that the action taken by the people is the correct one, and I took that view three years previous to my election. So far as regards the remarks of the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and it is one made by the Grit press throughout Manitoba, that the people made a mistake in sending here supporters of the Government, I venture to say that if Manitoba had four representatives of the capacity of that hon. member, it would make no difference to the Government, and the House will give me and the hon. member for Winnipeg credit for having used our best efforts to place our views before the Government. If we fail in obtaining this concession this year, probably another year the Government will feel differently. I have great hope of this, because the more the matter is discussed the more certain it is that the Government will come to the conclusion that the question must now be settled. The Minister of Finance stated that \$71,000,000 had been expended on the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he would lead the House to believe that we in Manitoba and the North-West are getting all the benefit. Does the hon. Minister not recognise the fact that in opening up that country he is developing a market for the productions of the eastern Provinces under the protection of the National Policy. The people of the eastern Provinces are receiving almost, if not quite, as much benefit from the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway as are the people of Manitoba and the North-West, and it must be remembered that 25,000,000 acres of our land went into the building of that line. I desire to refer for a moment to the fact that the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) asked me to second the resolution. I felt rather surprised at the time that he should do so, for he had never mentioned the matter to me in any way before, and he might have asked the member for Winnipeg, who is my senior, to second it; but his object in asking me was, that it might go throughout the Province of Manitoba that I was afraid to second it. I do not agree with everything contained in the resolution, because the hon. gentleman has raked up a great deal of old matter not necessary to the discussion, and I did not, therefore, second it; and a great many of the people of Manitoba agree with me that it was not until the present year that we were ripe for running a line into Manitoba from the south. It was only this year that the St. Paul and Manitoba commenced to extend its road into Montana, and it was not until they made that movement that the Northern Pacific made a movement to our boundary, and it was, therefore, only this year there has been a proper chance of obtaining another connection east and south. But that opportunity has arrived, and as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have finished their lines north of Lake Superior, it will not injure them nor affect their trade in any possible way from Manitoba and the North-West if we obtain a competing line; but, on the contrary, it will build up the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway, give them increased freight and at the same time assist largely in developing the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. DAWSON. This is a question on which I think every hon. member should express his opinion and in

expressing my view I am expressing that held in the district I have the honor to represent. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has based his argument entirely, so far as I can make out, upon the question of rates. He says that because the rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway are too high, therefore we should have competing lines and should encourage the construction of another railway to the frontier. He does not say there is not already in Manitoba sufficient railway accommodation for the population. There are already in Manitoba two railways running to the boundary line, one on the east and the other on the west side of the Red River. The hon. gentleman's statement is not that those railways are not capable of carrying all the freight to be forwarded to the south, or that the Canadian Pacific Railway is not sufficient to carry all the traffic from the east and west, but that the question is simply one of rates, and that we should encourage the building of another railway in order to reduce rates. The Minister of Finance has explained very clearly that the Government have the power of regulating the rates; that it is in their power to reduce the rates if necessary, and to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to adopt such reduced rates as would be in the interest of the people at large. If that power is possessed by the Government, the question arises whether it would be for the advantage of Manitoba and the country at large that the rate should be made such as would encourage settlement in Manitoba although they were not entirely remunerative to the railway company, and whether the Government of the country should not make up the difference to the company. Surely some means might be found whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway should be remunerated for the particular advantages they give to the settlers of Manitoba if we are to compel them to adopt unremunerative rates. One thing is certain in my estimation, and that is that this contract has been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that this country is bound to abide by that clause in the contract which prevents them from running railways in the North-West Territories to the frontier, except in a given direction. When that contract was made Manitoba was fully and fairly represented in this House. Her representatives were parties to that contract, as well as the representatives of the other portions of this Dominion, and I do not think that there is now any reason in her turning round and saying that that contract ought to be abrogated, as it virtually would be by adopting this motion, just because they can gain a temporary advantage by its abrogation. The country has not merely to look to the interests of the present population of Manitoba, but to the interests of the millions who will inhabit that country in the future. If we once open up routes of traffic through a foreign country and establish channels of trade, it will be very difficult in the future to divert the trade from those channels. That we should at the very moment when we have established a line of railway across this continent and have got it into working order, when that line has been put in operation after immense difficulties, with an energy and an enterprise which has never been equalled in the history of railways in any country—that we should turn round now and say that we shall not allow the company to have this traffic, that we shall, in effect, break the contract with them, that we shall open up rival lines, that we shall give facilities to the great Northern Pacific to come into this region to sweep away the traffic from our own company, would be a very serious matter indeed; and I for one am not at all astonished at the telegram which Sir George Stephen sent to Manitoba. It may have been hastily written, but who, with such a thing as that which was threatened, and with such vast interests at stake, could sit quietly by and hear of such proceedings taking place. I merely rose to express my views on the matter, and they are decidedly that the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway should be maintained, and bills which would virtually annul that con-

tract disallowed. More than that, as has already been said we derive a great deal of advantage from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that if the Canadian Pacific Railway had done nothing more than enable us to send forward our troops to suppress the rebellion in the North-West, it was a cheap bargain to this country. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had not then been in a condition to admit of those troops being sent forward, we could not have sent them forward at all. I remember that, on a former occasion, when we attempted to send troops through the United States, the Sault Ste. Marie canal was shut against us, and we had to make roads on the Canadian side before we could send them forward; and I can easily imagine that if application had been made on this last occasion to the American Government, with no means of our own to send forward the troops, that permission would not have been accorded, the rebellion would have gained headway, and the whole of the North West Territory to the east of the Rocky Mountains would have been in the hands of the rebels before we could have sent the troops forward. But with the Canadian Pacific Railway, even before it was quite completed, we had the means of sending them forward and of thus saving our country from what might have been a much greater calamity than it was. As has been stated to-night, the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a different position from that of our other railways. The company have opened up a line through a new country, only partially settled in many places, and in others not settled at all, and to expose them at the very initiation of their enterprise to a competition with other lines, to allow new lines to be built in from a foreign country to draw off the trade of those settlements in the very infancy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be most impolitic and imprudent. Along with all this we must also consider that the Canadian Pacific Railway has, on its part, faithfully performed its share of the contract, that it has opened up the line across the continent in a much shorter time than was originally contemplated, and has thus given us greatly improved facilities for getting immigration. When we consider the immigration that is now flowing in, to a greater extent this year than before, when we consider that the prospects of that country are very promising, and that the more these Territories are known the better are they appreciated, I think we should proceed with extreme caution, and that we should look carefully at the probable consequences before consenting to traffic being diverted from our own national highway.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has somewhat mistaken the question before the House. He has spoken as if the question before the House was whether we should break the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, that is not the question. It has not been contended by any hon. gentleman up to this time that the proposal which is in your hands is one which involves any breach of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In so far as that contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entitles it to a monopoly, entitles it to be free from competition, it is quite clear that the public faith is pledged to that company for the performance of that contract; and that if at any future time the public interest should require some other arrangement, that arrangement must be made with due regard to the existing rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. No contract in this country, with any company or any individual is so inviolate but that, if the general public interest requires some change to be made, he and it are subject to that change being made, but only on condition of just compensation to the individual for the loss involved in the change which the public interests demand. That is the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with reference to its charter rights, to which the hon.

Mr. DAWSON.

member mistakenly alluded when he argued that the proposal before you was a proposal for any breach of the charter. Now, with reference to the general question of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company complaining that it should be exposed to a competition to which its charter renders it liable, or from which its charter does not protect it, I do not myself perceive any particular ground that that corporation has to ask such consideration. First of all, it has been constructed, mainly, if not entirely, so far as the main line is concerned, at the public expense. Secondly, it professes, by its last annual report, to occupy the fortunate position—rating its stock even at par, when we know it was issued at 43—of having assets double the amount of its whole liabilities, including its liabilities to the stockholders. Thirdly, it has promoted its commerce and traffic—I do not say so complainingly—but it has promoted its commerce and traffic upon the principle of undertaking an aggressive competition with the other railway companies within, and with some which might have been supposed to be without its reach. It has promoted an active competition in the Province of Ontario and the other older Provinces of Canada, and it is to-day engaged in the promotion of a competition, not with the Northern Pacific so much as with the other Pacific lines, taking the freight from San Francisco by steamer to Vancouver, thence over its lines and along the routes to Chicago, in competition with the short and direct line. Now, in so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway finds itself able to carry that traffic, without loss or at a profit to its shareholders, so far from condemning it for entering into that competition, I highly approve of it; but I do not think it is entitled to use the great position which the Canadian people have given it to carry on an active and aggressive competition of the character to which I have referred, and at a loss to be recouped by means of extravagant rates of freight obtained from those portions of the Canadian people who are placed, either by law or by the action of the Government, at its mercy. The proposition before us to-night is one in which, so far from the Government and the Parliament being asked to violate any pledge made to the company in connection with the contract, the Government and the Parliament are called upon to carry out the pledges which were made before Parliament at the time the contract was made. At the time this contract was made, as I shall show presently, arguments were addressed against it on the ground that it created a great monopoly, and those arguments were answered by the statement from the leader of the Government that the statement as to the monopoly was an over-statement, because the contract did not affect the right of Manitoba or the right of Ontario to charter lines; it was only in so far as the Dominion Parliament had power, namely, within the Territories, that it was proposed to act. Now, to what intent was that argument advanced? We were saying, you are giving the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a monopoly. No, the hon. gentleman said, not such a monopoly as you contend, because it is limited to the Territories; Manitoba, we cannot check, Ontario we cannot check. And I say that, in common parlance, in common honor and good faith, that was a pledge and a declaration to Parliament that the monopoly was to extend only in so far as the language of the contract, as interpreted by the Minister, would extend it. It is true, that pledge, made to Parliament upon the occasion of the contract, was subsequently departed from by the Government. It is true that a few years afterwards they proceeded to disallow Manitoba charters, and that an agitation sprang up against their course—an agitation of great strength joined in by a large portion of the population; and that agitation reached such a pitch that there were discussions in the Legislature, meetings among the people, and representations to Ottawa; and when from time to time the Government asked Parliament to make further concessions to the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House proposed as conditions of those concessions that the monopoly should be to some extent abandoned. When perhaps the largest of all these concessions was propounded to Parliament, in the year 1884, the Minister of Finance, then Minister of Railways, felt that it was necessary for him to deal with this question even at that time, and he dealt with it in the language which is quoted in these resolutions—language which he has endeavored to-night to narrow down to the expression of a hope, but which certainly was more accurately characterised by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), in the language which he applied to the hon. gentleman's words. Plain men, such as an elector of Canada, could draw no other inference than that which the hon. member for Selkirk says the people of his constituency and of his Province did draw from the language of the Minister of Railways. What did he say?

"I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

Sir, that is not the expression of a hope or an expectation. It is a positive pledge that upon the happening of an event, which was expected to happen within a few short months, the policy of disallowance would be abandoned and the Province of Manitoba would be restored to its constitutional rights and its constitutional freedom which had been up to that time improperly abridged. Thus you see that the solemn pledge given to Parliament in 1880, at the time of the contract, that the Legislature of Manitoba should not be checked, was departed from afterwards, was reiterated in the year 1884, upon an occasion when a great demand was being made upon the liberality of Parliament at the instance of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that the declaration of the hon. Minister had much to do with the success of his proposal which he then laid before the House. I do not hesitate to say that his declaration that that boon was about to be given—not to the people of Manitoba alone, because I agree that this is not a Manitoba question in itself at all, but is to be considered in the common interest—that the declaration which he made as to the restoration to that Province of its constitutional rights and of the benefits of competition, helped him very much, as he expected it to help him, to carry his measure. He carried his measure and he broke his pledge; and he now proposes to us an indefinite continuance of that disgraceful state of affairs. Now, Sir, what the Government is asked is at once, without further delay, to fulfil those reiterated pledges to Parliament. What the Parliament is asked to do is to see that the pledges made to itself are observed and maintained; that to the Province of Manitoba are restored its constitutional rights and the care of its material interests, and that to the whole of Canada is restored the better, the sounder, the wiser policy which is involved and implied in the reversal of the policy hitherto maintained on this subject. Now, Mr. Speaker, the North-West and Canadian Pacific Railway policy of this Government for the last eight years has been a very large part of its whole policy. It has filled the minds of the people of this country to an extent equal, perhaps, to all the other branches of the policy of the Government, including its fiscal policy. It has involved an expenditure on capital account for the North-West and the Canadian Pacific Railway policy of somewhere about \$80,000,000. And

that policy was so important, so far-reaching, materially and politically, was based, was recommended to Parliament, and was adopted by Parliament, upon the faith of calculations, and of pledges, and of predictions made by the Government at the time in each Session in which they recommended to us to pursue the course which, at their instance, we adopted. These calculations, these pledges, these predictions of theirs, have lamentably failed, and the condition of the North-West to-day affords a satisfactory contrast to their pictures of that promised land, as it was to be under their guidance and their policy. To-night a mild admission was made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that the roseate picture had not been altogether realised, but that mild admission, though it is something to have obtained from his lips, even such a mild admission of failure, does not answer the exigencies of the case. It is not that the roseate dream has not been altogether realised; it is that the roseate dream has not been realised at all. It is that it has been an utter mistake, a strong delusion and a lie. Now, to reach a right decision upon this question to-day, it is necessary, particularly after the mild admission of the hon. gentleman, that we should glance for a moment at the contrast. It was in the year 1880, seven years ago, that the policy of expansion began, and the grounds for it were then stated. Those of us who sat in this House then will remember the tall talk in which the First Minister and the Finance Minister, then Minister of Railway, indulged upon those occasions. They backed each other up; they vied with one another in altitude and in amplitude of statement, and one of them said that the other erred only in the moderation of his language. Many of the members of the Ministry, I have observed, have been commemorated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Their names adorn stations on the line. I see Chapleau, and Caron, and Bowell, and Langevin, and Tilley. They stretch all along the line. Odd to say, that one of the very best friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway does not appear in that particular relation, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Pope), who everybody will acknowledge, is a good friend to them; he does not show up.

Mr. DAVIES. There ain't nothing to it.

Mr. BLAKE. But the Minister of Railways has had the satisfaction of receiving a certificate from an unexceptional source, a source which might have been still higher than it is but for unforeseen circumstances. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) wrote of the hon. gentleman in reference to a transaction, in which he said the honor and faith of the Government were involved, in these words:

"I must confess, however, that I had not the same faith in his acting Minister, who certainly seemed to me then, as he has ever since then, to be acting as the friend of and in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Notwithstanding this certificate so well deserved, as we all know, the Minister of Railways does not show up as the proprietor of one of the stations by name, but the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) is a practical man; nay, he is an international man. He prefers, perhaps, some other memorials; his name may not be blazoned upon a station, indeed, but it may, perhaps, in some corporate capacity, be imbedded in a contract, and be found recorded in the quiet annals of a short line. But whatever may happen to him, the two principal composers of these works of Confederation, by which we were deluded into the course we took for the last seven years, the First Minister and the Finance Minister, deserve, no doubt, as certainly I find they have received, a still more exalted memorial than being honored by giving a name to a station on the line. It was yesterday I found it in the report of the Department of the Interior, whose officer describes in vivid words the Rogers' Pass in British Columbia:

"The pass is narrow, only affording room for the creek and railway, and on each side rise stupendous mountain masses, that on the south side being Mount Macdonald, towering over a mile with almost perpendicular wall above the track, while on the north side rises Mount Tupper to nearly the same height."

Mark the accurate appreciation of the fitness of things. Both are high, but Mount Tupper is not yet quite as high as the companion mountain. But, Sir, I find also that exalted as are these two memorials, there are two elsewhere which dominate even them, for, if I rightly understand the topography of mountain peaks, there are to be found elsewhere and higher still Mount Stephen and Mount Sir Donald. Once again, I commend the admirable proportion of things which has been realised, and it is fit revenge for a long and a happily buried past. I see that the Canadian Pacific Railway's report of the other day speaks most hopefully of the prospects of developing the mineral resources of the region to which I have been referring. I am sanguine enough, I confess, to share these hopes of the proprietors of the line, and even to indulge in some peculiar to myself. I venture to hope that there may be found yet in these mountains what is a prodigy in mountains, if not a prodigy in men; I venture to hope yet that on the face and cheeks, and head and front, of each of these twin peaks may be found extensive veins of composite matter—extensive veins of brass. It will make the parallel still more complete, as is shown to-night, when we see the hon. gentlemen so cool and so calm under the beneficial process of a contrast between what they have told us for the last seven years and the actual result of the wretched policy which they induced the country to agree to. Now what was this policy, and upon what was it founded? What were the promises which these gentlemen made, which, the hon. gentleman says, have a little faded in the washing? The basis of the policy was brilliant. There were 250,000,000 of acres of the most fertile land under the sun, a sun which dealt so kindly with that favorite soil as to leave it but little vexed with unkindly droughts and summer frosts, and gave assurance of regular, repeated and unparalleled crops of No. 1 hard. Then their policy, they declared, was to produce the actual settlement by the year 1890, within eleven years, of which over seven have now gone by, of 34,640,000 acres of agricultural lands in that country. Such was the statement of the hon. the First Minister which the hon. the Minister of Railways thought was rather erring on the safe side. How many acres of agricultural lands will they allege have been settled within the last seven years? I do not mean speculated homesteads, but settled for good, and how many will they now estimate for the remaining four years of that eleven years' term? It is needless to discuss the subject. We know that that promise has most lamentably and egregiously failed. Then they declared—and here the Minister of Finance took up the parable—that the North-West was a huge wheat farm. The hon. gentleman delighted and instructed those of us whom he did not amuse and astonish by a calculation by which he showed that one hundred thousand farmers in the North-West would produce 640 millions of bushels of first class wheat in a year. What has the profit been? What has the export been? What are the prospects compared with the statement of the hon. gentleman? Is it not now admitted that it will not do to turn the North-West into a wheat farm? Have not the most experienced persons been advising the settlers for some years to reject that treatment, and to adopt mixed farming as the proper course to be taken in the North-West? Will anybody seriously repeat, will the hon. the Minister himself seriously repeat, as a thing fit to be entertained, as a subject to form an argument in a deliberative assembly, that one hundred thousand farmers in the North-West can produce 640 million bushels of wheat in a year? Then they declared that the agricul-

Mr. BLAKE.

tural land sales for these eleven years would, by 1890, give us \$38,600,000 actually received in cash, and \$32,700,000 secured and as good as the wheat, or in all \$71,300,000; and the expenses of surveys and of administration were to be \$2,400,000, which, being deducted by them, as prudent men making such calculations ought to do, left a handsome balance of \$69,000,000 as the produce of the agricultural lands of the North-West to the country by the year 1890. Their gross receipts, including the scrip, including the speculative and other sales made during the boom, their gross receipts from the agricultural lands of the North-West seem to have been between four and five millions in the first seven years of this eleven years' term, and the later receipts smaller than the earlier receipts. Their net receipts have been only nominal, after you deduct the costs of survey, of administration, and the head office expenses, and that without taking into account a shilling for the expenses of the Territory, such as mounted police, Indians, immigration, territorial government and improvements; and besides all this we have paid out over ten millions in solid cash to buy more of the lands that we cannot sell. That is the comparison between the statement as to land sales and the results. So late as the year 1883, they produced calculations that we would receive, not now from the agricultural lands but from these and all other sources connected with lands in the North-West—forest, grazing, timber and mineral—between 1883 and 1890, fifty-eight millions of dollars in cash, and that they would make ten millions out of colonisation companies, and a very large number of more millions out of the land grants to the local railways. Now, that was the state of things as late as 1883. These predictions have wholly failed. Who dares estimate to-day large net receipts out of the North-West lands within any appreciable time at all? They affirmed that the land sales of the North-West would repay the expenses of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would so cost the country nothing, that our debt would not be increased nor would our taxes be heightened, and so late as 1883, the Minister of Railways said that his colleague, the then Minister of Finance, would have the satisfaction of proposing a decrease in the public taxation and in the public debt, as Mr. Childers was doing in his budget, besides constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. Who dares to say to-day that the seventy millions and interest, apart altogether from eastern expenditure, which the railway has cost, can be met out of the net North-West lands, or that our debt and our taxes have not been largely and permanently increased by the construction of the railway? Have we not heard an argument this evening—has not the Minister of Railways pointed to the Public Accounts with triumph—the record of his shame—has he not pointed to the fact that there are seventy-one millions expended there, and called upon the east to be unjust to the west because it had been at this cost which up to this time he has been declaring to us the west itself was to bear out of the sales of its lands. In the year 1880, they gave us figures as to the immigration, which the hon. the First Minister delivered, and which his backer, the then Minister of Railways, declared erred only on the side of moderation—figures of immigration in a progressive series for the eleven years commencing with 1880, which would result by the year 1886, allowing for the initial population and a small allowance for the natural increase, in our having a population of between 370,000 and 380,000 whites in the North-West by 1886, and by the year 1890 would result in 680,000 whites being in the North-West; and they asked us to act, to adopt their policy, to agree to the expenditure, upon the pledge that these moderate estimates would be fulfilled or more than fulfilled. After that year, 1880, and very shortly after, they hastened the railway construction, they promoted the era of boom and speculation which took place in

the North-West. They made an enormous, and at an earlier period, an entirely un contemplated immigration expenditure, and they declared that their policy of increased vigor was resulting and would result in their predictions of 1880 being far more than realised, and realised far earlier. In the four years from 1881 to 1884, they actually told us officially that 148,000 immigrants had settled in the North-West—no longer an estimate, but it was the declaration of a fact, that 148,000 had settled between 1881 and 1884 alone. But by the last reports there are only, all told, about 125,000 whites, as the result of the old settlement, of the immigration previous to 1881, of the immigration between 1881 and 1884, and of the subsequent immigration up to the period of the census. This, a mere fraction of the estimate, has resulted from all these things and from the natural increase besides; and beside all this, though the papers are not yet brought down to enable us to verify the fact as to Manitoba, yet, allowing the same result in Manitoba as is indicated by the census for the Territories, of these it may be conjectured that only about 50,000 come from abroad. The rest was a mere transfer of population from one part of the Dominion to the other, but not an accession to our total population; and that is the net result of the enormous expenditure which we have made in immigration and in other particulars for the development of the North-West. Why, Sir, by these accurate calculations of theirs, the immigration for last year was to be 55,000, for the present year 60,000, for the next three years 210,000. Who now pretends that these figures, or anything approaching these figures, will be realised, or that the predictions—nay, I go further—these statements of what had occurred, were anything else than grossly inaccurate? They declare, Sir, in the general, that they would show us within these few years, a powerful, a numerous, a thriving, a wealthy and contented population, making a new Province, and the material for many more Provinces, for Canada, their creation adding to our material, adding still more to our political and national strength, helping to bear our burdens, and to carry onwards our destiny, and uniting it to us by those bonds of affection and common interest which would have resulted from the realisation, no doubt, of their dreams. Now, what are the facts? The facts are that you have there some six score thousands of whites, who are struggling, who are discontented, and who are calling on you to-day for relief, who are asking you to-day for the liberty to live and to prosper. Now, how comes this contrast, the record of which hon. gentlemen, unmoved, hear? It comes, no doubt, from the gross exaggeration of the picture they presented. No doubt it was very largely, as I pointed out at the time, an exaggeration of all the possible hopes for the North-West that sane and prudent men could entertain, and, therefore, a portion of this contrast is due to that exaggeration. It comes largely from their blunders, their maladministration, and the faults of their general and local policy. On these I do not intend to say a single word, nor to enter into the enumeration of them to-night, except with reference to that particular branch of that policy which forms the subject of the present motion. That is the question of that portion of their policy which involves the keeping of the North-West in bondage to one railway company. Now, it is time that the truth should be heard and should prevail in this matter, and the truth is that the North-West requires relief in order to its having a chance, a fair and reasonable chance, to succeed. I have heard statements made from the other side, which, if they had been volunteered from this side of the House would have been denounced as treasonable—that there have been two frosts and a drought; that there have been failures of crops, and that this has caused all the difficulty; that there has been a rebellion; and that all these circumstances were entirely beyond the control of the

Government. No doubt, Sir, the drought was beyond their control, though I remember when my statement as to a particular portion of the southern part of the territory, that it was inferior to another part in view of the want of water supply, was stigmatised as something very wrong, very untrue, and calculated to damage the prospects. Still, I hear from one hon. member opposite that there has been a drought, and that there has been two summer frosts for two years, and that there has been partial failures of three consecutive crops, at any rate. We must all deplore that unfortunate conjunction, and I earnestly hope that the prospects which are at present bright in the North-West for a good year, may be realised to the full. I am glad to hear that the prospects, so far as the appearance of the crops goes, and the rainfall that has taken place, are such as to lead us to hope for that good year for which the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) hopes. I should not be at all surprised if there was a good year and that it would produce an abundant crop, which we all desire, and which I am sure the people of that country want, and I hope the expectations of the hon. member for Selkirk will, to some extent, be realised, and that the people will cease to be so uneasy and anxious as they now are. But we must remember that where there have been frosts and droughts, these may possibly recur. We must remember that they have no immunity there, any more than any other part of the world, from these contingencies, and that the people of that country are entitled to be treated by us as a people who are exposed to these contingencies, and whose prospects of success are to be reckoned with regard to those contingencies; and, therefore, we ought to see that we do what we can to enable them to profit as much as may be from a good crop, and to stand, if they have the misfortune of a bad one, as well as they may against that misfortune. I have always regarded this question of railway accommodation and rates for the North-West as the cardinal question, as the cardinal material question. Several years ago I pointed out in this House that the great question in that country would be cheap freights, that the fight of the North-West farmer was a fight against time and space, against a short season and a distant seaboard. I pointed out, seven or eight years ago, though the prospects then seemed dim and remote, perhaps, but sufficiently clear, that large additional areas would be brought under cultivation and within reach of the main market of the world, altering the condition of the wheat supply for exportation altogether, and affording the prospect of a long period of low prices for that commodity. I showed, therefore, that with reference to the peculiar local position of the North-West farmer, and with reference to the prospect of the wheat market of the world, the success of the North-West was vitally bound up in the question of cheap rates. In the month of December, 1880, and in the month of April before December, I dealt with some of these questions. At that time the proposal of the Administration was not the handing over of the road to a company; the proposal was Government construction, and of course many of the questions which were raised by the subsequent change of policy did not exist. But at that day, Sir, in view of those rosy pictures which hon. gentlemen presented, I pointed out some of the difficulties which would beset the North-West farmer. I said:

“He has to build his house, he has to build his barn, and to fence his land; he has got to get his implements and his animals, and to maintain his family—in the homely parlance of our country, he has ‘hard scratching’ before him for some years. It is true that the prairie has very great advantages in some respects. It enables you, if you have capital and can lay out money, to fence in and sow very much earlier, and to raise very much sooner. But on the other hand, the scarcity of timber and so forth renders the material required for the house, and the barn, and the fences dear, and that is what, I have no doubt, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) meant, when he spoke of the initial difficulties of the settler in the prairies of our North-West, as compared with those of the wooded country. I expect to be called unpatriotic because I tell a few plain truths, but those who are so loud in

this kind of denunciation may go on. I believe it is not patriotic to be dishonorable. I believe it is not honorable to present false views of one's country to immigrants or others. We should not overstate, but fairly state the position and situation of the case."

I further said :

"It is quite true that in early years he will not have home manufactures, but these years will be the hard years for the settlers. They are the years in which it would be vastly important for his welfare to have, I will not say home-made goods, but cheap goods, to be allowed to purchase the necessities of life at the cheapest rate, and in the market that gives the greatest satisfaction. But you encourage him in this way : You tell him that we have established a tariff wall, by which you must buy in old Canada, at our prices, what you require in the North-West. The large expenditure due to the increased price of goods will diminish the settler's narrow and limited purchasing power, and will in effect render him subject to a rate of taxation so high as to interfere with his comfort and advancement."

Also :

"Now, Sir, I for one have no wish to prevent any expenditure which is essential for the settlement of the country. I wish the House to understand that that is, at any rate, no part of my policy. On that subject, as I have said, the die is cast. Most of us believe that we have a prospect there, and I want all to unite in the effort to realise the prospect. I think even those who do not believe it to be so bright as others do, will agree in making the effort. I wish that we should direct our exertions to every step calculated to make the best of that country ; to settle it at the earliest day, to give it as soon as possible a productive population and to make it a prosperous and influential portion of the Dominion."

When December came, when the contract came before us, I showed repeatedly the danger to which the North-West was involved in this connection. I adverted to the early experience of the United States. I am not one of those who tell you that they have a paradise there or that Canadian railway monopolists, or railway proprietors, act upon any different principles from the American railway monopolists and the American railway proprietors. I said then, as I say now, that they act upon the same principles ; they are going to make the most out of the property they possess, out of the rights and privileges confided to them. Human nature is the same on each side of the line ; the same principles will be found acting under the same conditions. I pointed out the course taken by practical monopolies on the other side of the border. I pointed them out as a warning to us. I inveighed against the proposal to make a gigantic monopoly in this country. I showed, feebly but as well as I could, the results of such a policy. I pointed out the advantages for us of our great interior system of water communication and the Sault connection. I pointed out that that would secure to us the North-West trade, not only Canadian but American as well. I showed the possibilities open to us by means of our own railway, which we were then about completing at the public expense, from Selkirk to Port Arthur, a continuous railway and lake navigation, and I implored Parliament not to throw away all those advantages. Speaking on 14th December, 1880, I said, among other things :

"I know that, in the prairie country, we are told that ten miles on each side of a railway will support a railway. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe it to be true, but what makes it true ? Why it is the rates they charge. It is because they are landlords of the area of twenty miles. That is the reason it is profitable, and unless you have given them power to exact those extortionate rates, they will not have the great interest to which I have referred, to get settlers on their lands.

"Oh, it would never do, after you pay them a price and a half for building the road and give it to them, and allow them to take whatever they please for fares and freights—it would never do to allow any one else to build south or south-west. No ; they must be protected in their vested rights, and there is a prohibition for twenty long years that no one else can construct any line which shall go south or south-west of any line which shall go within fifteen miles of that abominable boundary. But they may go themselves ; they only may touch it, they can do no harm. They are the country, they are the Government, and, of course, they can do no wrong ; but all the rest of us are prohibited solemnly, by the Parliamentary contract, which binds our descendants as well as ourselves ; binds all those who may be induced to go into the North-West ; declares that in the constitution of any new Provinces to be created out of that vast territory there shall be inserted a constitutional provision divesting the inhabitants of that country of the right to build railways wherever they may think advantageous to them, and leaving them to the mercy of the Syndicate. They have the absolute

Mr. BLAKE.

right ; you cannot restrict them ; you cannot say others can build with the consent of Parliament, for the Syndicate have the absolute unconditional right to build in a way from which everybody else is absolutely excluded. Now, there is in this a practical monopoly of the trade of the North-West Territory secured by law for at least twenty years, and it probably means *in perpetuum* to this corporation.

"Within a few years past the people of the neighboring Republic, having the greatest development of railway enterprise in the world, having, I suppose, in round numbers, some 90,000 miles of railway running there, have had the opportunity of knowing, and, by sad experience, do know, what the difficulties and evils are which are incidental to these great benefits to humanity, railway corporations and railway enterprises. The peculiar circumstances favoring with us, the growth of the evils of monopoly, render it still more necessary that we should see what those evils are which are experienced elsewhere, and devise some means of averting them instead of blindly going on as if there were no evils, or as if there were evils that were not capable of being averted. Sir, these people will become the landlords of the North-West. They will take such a share of the profit of every farmer in the North-West as they choose to demand, consistently with there being any stimulus on the part of that farmer to raise grain for the market. They are not entitled to ask, Sir, for the privileges given to men who build railways at their own risk. They do not occupy that position. You are giving them the money to build up a monopoly of trade, and giving them statutory security for that monopoly, and you are bound to restrain them. Their exceptional position obliges you, if even the general evils did not, to restrain them. Talk to me of this thing standing. It will not stand. If you pass this law, and if the country of which you speak so glowingly is what you depict it, if its prospects of settlement are such as you hope they are, I say you are blighting these prospects by passing this law ; and if these prospects are measurably realised, notwithstanding the passing of this law, I say the people of that country would be less than men if they suffered such a law to exist. Talk of the immigration of Irishmen to the North-West. You are proposing to them to substitute the scorpion for the rod. You are proposing to those who are suffering under the tyranny of individual landlords, to expose themselves to the soulless tyranny of a gigantic corporation. You are telling them that their chance of profit is to depend on what this corporation thinks they ought to pay as tribute before they can take their produce to market.

"Now, Sir, it does seem to me that if it had not been for the wonderful productiveness and expansion of the North-West, the people could not have borne the taxation which the railroad companies have been imposing upon them, and as year by year the average fertility of the soil diminishes, as year by year the crop to the acre decreases, it will be found a burden which will compel a change by the act of Congress or some other power. It will be found a burden wholly intolerable to be borne very long ;—this control which these great railway companies have over that great country and over the agricultural interests of the great North-West. And while that state of things is existing in the neighboring Republic, while its people are groaning under the burden, while they are looking all around them for means to redress the evil with reference to existing corporations possessing vested rights, the Government of this country, blind to the lessons which the experience of the Republic teaches, proposes to extend and inaugurate that evil in a ten-fold more aggravated shape in this country. To what end is our splendid road to Thunder Bay ? To what end did we sink millions more than necessary to produce the extraordinary grades and splendid provisions with respect to curvature which exist on that road ? Why, was it not to cheapen the cost to the head of navigation and enable us to defy competition, having a good port, and being so circumstanced that we can take down freight a little cheaper, as we can from Prince Arthur's Landing to Montreal by the lakes, than they can from Duluth, and so beat them ? Was it not to invite farmers to the North-West by the statement : "Gentlemen, here is a country in which you have not got monopolist rates for freight charged, a country in which the Government itself, in order that you may have your freight down cheap, has built, at an expense entirely unnecessary for other purposes, a railway superior, perhaps, to any other except the Canada Southern, and capable of transporting your freight at the lowest possible rate ?" Sir, the grades and provisions as to curvature of that road are such, as you will learn from the report of the chief engineer last Session, as to enable us to take within a fraction of twice the paying load the average grades and curves would allow. It will, therefore, approximately carry freights at half rates. Approximately the cost for transportation will be one-half—I do not say actually one-half, because there are other circumstances which may require to be considered, but approximately it will take freights at very little more than half of the average rates. That is the means, that is the inducement you have to offer to the people of Manitoba and the North-West within a year or two. But, Sir, to whose advantage are these splendid grades ; to whose advantage is this magnificent railway constructed so that it can be run and worked very cheaply, and enormous trains twice the length of those on other roads can be brought down ? To whom is the gain to enure, if the practical result is to be that freight can indeed be carried down at a less actual cost and that you have only given a greater margin on the division of the profit on the crop to the railway company ? Then I must say it has been a very unprofitable expenditure. We are bound, in my opinion, by the most obvious duty to our country, to see that the singular advantages which the Thunder Bay road gives, of taking down the wheat of the North-West to the seaboard, and taking up the manufactures of the East to the North-West at moderate rates, shall be used not to give still larger profits to a railway company but to secure cheap transport to the public, whose money has paid for that road, and who

will have, for generations, to bear the burden of the interest due to it. Now, there are various remedies. Competition is, of course, an imperfect remedy, because the competitors may combine, but it is better than nothing. Look what it does between Chicago and New York! Look what it does between Chicago and Montreal! Contrast those distances and the rates on these lines with the rates where there is no competition, as in the case I have given you of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway. And remember that often, though there may be a difficulty in keeping up a competition, and though you cannot ensure that the competitors will not combine, yet the possibility of competition, and the knowledge that extortionate rates may lead to the building of other roads, is a check upon these corporations. But you prevent anybody, who is not in the interest of the Syndicate, from building at all in a way which will produce competition. You not merely do not secure but you prevent designedly the possibility of competition, and the hon. Minister seems rather to congratulate himself that he has secured a consolidation of interests with the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway Company, so that this very line of railway to Thunder Bay which the people of the North-West were looking for, and hoping for, and praying for is closed to them as a means of relief, and the Syndicate is to control every gateway to the North-West.

"Now, I have stated that this route is of vital consequence to Canada, irrespective of the North-West altogether. I say the prospects it opens to us are cheering in the extreme. I take as a point which is most reasonable, Glynndon, to which I have before referred, which is, if I remember aright, 132 miles to the south of the border and on the line of the Northern Pacific Railway. The distance from Glynndon to Montreal by the Sault would be 1,307 miles. A line by the Sault running down to South-East Bay, thence on to Brockville, and thence to New York, is the shortest line that can be obtained by any existing or even by any projected or reasonably devised means of communication. Therefore, if the traffic from that point to New York is going to take the shortest route it will come through our territory all the way from the Sault Ste. Marie to Brockville, and it will be 1,566 miles from Glynndon to New York, a saving of 299 miles. But if you suppose, as not unnatural, that the great railway companies *via* Chicago, which at present engross that trade, compete for such of it as is going to New York, and if you compare the distance from Glynndon to Montreal by our line with that from Glynndon by Chicago to New York, you will find that the latter gives a saving to Montreal of 299 miles. If you take Boston, rising in importance as a port, the shortest line to Boston from Glynndon would be down to Brockville, and it would be 1,600 miles, or 293 miles longer than the distance to Montreal. If you take the travelled route, by which the trade would most likely go, by way of Chicago, it is 1,662 miles to Boston; that is a saving in favor of Montreal of 355 miles. Then you must add the 250 miles saving in the ocean passage between New York and Liverpool and Montreal and Liverpool, and you will get, on the whole, in land and water, some 500 or 600 miles shorter distance from Glynndon by the port of Montreal than by way of the great Atlantic ports in the United States. I believe that is a controlling advantage. I do not assert that it would secure all the traffic against the gigantic competition, the determined competition, which would, no doubt, be exhibited in favor of the existing roads; but I have no doubt whatever that the Northern Pacific would desire, and it would be to their interests so to do, to take the traffic right along to the Sault Ste. Marie, which would give them 300 or 400 miles more of transportation over their own lines, and all the traffic that they could control would go there. It is also to the interests of St. Paul to send their stuff by the shortest route to market, and seeing we have the combined advantage of 300 miles of rail and 250 miles of water, we are bound, in my opinion, if only we act in time, and stretch forth our hands towards the future that is waiting us, to obtain it.

"The hon. gentleman opposite said last year in Montreal and Toronto, that he quite agreed that the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie line would be to the public interest, because it would give a short route to the North-West and could be presently used to get the American trade. I believe that if we can get the American trade we cannot but hold our own. Do you suppose that if you will go and take the trade for 300 or 400 miles south of the boundary, that the Canadian trade will go by other roads? Do you suppose they will not prefer to go that way when the Americans, from their business point of view, prefer to use it? Every man must believe, as the Minister does, that we will take the American trade by the Sault line, and we must believe that we will keep our own trade. My views upon this subject are maintained by the report of the engineer in the last Session. He pointed out in strong terms that both by land and water the route of this line was admirable; that the railway would command the traffic of all the country north of St. Paul; that was a cautious statement, and my belief is that it would take the traffic of a considerable area to the southward of St. Paul.

"We are interested in doing the best for the North-West, and we are interested in common with all in that. We are interested in the trade and commerce of the North-West, being taxed as lightly as possible, and why? Because we are paying millions every year to maintain the North-West; because it is our direct interest—the interest of all of us—to see the North-West self-sustaining as soon as possible; because its being self-sustaining depends upon a population getting in there and thriving after they have got in; and because their getting in and thriving afterwards depend upon traffic facilities being given in the earliest and best way.

Now, I can understand, even if I cannot sympathise with that sort of feeling which, in other circumstances, would be rather apprehensive of trade going south. I could understand the hon. gentleman's putting in a clause saying that no man should build a railway in a particular direction or within fifteen miles from the United States frontier unless

he belonged to the Syndicate; I could understand his saying that, if our conditions differed. But, since we have the key of the position, since when the stuff does go south, it must, by the laws of trade, find our shores again by the Sault Ste. Marie, since all that it goes away for is to come back again, since it can only go by another route at a manifest disadvantage, since by that line we are going to tap the American trade, I cannot understand the carrying to such an extraordinary extent the objection to using other people's lines for our own purposes as is implied in the suggestion that it is wrong to have a south-westerly line. I maintain that we will be able to control the traffic of the North-West legitimately, and I do not want to control it in any other way. I do not believe we have the right—speaking for posterity, speaking for the future of a country which you say contains 250,000,000 acres of fertile and habitable land—a country which contains such an area of fertile and habitable land that the largest of our Provinces shrinks into utter insignificance in comparison—we have no right to say, still less have we the right to expect, that the commercial prosperity of that country shall be kept dependent on any other consideration than what will be to the highest advantage to the producers and consumers of that country—what will give them the cheapest route to market. But it is our good fortune that their and our interests will harmonise, because we cannot only give them the cheapest route to market, but we can point out to them that their cheapest route to market takes their stuff to our own ports, and takes their imports from our own ports.

The problem, which of the two agencies, rail or water, will win in the competition for transportation, may be said to be in doubt. The actual cost, not including profit, to take the grain from Selkirk to Thunder Bay, 400 miles, would be on an average road 4 cents. I have already said that you can double freights on that railway, and, therefore, you may fairly count the rate of actual cost at 2½ cents, making no allowance for profit at all. It is pretty clear, I think, from what information I have been able to gather, that you can freight the grain in large vessels on Lake Superior at from 1½ to 2½ cents from Prince Arthur's Landing to Goulais Bay, the smaller sum being the actual cost, and the larger one embracing a profit; and the average rate from Goulais to Montreal is 6½ cents, making a total of 10½ cents. If you go by the lakes, you pay 2½ cents to Thunder Bay and thence to Montreal 7 cents, making a total of 9½ cents for actual cost exclusive of profit, so that at present both routes are nearly equal, and at present both routes are very good if only you resolve not to hand over those advantages which you have bought and paid for to others that they may profit by them, instead of your countrymen."

From these extracts hon. members will discern that the propositions I then presented are the propositions which I maintain to-day. I showed that we could give the new settler cheap rates from Winnipeg, or as far west as we built the prairie line, right down to Montreal, and what I asked was, that we should not abandon that power of so promoting his prosperity. During that debate we offered various amendments to the proposition before the House. We offered amendments with respect to the Sault line, with respect to the monopoly clause, with respect to controlling immigration and with respect to those avenues west and south of the North-West, those gateways, one then constructed and another almost constructed from Winnipeg to Pembina and from Selkirk to Port Arthur, and the right to keep them open by the Government and give running powers to other corporations should be preserved. Our general line was met by argument, our amendments were rejected; but the proposition as to the danger of a monopoly, and with the existence of a monopoly by which the western country and Canada at large were being hampered, was disputed by hon. gentlemen who sought by argument to minimise those dangers; and they suggested to us two reliefs. The first was the Hudson Bay route. The Minister of Finance, who was then the Minister of Railways, brought that forward. There was no monopoly, he said, because there is a line open to Hudson's Bay, an excellent line it is, and so forth. Now, I have not yet been able to find in the documents that I have read, with respect to that proposed route between the interior of the North-West and Liverpool, evidence which satisfies me of its ultimate feasibility as a successful mercantile operation, but, notwithstanding that, I have always here and elsewhere supported the proposition of the people of Manitoba and the North-West that they were entitled to generous consideration from the Parliament of Canada to enable them, if they could, to carry out that project. I thought that it was the least we could do for them, strangled as they were by our general policy, to afford them a chance which they might

think was open to them for relief. And this I did, although it was very clear indeed that should the scheme succeed, its consequences would be such as to blight the hope of many eastern traders, inasmuch as short and successful steam communication by rail and water, between Winnipeg *via* James' Bay and Liverpool, would mean that the wheat would go that way and a large proportion of goods would return that way, and that the direct trade which it was hoped to create between the older Provinces and the North-West would be to a very large extent prostrated. I thought we had no right, selfishly, to say: We refuse you this method of relief. But since, by the combined operation of the charter and the Government policy, we were prohibiting them from getting access to the south, I thought the least we could do was to help them out by this method of relief. But neither the Government of the day, nor the Hudson Bay Railway Company, ever opposed any obstacle to that Hudson Bay route. Anxious as they were for competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they rather favored than otherwise the Hudson Bay route. Why so? I may be rather uncharitable, but I have a suspicion that a red herring was being drawn across the trail. What they feared was a continuous and persistent looking for a southern avenue on the part of the people of that country, and they were very glad, believing that nothing would come of the Hudson Bay route, that they should turn their attention in any other direction than that of Pembina; and, therefore, they said: Go on, gentlemen, build a railway to James' Bay; get your steamers, and all is well so long as you turn your eyes away from the south. That was the first proposal made to the country as modifying the proposition that we were creating a great monopoly adverse to the general interest and prosperity of the North-West. The second was, that we were overstating the case because the proposal that was made to us was not to create a monopoly in so far as the old Province of Manitoba was concerned, but that it was confined to the Territories and that old Manitoba was not to be, as she could not be, checked. Now, as I said in the opening of my remarks, for what purpose was that statement made? Was it not made in order to point out to the House that Manitoba would go that way, and might go that way, and should, if she pleased, go that way? Can it be said to be inconsistent with candor or honor, or good faith, that a statement of that kind should be made, if there were a mental reservation in the mind of the maker of it, that he was about to use the executive power which was in his hands to check Manitoba in going that way, to prevent her from using the power which he had just declared that Parliament should not check. Did not candor and honor and good faith demand that a statement made at that time, under those circumstances, with that object, should be accompanied with the statement: but of course we do not intend to allow that; true, Parliament cannot prevent them but we, the executive, will prevent them from building a railway to the south. Now, Sir, it was on these assurances that Parliament acted and passed the contract. I say that it would be a fraudulent evasion of the statements and pledges which were then made to argue that the executive of this country, whose policy is under the control of the Parliament of this country, should the next day decide to nullify that measure of relief and freedom of action which they had just declared existed for the Province of Manitoba, and upon the faith of which the difficulties in that Province and the objections here had been largely met. Sir, the executive policy as I have said, is moulded by Parliament. Why, the matter is in the hands of Parliament to-day. I observe that the answer was made to the deputation, or to some persons who interviewed the Government on this subject, that they could not say anything because the matter was in the hands of the House. It is in the hands of the House. Let us pass an address to His Excellency to disallow the charter, and no

Mr. BLAKE,

doubt that charter will be disallowed, or, the Government will go out and another Government come in who will advise His Excellency to disallow it, and it will be disallowed. Let us pass an address asking that the charter be not disallowed and no doubt it will not be disallowed, else the Government will go out and another come in which will adopt that policy. The executive policy is the policy of a committee of this House; it is moulded and guided by the views of a majority of this House. Hon. gentlemen ought not to forfeit their convictions of the public duty in order to retain office; sometimes it is said they do, but if they do, that does not interfere with our control over matters of this kind. Nobody disputes the constitutional right of this House to pass this address; nobody disputes that it is constitutionally our right to advise that a particular course shall be followed and that, so advising, that course must be followed. I say it would be a shameful mockery to say that there was relief for the North-West by the suggested limitation, under the powers of the Parliament, of this monopoly clause, and to intend all the while that the cup shall be torn from the lips of the sufferers by those who pretended to present it. And yet that is what the hon. gentleman said. We said we could not check Manitoba, but we in our secret hearts intended all the while to check Manitoba, whether you liked it or not; though we acknowledge you are our very good masters, and though you direct the policy of the country, we intended all the while to do that which we told you we could not do. The Minister of Finance said this was an old policy; it was Mr. Mackenzie's policy. My hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has answered that statement pretty fully. I have pointed out, I think, that it was utterly immaterial. We take our stand upon the condition of things at the time the charter was granted. It was an entirely new condition. Mr. Mackenzie's policy was not a policy of disallowance or interference with a provincial right at all. Mr. Mackenzie's policy, so far as it was a policy of restricted action by this Parliament, with reference to the railways which should be chartered, was avowedly a temporary policy, pursued until the line should be finally located, and the plan and system for its construction arranged. Mr. Mackenzie's policy was a policy devised for and applicable to the then condition of things, which I have pointed out, and pointed also markedly to the fact that it was a Government work which was then under construction. But, as I pointed out in 1880, the whole condition of things is changed when you interpolate between the different sections of the community, no longer a Government and a Parliament, the guardian of all interests, but a private and separate corporate interest. The moment you propose to interpolate that, that moment new considerations of action arise. Let me illustrate it. You have two great national railways; one the Intercolonial Railway serving the eastern Provinces, worked by the Government and built by the Government. The other the Canadian Pacific Railway serving the great west, worked by a company though built by the country. Who pretends that the Intercolonial Railway rates are not duly looked after, with regard to the interests of those who pass along and use the line? Who pretends that the rates there are not low? Why, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in that speech in which he brought forward the telegram of the Minister of Finance, as to his new scheme for consolidating the local railways in the Lower Provinces, and making them one with that enterprise, pointed out what the results would be. And what were to be those results? Better service, lower rates of fare and freedom from railway taxes. Local taxes were to be abolished, lower rates and better accommodation were to be had the moment the Government acquired that line. The danger which the public, as a whole, has to guard against, in the case of a government railway, is that there will be too much accommodation and too low rates. The danger the public has to

guard against, in the case of a private railway corporation, is that there will be too little accommodation and too high rates. We had to deal with just the reverse state of things in Mr. Mackenzie's time from that which is created by this particular contract. Then we are told—it was repeated by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), and suggested time after time; in fact it was avowed at one time as part of the policy of the Government by one of its officers, and a very large portion of the spirit of the argument of the Minister of Finance was in that sense—we are told, in effect, that this will be a sort of breach of faith with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that suggestion is made by the president of that great corporation. I should be sorry, as I said before, to recommend, or suggest, or countenance anything approaching a breach of faith with the humblest or the greatest in the land. I cannot understand that it is any breach of faith whatever. Let us understand wherein this breach of faith consists. When was it? where was it? how was it? that this country agreed to disallow Railway Acts in Manitoba, in order to prevent competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway? Show me that; show me that Parliament agreed to it; show me that Parliament assented to that view; show me that that was a term of the contract! If you can, well and good; but nothing of the kind is shown. If there was such a bargain, it was a secret and a shameful bargain between a Minister of the Crown and the great corporation which they were dealing with. If there was such a bargain, it was a bargain which cannot be allowed or justified. If there was a private term or understanding of that kind between the Government and the company, they were bound to make it public when calling upon the House to ratify their bargain. We were bound to know every term and every fetter that they were binding on the country. Therefore, I repudiate the notion that there was any secret, which, I say, would have been a shameful and a disgraceful act. Well, it is stated that we are interfering with them. No, Sir, we are interfering with nobody. We are proposing that we shall cease to interfere with people. We are proposing that we shall cease unwarrantable interference with the Province in the exercise of its constitutional rights. We are proposing that we shall cease unwarrantable interference with the material concerns of those who, under our constitution, are entrusted with the authority of determining how those concerns may be conserved. It may be that those are prejudices, as the Minister of Finance suggests. It may be that the interests of the Province of Manitoba would be best conserved by their not building the railway which they wish to build, as the hon. gentleman suggests. Sir, we have no right to judge that for them. The constitution has given them the right to decide that for themselves, and we have no right to set ourselves up against their judgment. But we ask more than this. We ask that unwarrantable interference may end. We ask also that solemn and repeated pledges may be at length observed and fulfilled. We ask that the statement made at the time of the contract, the true meaning and understanding of which was developed and amplified without dissent from the ministerial benches to be merely as recited in this resolution—we ask that the reiterated pledge of 1884, made in the name of the Government by the Minister of Railways, may be granted. We believe that these views will in no sense interfere with the progress and prosperity of this country as a whole, but, on the contrary, that they will largely conduce to that progress and prosperity. It is suggested, indeed, that the result of such a change would be to promote a competition which, however beneficial it is to Ontario—and where is the Conservative from Ontario who wants to get rid of the competition of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway—can only be baneful in the west. Sir, I have read a little about railway rates, and have studied that confusing subject to some extent, and I quite admit that you have different rates under different circum-

stances; but either it will require a great deal more study than even the hon. Minister of Finance has given to this subject to justify the view that because he selects some particular rates in some quarter, therefore no benefit would ensue to the Province of Manitoba if competition were permitted. I have never said that the people of Minnesota had no grievances. On the contrary, in the very speech to which I have referred, I pointed out that they had great grievances. I never said that if it was possible to get capital to build another railway, therefore they would get competition; they would have the possibility of competition. But in this case you know you can get the competition. In this case the advantage—though doubtful in its character, no doubt, because of the possibility of the competitors combining—yet exists, and here results will be achieved which will produce an entirely different state of things—which will render the farmer of the North-West really prosperous in a good year and enable him to exist even in a bad year. At this very time the views I expressed in the early years of this great controversy, now extending over several years, have been realised. The company is practically the landlord of the North-West, and has practically the power of deciding what rates shall be charged and what proportion of the profits of the farm shall be exacted from those of whom it is the landlord. Now, I have an authority, and a very recent authority, which it is important to quote, with reference to the probable results of such an operation as is now proposed. It is pleasant to compare the ante-election and the post-election statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. The general election took place in the bulk of the Dominion the third or fourth week in February, but the North-West elections were delayed somewhat. In the anxious interval the hon. Minister of the Interior visited the North-West, and in Winnipeg he was addressed by some people on this subject, and this is what he said in reply:

"Should the decision of the Government be in the sense that the people of Manitoba evidently hope it may be, I am quite sure that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to hold its own in the competition to which it may be subjected. It occupies a position of special advantage over any other possible line to the south of it. It is shorter in mileage, and it is for its entire length under one management—an advantage the influence of which can hardly be overestimated. Moreover, competition, resulting in creating a new interest in the development of Manitoba and the Territory, would soon create new and enlarged trade. That has been the result everywhere. In Ontario, for instance, where the Canadian Pacific Railway has invaded territory which the Grand Trunk Railway Company was disposed to regard as its exclusive possession, the result has been to enormously increase the general traffic, an increase in which the Grand Trunk has become a sharer. Everyone must rejoice to see that the traffic returns of that railway to which Canada has been so much indebted in the past, are showing a steady weekly increase, and I think I am right in saying that that increase has come chiefly from Canadian freight and passengers. There will be trade enough in Manitoba and the North-West to afford profitable returns for both the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railways, if the latter should find entrance here, and it would be no small advantage to the country as a whole to have the large interests connected with these two great corporations enlisted in the work of developing the great west, instead of, as there is too much reason to fear has been the case in the past, as to one of them, devoted rather in the prevention of the development."

Now, Sir, do you want a better argument to meet the hon. Minister of Finance with than the statement of his colleague the Minister of the Interior delivered before the elections? He tells us that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be practically destroyed by the proposed competition—that there is not trade enough, there is no trade and there are no people; there is no necessity for another railway because there is nothing to move. He tells us that painfully and reluctantly, the Government as a whole, including his colleague the Minister of the Interior, are convinced that the public interest demands that the great difficulties and prejudices to flow to the whole country from competition, should be averted; and yet as late as March last the Minister of the Interior pointed out that if there were competition the Canadian Pacific Railway Company occupied a predominant position, that it had the shortest possi-

ble line, that it had the great advantage of being under one management, that the general result of competition would be an advantage to both the competing companies, that there was plenty of profitable trade for both, and that it would be no small advantage to the country that these two corporations should have entrance to the Territory. Can I be surprised that the people of the North-West supposed that the hon. Minister of the Interior rather favored the cessation of the disallowance policy? It is an uncharitable inference to draw from that speech? Is it uncharitable I should suppose he wanted the people whom he was addressing, and whom his words reached just before polling day, to come to a similar conclusion as to his views? And when did his views change? Did he think of these things then? If he did, how does he make them accord with the opinions which have been expressed by the mouthpiece of the Government to-night, the Minister of Finance? I, for my part, have always opposed the disallowance of charters in old Manitoba. I have always opposed the disallowance of charters as an unconstitutional interference with the rights of the Province; I have opposed them as a breach of the faith to which the country was pledged by the results of the discussions on the Canadian Pacific Railway contracts; I have opposed them since 1884 as a still further breach of that reiterated pledge; I have opposed them also in the general interests of the country which, to my mind, are bound up with this consideration, that if the North-West is to thrive and grow it must to-day thrive and grow because its people feel that they receive equal rights with the other Provinces; because its people feel that they receive equal justice with the other Provinces; because the moral effect, the effect outside of the circumstances of this monopoly, is itself destructive to the full chance of the emigration and settlement in this country; and because the practical effect of this monopoly and power is, and will be in the nature of things, no worse, but no better, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, than it will be in the case of any other great corporation. Man is not fit to be entrusted with despotic powers, and any departure from the rights and liberties, any departure from the attributes of a free people, is not merely derogatory to manhood, but is also calculated to lead to great practical and pressing dangers and deprivations. My belief is that the chances of the real development of the North-West, in which we all have a deep interest, largely depends on the reversal of the policy of the Government followed up to this time. I do not believe that with the tariff now placed upon goods the possibility of the goods going round in a double way by Chicago would enable American goods to enter. I do believe, on the other hand, that the possibility of reducing all rates on wheat and produce outbound, and on the consumptive goods which come into the country, is of the greatest consequence to the people of that country. My belief, hope and expectation is that the Sault Ste. Marie connection will be speedily made. I believe we will then have a fair prospect of attracting to us the trade of a very considerable portion of the American North-West as well as our own. I call your attention, Sir, to the fact that the Government of the country have said so and believe it. They, with my hearty approval, some years ago, released the Algoma Branch from its mortgage in order to enable the construction of the Sault line to be made, and I gave my approval in the hope and expectation that we would thus tap Minnesota, Dakota and northern Michigan. If we can tap the trade from a country two hundred or three hundred miles to the south of Manitoba, can we not retain our trade to the north? Is it possible that we can take the trade of the region which will feed the Sault from Duluth and yet not be able to retain our own trade, which must go 300 miles down to reach that latitude? That is out of the question. Therefore, the theory upon which the railway company, the Government and Parlia-

Mr. BLAKE.

ment act, the general opinion which Ministers and other public men have expressed, that there is a bright future for Canada of development by the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie line, is one which utterly destroys the opinion that we cannot retain the trade of the North-West. If it leaves us for a while at Emerson, it leaves us only to return at the Sault, and if it does not return it is only because of the exorbitant rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Against those some safety valve is required. Let us give it by no longer allowing the executive of the day to interfere with the constitutional rights of our sister Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can congratulate the House and the hon. gentleman on the cheering spirit in which he opened his remarks. He evidently was speaking under a certain sense of relief at being rid of a heavy load. We hear the hon. gentleman is resolved no longer to suffer under the painful servitude of having to obey masters, under the pretext of leaving them, and that now he is,—

"Free as nature first made man,
'Ere the base laws of servitude began."

Under this pleasant feeling that he was no longer obliged to work with uncongenial material, he broke out in a new place, if I may use the expression; and although the jests were rather prepared and smelt of the lamp, they were very cheerful, and I was delighted to hear the play of his language in which the hon. gentleman pointed out the very important fact that one station was called Chapleau and another by the name of some one or other of my colleagues. Well, our greatest victories and exploits are written on the face of this continent. I have a mountain called after myself; but if the hon. gentleman's railway policy had been carried out, no mountain would be called Blake in his time or in the time of the present generation; no stations would be marked across the continent with the names of hon. gentlemen opposite. If I remember rightly, we were told that we were building the railway far too quickly, that we might creep and crawl across the continent at the rate of 100 miles per year, if we were very expeditious and energetic and that more speed was in fact a mistake in politics, and a mistake in the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman, however, has not forgotten his theories, and has adopted his usual course of late years of repeating what he has said before. We always like to hear the hon. gentleman, but we would like to hear him say something new. However exquisite the language may be, however potent the argument, however pointed the sarcasm, yet sometimes these things get stale and pall on the public ear, and we have heard that speech—every man in the old Parliament has heard the same identical speech, in the same identical words the hon. gentleman has favored us with to-night. No, he has not favored us with it to-night; perhaps he began to think, on reflection, as he was speaking, that the repetition of those things would pall on our ear, however brilliant, so instead of imposing on us the repetition, he has handed it over to the reporters and the public. We have heard the old story of our exaggerated statements and the roseate pictures that we have drawn, and we were told by the ex-Minister of Finance, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that if the North-West Territories were not settled, it was because our railway policy was bad, our land policy was bad, and the laws affecting the North-West altogether were bad; and how could a country prosper, how could we expect people to go into that country with this series of mistakes and malefeasances on the part of the present Government? Well, as to our railway policy, we need not defend that. In 1878 and 1879 we pro-pounded that policy; the Parliament of the country adopted that policy; we went to the country in the elections of 1878 on that policy, and the country in advance

approved of that policy. We carried out in 1880 the pledges we had made to the people in 1878. We got up the syndicate, we made the contract with the millionaires, the contractors who built the road so successfully. We made that contract, and we were told our policy was altogether erroneous, that we were ruining the country, that our course was visionary and reckless, that the credit of Canada would be gone, that we were putting a mortgage on every man's farm, and that the children yet unborn would suffer in consequence of the recklessness of the policy which was ruining the credit and destroying the prosperity of the country. Well, we went to the country in 1882, and the country, not frightened by the gloomy forebodings of hon. gentlemen opposite, not frightened by the statement that the country was going to be ruined, but feeling confidence and faith in the future of the country, that confidence and faith of which hon. gentlemen opposite are utterly devoid, said that policy is correct, and said: God-speed to the carrying out of that policy to the utmost extent. Since 1882, we have gone on, we have increased the burdens on the people of the country, we have still further—as is said by hon. gentlemen opposite—mortgaged the resources of the country, and on the 22nd February last, the country gave its voice on that policy with no uncertain sound. The two questions that were discussed on every platform and on every hustings, the two questions which decided which party was to govern this country for the next five years, were: first, the National Policy, and next, the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, and we have got the voice of the country, the unmistakable voice of the country, that the Pacific Railway policy was the true policy. If ever a people in the world, if ever an electorate in any free country in the world pronounced on a question, one way or the other, it was when the country, by electing a majority to this House, declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway policy was the true policy, that it was a policy which was calculated more than any other to develop the resources of Canada. And strange to say, wherever we go, whether we go to New York or across the Atlantic; whether we go on the stock exchange, or go to Amsterdam or Paris, or Berlin, we find that that policy has been supported in the most practical way by all the securities of Canada—securities increased in amount by millions, in consequence of the expenditure on that railway—being more valuable to Canada than they were before a single sixpence, before a single cent was expended by our Government on the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have the endorsement of the whole of the capital of the world; we have the endorsement of the people of Canada, and we have the endorsement of the representatives of the people in this House, showing that our railway policy was the policy for the future. It is true that we have reason to regret, from the various causes that have been mentioned, that the expected population has not come into the North-West in such large proportions as we could have wished; but certainly it was not in consequence of our railway policy. Our railway policy opened that country to the immigrant, and, therefore, it could not prevent or deter the immigrant from going into it. It was not in consequence of our land policy. You have heard the speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), and it is merely repeating what was known to the last Parliament, and is known to the people, that the land policy of the Government of Canada, the land policy of the Parliament of Canada, the land policy approved by the people of Canada, is the most liberal land policy that exists in the whole of North America. Then our general laws are all bad. Why, the law which now governs the North-West is the law which was passed by the hon. gentlemen opposite during the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and, if the law is bad, the responsibility rests upon those gentlemen. But that law is not bad. The constitution, in the first place, which was given to that infant country, was a sufficient one

for its purpose. The adoption of the principles of English law, and the application of those principles to the circumstances of a new country, contained in that measure, were well considered, and that they were well considered is proved by the fact that we, during our eight years of administration, have not altered them in any material degree. So that, if the immigrants have not gone into that country, if the country has not been settled so fast as we could have wished, certainly it is not to any of those causes that this unfortunate position of affairs is to be attributed. But there is a reason, which has been alluded to, but not sufficiently pressed to-night, although the people of the country understand it. The great and the chief reason why that country has not been settled, is the persistent slander of that country by the hon. gentlemen opposite—by their persistently decrying that country. I see the hon. gentlemen laugh. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was not a member of Parliament in those days. Why, Mr. Speaker, you can remember—if I may be allowed to refer to the Speaker having been on the floor of the House except as Speaker—the debates which took place in those days; and my hon. friends on both sides, who were in Parliament at that time, can remember that it was said to be absurd for any people to go into that country when they had Kansas and Texas to go to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen say "no." I know they do not like to hear this, but *litera scripta manet*, and you will find it in *Hansard*, and in the days when there was no *Hansard* you will find it in the columns of the *Globe*. You will find that this country was systematically disparaged by those hon. gentlemen opposite. It was said that the immigrants should go to the older portions of North America. They should go where republicanism and all the benefits of republicanism had proved themselves so distinctly, that it would be absurd to suppose that the North-West could be filled up until the country to the south of us, equal in soil, superior in climate and having the whole of the United States at its back, was filled. And we all remember how these speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite were published as advertisements of lands in the United States. We all can remember the admirable likeness of the hon. member for West Durham, that was published in Chicago, in St. Paul and elsewhere, showing that this was the great man. I must admit that the great man is written on that hon. gentleman's countenance. But in order to make the thing sell, there was a portrait of the hon. gentleman put on the front sheet, and it had its effect. The hon. gentleman's speech and the hon. gentleman's picture taken together were irresistible. They might have resisted the picture, they might have resisted the speech, but with that speech delivered by a man having that countenance—why, they both together carried the whole country. But, Mr. Speaker, I am told by the hon. gentleman that there was a breach of faith in consequence of my having made a speech, a portion of which is set out in the resolution now before the House. Well, Sir, I did make that speech, every word of it, and I hold to it now. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that we were discussing a Bill before this Parliament, and which it was within our competence to pass, and I was asked the question whether the contract provided that the Dominion Parliament should not for twenty years pass any Act chartering a railway running to within fifteen miles of the boundary, or running in any direction south-west or west of south-west, and I said, yes, we can pass that. But will the contract, or will this Act, prevent the Province of Manitoba from passing any Act? I said, no. We have no power, we cannot do it, we cannot put it in the Act. The Province of Manitoba, like the Province of Ontario, or any other Province, has the power of passing Acts within their jurisdiction, and, therefore, we cannot in our legislation, we

cannot in that Bill that was then before Parliament, make any provision to put any check or control upon the legislation of any Province. That was what I said. That was common sense, and everybody knew it who did not wish to draw a sinister meaning from plain language, and everybody understood what I meant, which was that the Act was simply carrying out what we had a right to pass, and that we did not expect in that Act to pass any clause preventing any Province from exercising its power of legislation. Now, we have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen about the policy of the Government on the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether we were right or whether we were wrong in not listening to the warning. He told us his predictions. He is very glad to get up with the old woman's statement: "I told you so"; and he seems to rejoice whenever he can say that our policy has failed, that immigrants have not gone in, that our expectations about the future of that country have been fallacious. Oh, how he gloated over it. How the two gentlemen opposite belonging to the late Administration, gloated and rejoiced as if they had found a treasure, when they could say to us that our predictions were fallacious, much of the fallaciousness being caused by the course taken by the Opposition of that day, and, I am sorry to see, persisted in up to this moment by the same Opposition. The hon. gentleman says that we have been guilty of a great breach of faith, after the speeches made by my hon. friend who sits near me, myself, and by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. But, in the very beginning of the hon. gentleman's speech, he said: The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is mistaken; I would not take away a vested interest from either the greatest or the poorest man; I would protect those vested rights. But, said he, there may be cases with regard to those vested rights where, if the public interest demand it, those vested and vested rights should be overridden. The public interest must come first, and, of course, the private interest to be sacrificed must get compensation. Well, Mr. Speaker, why not apply that to a Province, as well as an individual? If the Government, and if Parliament, which has a check over the Government, believe that the general interests of the whole Dominion require that the private rights of an individual, or of a private corporation, or a public corporation, or a Province—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—I say, Mr. Speaker, that if they believe that the general interests of the whole Dominion require that the private vested interests should yield, why the public interest must be paramount, and the vested interests of individuals must be fully and to the last farthing compensated for. Now, Sir, I have not remarked in the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), nor yet in the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, that they addressed themselves to the resolution which is now before us. Our railway policy has been attacked, the faith of pledges has been spoken of, the rights of Manitoba have been dwelt upon, but the great question which this resolution brings before the House has scarcely been spoken to at all—certainly not by the hon. member for South Oxford, and very cursorily by the hon. member for West Durham. The question in this resolution is whether, under the circumstances, this Act which was passed by the Province of Manitoba, did not commit a great injury to the interests of the Dominion as a whole. That is the simple question—whether the Act passed by the Legislature of Manitoba, which was disallowed last year, was not an unmistakable injury, a great injury that could not be surmounted, to the interests of the Dominion as a whole. The Government made up their mind that the Act was injurious to the vital interests of Canada as a whole, and under their responsibility to Parliament, they recommended His Excellency to disallow it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Oh, but, says the hon. member for West Durham, this is despotism and there must be no despotism. Sir, there is no despotism in this country. The hon. gentleman said very truly that the Government of the day is merely a committee of this House. If the Government of the day acts improperly, it is liable to the censure of Parliament, and this motion is a direct censure upon the Government of the day. They have a right to say so, and the only consequence will be that the moment that it is said, the Provincial Legislature at its next meeting will pass that Act, and a new ministry here which will take the place of the old one that has improperly disallowed the Act, will at once advise His Excellency the Governor General to allow it to go into effect. The only consequence of the disallowance of an Act by the Administration is this: that it is liable to be reconsidered, to be reviewed, and to be approved of or censured by the representatives of the people at the very next Session of Parliament. This is the course adopted by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). He says we were wrong in disallowing that Act, he asserts that it was an improper policy and one that should be reversed. If this House thinks so, it will so express its opinion, and another Government will advise His Excellency the Governor General when Manitoba repasses those Acts, and they will be allowed to go into operation.

Mr. HESSON. Later on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Next Session. There is no despotism—

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman seems to have misapprehended me when I spoke of despotism. My remark was in respect to the despotism of the railway company, not of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The simple question for the House to decide is this: We are representatives of the whole Dominion, representing every Province from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to use a worn-out expression, and we are here to decide whether it was wise to allow the Province of Manitoba for a very natural, but we will say a selfish, purpose, to build railways to carry off the whole of the western trade of Canada from the great line of railway which at so much expense, and at so ruinous expense as hon. gentlemen opposite have stated, we have built for the purpose of securing one great line through Canadian territory from the Pacific, skirting our great lakes and carrying the riches of the great west, increased by the trade of Asia, of China and Japan, and ultimately of Australia, to our eastern ports. This great road, I say, will bring eastern traffic which has landed in British Columbia past Winnipeg, making it one of the greatest cities on this continent, past the Lake of the Woods and through the whole length of the great Province of Ontario, skirting Lake Superior and opening the mines of that vast region, and down to Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John. Every Province is interested in keeping that trade along the line, both going east and west. Every Province is interested in keeping that trade for ourselves, and no one knows better than hon. gentlemen opposite that the Pacific Railway charter would not have been granted, that the land would not have been given, that the money would not have been voted and the loans would not have been made if it had been understood by the representatives of the older Provinces that the money was to be expended on an enterprise which might be bled at one hundred different points, so that by the time the traffic arrived at Montreal, it would be a miserable fragment of the magnificent stream of commerce that we had a right to expect to pass through Canada from one end to the other. Every member of this House and every man in the country knows that the charter, and all measures for the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, would never

have become law if every member of Parliament had known that instead of opening a great empire for the eastern Province and a country where our children could settle, we were to benefit New York, Baltimore, Boston, Portland, Chicago and that our trade was to be diverted to those points instead of coming in a full stream to Montreal or Quebec. The House and the country know this. We believe we were right, we are sure we were right in disallowing an Act of that kind. If the representatives of every Province of the Dominion think we were derelict in our duty, and hold that we ought to have handed over the commerce of our great west to Duluth and Chicago they will say so. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said that the trade would go back to Sault Ste. Marie. The great interest of Chicago and the great railway interest would turn the stream far south of the Sault. New York, Boston, Baltimore, Portland and even as far south as the Mississippi would be the recipients of the great bulk of that trade, and while we had offered a fish we would have given a stone to the people of the Eastern Provinces. No; we are convinced our policy was right. We have confidence in it. We will, subject to the opinion of Parliament, not shirk from performing the same duty as representing the whole Dominion, and I am very much mistaken in this House, and in the people whom the members represent, if by an enormous majority our policy in the past and our avowed policy in the future shall not meet their hearty approbation.

Mr. DAVIES At this early hour of the morning I have no intention of inflicting a long speech on the House, and I do not think the flippant speech of the hon. gentleman, if I may say so without giving offence, on a subject which I think deserves a little more serious consideration at his hands, requires a very lengthy speech from me in reply. The lucid and convincing argument addressed by my leader requires no amplification at my hands. But one or two remarks fell from the hon. Premier which I do not propose to leave unchallenged. He has had brought home to him to-night, perhaps more clearly than heretofore, the fact that the promises he has made to the people of the North-West have not been fulfilled,—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have heard it one hundred times in this House.

Mr. DAVIES—and that the predictions of the hon. gentleman are as little likely to be fulfilled; that alike his predictions and his promises have been a failure. It has been made clear that neither with respect to immigration nor with respect to the trade which was promised to flow from the speedy construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, have the promises of the hon. gentleman been fulfilled, and the lamentable condition of the North-West, as pointed out by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is being brought home to his mind and to the minds of hon. gentlemen behind him, and the fact made clear that the policy in vogue in this country for the past three or four years of reckless expenditure, without regard to the ability of the people to pay, is one respecting which the people will require a halt to be called very soon. Sir, we are told that this policy of telling the truth about this country in the North-West is a policy of slander. I have heard it stated not only to-night, but for the four or five years during which I have been a member of Parliament, that we must not tell the truth about this country at all, that the facts are to be disguised. I took in my hand this evening a copy of a paper which, until a short time ago, was the organ of the right hon. gentleman himself. It is now released from party trammels, and says it is released from party ties, and I find that that paper, which for the past ten or twelve years was the mouth-piece of the hon. gentleman and the exponent of his views, when those ties and trammels are removed is itself able to tell the honest truth

about that country, sad though it may be. And, Sir, I will, with the permission of the House, read a paragraph or two to show what is the actual condition of things in that country at the present day—a condition of things which, if it is allowed to exist, will leave that country in a few years in a much worse condition than it is to-day; a condition of things which we think will be materially relieved and improved if the policy of repression which has been pursued by the government heretofore is altered, and the people are allowed to govern the country, as they should be allowed, according to the rights which the constitution gives them. Speaking of Manitoba, the *Mail*, of Thursday, 26th May, says:

“The census shows that numbers have already abandoned the country, and there is reason to believe that the exodus this year is of unprecedented proportions. The *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, of the 21st instant, contains a letter from its Bottineau, Dak., correspondent, who happens to be a Canadian, in which it is stated that no fewer than sixty settlers from Manitoba have moved into his district alone since 1st April, bringing with them 198 horses and cattle, together with farm machinery and household goods valued at \$22,400, all of which, of course, were admitted duty free. The correspondent adds that ‘an almost unbroken stream’ of emigrants from Manitoba is crossing the boundary into Dakota and Minnesota; and, we regret to say, his story is corroborated by the testimony of residents in Manitoba who cannot be suspected of trying to injure that Province.”

That is a sad picture of this bright land of promise of which we have heard so much during the past few years—a picture not drawn by any of those dreadful Grits who sit on this side of the House, but a picture drawn by the paper which, until the other day, was the recognised organ of the right hon. gentleman, edited by the same gentleman then as now edits it, and a paper from which we at least may suppose, in speaking of matters outside of party politics, we will receive facts and statements that may be relied on by the people. If these statements are true, does the hon. gentleman suppose that they are to be answered by a speech such as he delivered to-night, a speech in which, with all due deference to him, I say that he begged the entire question before the House, and in which, with the exception of the few remarks at its close, wherein he stated that the Government had nailed their policy to the mast, he hardly referred to the resolutions at all. I regretted very much to hear the right hon. gentleman make that statement. He stated to-night, with regard to the pledge he had given in 1880, when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was passed through this House, that no man in his sane senses could imagine that he gave the pledge which we supposed he had given, which the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate said they believed he had given. For myself I can put no construction upon his language except the construction put upon it by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Premier said at that time:

“In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament; we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence.”

There was no inference could be drawn from that language used by the hon. gentleman but that he did not intend, either in his position as member of Parliament, or as the head of a committee of Parliament, as Premier, to check Manitoba if it legislated in that direction. Parliament could not check Manitoba, nor could the executive check Manitoba unless they acted in a manner at variance with the views which the hon. gentleman laid down there. But to show how those views were interpreted at the time, as I interpret them now, not by his opponents but by his trusted lieutenants, I need only refer to the language made use of a few days afterwards, in the course of the same debate, by the present Minister of the Interior, who put his construction on the language of the First Minister, and explained and am-

plified it to the House, and told what the First Minister did mean in stronger and clearer language than he employed himself. He said:

"The only guarantee which this company has under the contract, is that the traffic shall not be tapped far west on the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line. But there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. That is the position with respect to this matter."

That is the understanding which his own followers formed at the time of the pledge made by the right hon. gentleman, and I will undertake to say that there is not a gentleman who listened to those two hon. gentlemen speaking, or one outside this House who read their speeches, but came to the conclusion that the policy of the Government was to leave the people of Manitoba to exercise their constitutional rights to charter railways within their Province wherever they pleased. We were giving a monopoly to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the far west, beyond the boundaries of Manitoba, but we were leaving that Province in the same position as the Province of Ontario, or any other Province, which can charter railways within their boundaries as they please. I say that was a distinct pledge. And what does the First Minister say to the subsequent pledge, made with his full concurrence, at the time he asked Parliament to vote \$30,000,000 of the people's money in further aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Was there any ambiguity in the language then used by the then Minister of Railways, now the Minister of Finance? Did he or did he not state in unequivocal language that, if Parliament yielded to his demand and gave \$30,000,000 in further aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that monopoly clause would cease to exist. I am not going to weary the House by reading an extract —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. "Hear, hear." There are some hon. gentlemen who might read it for themselves, and perhaps, as it would do them some good, I will trouble the House with one sentence, and that the concluding one. And here I wish to remark that on that occasion the Minister of Railways was not only speaking as the mouth-piece of the Ministry, he proclaimed himself as the mouth piece of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He was announcing a compact, as it were, between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the one hand, and the people of Canada on the other, and he says to the Parliament of Canada, if you will give the \$30,000,000 which the company requires to complete the construction of this great transcontinental road, the company are prepared, as soon as the line is built north of Lake Superior, to give up this monopoly which is so hateful to the people. The language he used was:

"Such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

Sir, if the hon. gentleman had searched the dictionary he could not have chosen clearer words to express the views he was then conveying to the House and the country that the policy of the Government had been changed, and that thereafter disallowance would cease, and the people of Manitoba would be allowed to exercise unrestrictedly their constitutional rights to charter companies to build competitive railway lines in that country. There was no doubt about it. It was understood by both sides of the House,

Mr. DAVIES.

and by the country, and it was cheered to the echo by the hon. gentleman's followers as a master-piece of statesmanship. And the same gentleman comes down to-day and swallows his words, and asks the House to accept the statement that it will not be in the interest of the country that they should reverse that policy. But, Sir, I find that not only was the hon. gentleman's speech at that time so understood, but it has continued to be understood by his colleagues in the Government that this policy of disallowance was to cease. I find that the Minister of the Interior, addressing the Young Men's Conservative Club of Winnipeg, in the month of March last, stated that he had always understood it to be the policy of the Government to abandon this policy of disallowance as soon as possible. He said:

"I have always regarded the policy as a temporary one. I have always regarded the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, when Minister of Railways, and when urging the \$20,000,000 loan upon the acceptance of Parliament, as embodying the views of the Government. That statement was, that the granting of that loan would secure the completion of the railway some four or five years before the time fixed in the original contract, and thus render possible the abandonment of the policy of disallowance at an earlier period."

That is the view of one of the leading members of the Ministry given only a few months ago. That is the view the Ministry authorised him to present to the country when the people of that part of the Dominion were polling their votes. They, therefore, voted in the North-West under a Ministerial guarantee that the disallowance policy was to cease. The hon. member for Selkirk stated that they were elected in the Province of Manitoba to oppose the Government unless the Government abandoned disallowance, and the paper from which I quote the speech of the Minister of the Interior makes comments of nearly a column in length upon the announcement he then made, and triumphantly asks the Liberal party of the North-West: What more do you want? The hon. Minister of the Interior gained his point by declaring that to be the policy of the Government which the hon. First Minister repudiates to-night, and the people of the North-West voted on the assumption that the policy then announced was the right policy, whereas the very contrary is announced to-night. But we heard the First Minister say that this policy is maintained because it is for the benefit of the eastern Provinces, forsooth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the whole Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES. And he mentioned the eastern Provinces. The hon. gentleman must think us a lot of gullible people down there. There is no man from the eastern Provinces who would maintain for a moment that the maintenance of the policy of disallowance would benefit them. The hon. gentleman repeated the names of the winter ports which were going to be benefited by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He mentioned three, I think, Shippegan, St. Andrew's and Louisbourg. The Minister of Finance, when Minister of Railways, used to roll these names out one after another. He made the people at each of them believe that they were going to have the winter port of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but he mentioned another to-night. He told us there was the port of Old Harry, the depths and soundings of which I suppose he understands very well. However it may suit this port of Old Harry, the argument, to talk seriously, is perfect nonsense. The eastern Provinces of the Dominion, the hon. gentleman knows, are not very seriously interested in the maintenance of this disallowance policy. They prefer, as I hope all true Liberals prefer, that every Province should be allowed unrestrictedly to exercise its constitutional rights within its bounds, unless the exercise of these rights can be clearly shown to be in opposition to the public good. No attempt whatever has been made to answer the arguments of the leader of the Opposition; but the hon. the Finance Minister has told us that the policy of the Government is approved at Amsterdam and at Berlin and at some

other places. Sir, it is not of great matter to this House whether the people of Amsterdam, or Berlin, or any other foreign part, approve of the policy of the Government. What we are more interested in knowing, is whether the people of Manitoba approve of the policy of the Government in this regard. I think that even the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) will assent to the truth of the statement, that the people of Manitoba know a little more about their rights and interests than do even the people of the eastern Provinces. I think he will admit that in local matters, which the constitution has wisely relegated to them, they had better be left alone, and it is much more preferable to have the appreciation of the people of Manitoba upon a matter which affects their interests than the endorsement of the people of Amsterdam, or Berlin, or any other European city. It has been borne home to my mind, beyond all reasonable doubt, that this policy which the Government has pursued is a policy simply in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. The hon. the First Minister heard it intimated that, possibly, there was a secret agreement between the Government and Canadian Pacific Railway magnates at the time the contract was entered into. He had the opportunity of denying to-night whether that secret agreement was made. If there was a secret agreement, it was a disgraceful piece of statesmanship; if there was not, the right hon. gentleman in replying to the leader of the Opposition should have stated so. We have a policy continued which is in the interest solely of a corporation, which has been proved, even by members supporting the Government—the hon. member for Selkirk among others—to be antagonistic to the people of Canada, and to all the people concerned in the building up of the great North-West Territories; and the hon. gentleman has chosen, when the interests of the people are on the one side and those of the Canadian Pacific Railway are on the other, to give the latter the preference. I hope the hon. members of this House will not follow the hon. gentleman's lead on this occasion. I may have my doubts whether they will or not, but I hope there will not be a man from Manitoba who will record his vote in favor of disallowance. If such an hon. member should be found, and his conduct afterward be endorsed by his constituents, all I have to say is that I have misunderstood the reports I have found in the daily papers of Winnipeg, which give the opinion of the whole Province. It is not alone the interests of Winnipeg, which the Finance Minister says the Government has done so much to build up, that are concerned. The interests of the great Province of Manitoba are in question, and are being ignored, and, if we are to believe the First Minister, so long as he continues in his place, a continuance of that policy may be expected.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I intend addressing but few words to the House, and hope I shall keep within the limit proper to a member interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway. The right hon. the First Minister will recollect that when, at an unfortunate time for Minnesota—that is, when, on the collapse of the Jay Gould projects in 1872, the St. Paul and Pacific Railway being constructed in that State, stopped short about one hundred miles from the International boundary—I, with his consent, made some enquiries regarding the possibility of continuing the road through to Manitoba. I was thus led to look into the possibilities of that country, crossing it over as I had to do so often between Winnipeg and St. Paul, on the way to and from Montreal. Then, after a while, I succeeded in inducing some friends to join with me in taking up, but not for four or five years, the St. Paul and Pacific Railway, now the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway. Mr., now Sir George Stephen, was one of those who embarked in the enterprise, and at that time we certainly did not expect to make much profit out of it, but we did desire, and that very earnestly, to have a road into our own North-West.

Contrary to the wish of our associates, we made it a condition that it should be continued on to the boundary to meet a line at Pembina, a proposition which they thought was very foolish indeed, as it would result in no profit, but in a loss to the company. The First Minister will bear me out, I am sure, when I say that Sir George Stephen and the other members of the so-called syndicate—the gentlemen who became a syndicate afterwards—did not approach the Government with regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that the Government had tried in Europe and elsewhere to get others to take it up, capable of carrying it through, but did not succeed in this.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I say distinctly that the gentlemen who undertook the charter, although at first unwilling to assume the responsibility, ultimately consented, more with a view of assisting to open up the country than from any expectation of gain to be derived from it.

Mr. MILLS. When?

Sir DONALD SMITH. At the time the arrangements were entered into—in 1880, I think. I do not come here with any figures, statistics or dates, but wish to say plainly, in few words, that while the idea appears to prevail in this House, as it does throughout the country, that the gentlemen who undertook the contract for building the Canadian Pacific Railway have been dipping their hands very freely into the public Treasury, and have made vast profits by their connection with it, the actual facts are quite otherwise; and that as regards two of the individuals most actively engaged in it, their income to-day is at least \$100,000 less annually than it was at the time they undertook the work, and that they would be so much richer to-day had they not pledged every sixpence they possessed, with the view of carrying on the enterprise to a completion. Some hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think that if Manitoba had roads into the United States, we would be in a much better position to get settlers into the country than with the road only through our own territory. Now, how was it before the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed to Winnipeg? How many of those emigrants who came out, intending to settle in Manitoba, found their way there? Having to run the gauntlet of the Northern Pacific, the St. Paul and Manitoba, and other railroads west of Chicago, the inducements held out to them for settling there were so great that only a small percentage of them ever reached Manitoba; and one great reason for pushing on the road north of Lake Superior, and of having an unbroken line of railway through our own territory, was that we should be free from such drawbacks as those spoken of, and thus be pretty certain of getting into the North-West all who intended to go there from Europe and elsewhere. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said that the settlement in the North-West had come principally from the eastern Provinces, and that consequently we have gained comparatively little. Does not the hon. gentleman know that a very large portion indeed of the settlers in the North-West of America, in Minnesota and Dakota, have come from the middle and eastern States? If he does not know it, I can assure him it is the case; and when we consider that the population of the United States is upwards of fifty millions, is it at all surprising that with such numbers to draw from there should be a great many more, in a given time, going into Minnesota and Dakota, than we have been able to transfer into our own North-West out of a population of five millions? Again, is not the population in the middle and western States made up greatly of Germans and Scandinavians, and has not this been one of the great factors in inducing others of their countrymen to come out? To some extent it has been

the case also with us, and it will be so still more as our country fills up. It would have been very easy, even were we not aware that it is the case, for anyone who heard the leader of the Opposition speak of the North-West and of what he at one time thought, and still affirms, would be sufficient for it—that is, partial railway communication supplemented by water courses—to know that the hon. gentleman has not thought it worth his while to visit that country. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will readily admit that, until he did visit the North-West, he had very little idea of what that country was, and that his policy afterwards was in some measure changed. So I have no doubt it would have been with the hon. leader of the Opposition had he gone there, but there are people who do not desire to be convinced, and I regret to say I am almost inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman did not wish to see for himself and to be convinced that we have there a country which every patriotic Canadian ought to be proud of, and aid in advancing. We have been told by the hon. gentleman from P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that we need not care for the opinion of Amsterdam and the money centres of Europe. But does not the hon. gentleman know the bearing of the opinion in these centres on our credit, and that if we deery our own country and its resources we cannot expect those outside to think well of either? As regards the agitation in the North-West, I believe that were we to do away with disallowance to-morrow, we should have very great difficulty in getting any more money from the other side of the Atlantic for enterprises, especially in the North-West. If we are to open up the North-West to the United States and lead our trade into that channel, why think of building a short line to the ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? The leader of the Opposition was very facetious. He spoke in a vein of pleasantry, and I am sure we were all delighted to see him so condescend, and I think he would live more and more in the affection of his fellow citizens if he would more frequently show that milk of human tenderness, that sympathy for his fellow men, and that love of his country which is due from everyone who is a citizen of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LANDRY. It is with great reluctance I rise to make a few observations.

Sir DONALD SMITH. There is one thing I omitted which I really intended to say. It has been insinuated that there may have been some secret understanding between the Government and the so-called Canadian Pacific syndicate, by which promises were made which did not appear in the contract. I can say, without hesitation, that this is not so, and that in all the negotiations everything was straightforward and above board.

Mr. LANDRY. I was going to say that it was with great reluctance I rose to address a few words to you on this subject. I do it the more reluctantly because I see there is a general disposition to have a vote taken in order that the House may adjourn. However, I think it is only right that I should give expression to a few thoughts that have occurred to me as I listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). He professed to speak on behalf of the Maritime Provinces, and to say that there was nobody in those Provinces but believed and knew that the policy of the Government in reference to the disallowance of these Acts from Manitoba was not for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces or the eastern portion of this Dominion. He also referred to Manitoba as being in a lamentable condition. I do not desire to enter into any details at all, though I think details could be easily given to prove that his qualification of the condition of Manitoba as lamentable is not a correct

Sir DONALD SMITH.

one. I cannot understand how anyone, who has been in this Parliament as long as that hon. gentleman has, and have heard the discussions on the floor of this House, can come to the conclusion that Manitoba is in a lamentable condition. Make a comparison between Manitoba and anyone of the Maritime Provinces, or any one of the old Provinces of this Dominion. Make a comparison between the growth and development of our older Provinces and the Province of Manitoba. I ask the hon. gentleman and those who will read his speech, to take the growth of the whole of the North-West, including Manitoba, during the seventeen years previous to its being introduced into the Union, and compare it with its growth and progress during the sixteen or seventeen years after it was taken into the Union, and see what a difference there is in the prosperity and progress of the country. By such a comparison it will be found that that country has prospered with much greater rapidity during the last period than during the first. I would ask them also to answer what has been the cause of this great prosperity since it has become a Province of this Dominion as compared with the progress made before. Why, Sir, we were told to-night that, in five years, the population had increased something like 74 per cent. Now, compare that with the progress made in the other Provinces, and can you tell us that Manitoba is in a lamentable condition, so far as the increase in its population is concerned? Take the Province of New Brunswick, from which I have the honor to come; in ten years, I think, the population increased something like 13 or 14 per cent., while in five years the Province of Manitoba, with all these disadvantages which are alleged to exist, augmented its population 74 per cent., which would have been in the ten years seven or eight times, perhaps nine times, as much as the Province of New Brunswick; and I think the same comparison may apply to Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario. Why, I venture to say, though I have not made the calculation accurately, that the Province of Ontario, during the last decade, did not increase more than 18 or 20 per cent. Another fact that cannot be disputed is that the Province of Manitoba to-day has a greater number of miles of railway according to its population than any other Province in the Dominion. Is that a lamentable state of affairs? Who has contributed the money to build these railways in Manitoba? I dare say the people of that Province have contributed all they reasonably could, but it has been chiefly contributed by the rest of the Dominion, in subsidies that have been granted by this Parliament and sanctioned by the people of this country. If that be true, why should we say to-day that the condition of Manitoba is deplorable? Hon. gentlemen opposite declared, over and over again, that the Government was building the railway too rapidly, but now that it is completed they approve and demand that extended facilities be afforded for more railway accommodation. We admit the wisdom of all that we have done, and we think the money has been well invested. Why, if we consider for a moment all that has been done for that Province, all that has been done for this great territory which we purchased at so small a price, when we consider its

extent, it does appear to me that the people of the Maritime Provinces, on behalf of whom my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island undertook to speak, will be satisfied that a good deal has been done for Manitoba, and they will not believe that it is in the condition that has been alleged by some hon. gentlemen. Why, Sir, we have built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have purchased the North-West Territory. We have surveyed its public lands, we have improved its rivers and navigation, we have fed its Indians, we have quelled a rebellion, we have given it a constitution and representation, and we are contributing yearly subsidies for its local wants. A large amount of money has been paid for the purpose of encouraging immigration, and large amounts have been expended in various ways for the purpose of developing and ensuring the progress of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Sir, we think that great success has attended our efforts in that direction, so great a success, at any rate, that it has caused some jealousy in the Maritime Provinces. If there was an argument that was used with more persistence than another by hon. gentlemen opposite in the Maritime Provinces during the last election, it was that too much money was being expended in the North-West Territory and Manitoba, and the Maritime Provinces were not deriving any benefit from it, that they were being bled for the advantage of Manitoba and the North-West; and yet to-day, some of them have the effrontery to come to this Parliament and show by their voices that everything they said upon the hustings on that occasion was not true, that we have not yet done enough for the North-West, but we must do something more. I do not mean to say that we have done too much for Manitoba but at the same time I do say that we have done a great deal, that we have assisted very much in its material development. And if to-day the Government believe that the charters granted by the Local Legislature of Manitoba should not be sanctioned because it would be to the detriment of the Dominion generally, I for one am prepared to sustain them in their policy, and to vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROYAL. It is not my intention to say more than a few words on this occasion, although the subject is so interesting to Manitoba and to Canada at large. Other members of this House have referred to the agitation now existing in Manitoba in respect to disallowance, and I believe that every hon. gentleman opposite tried to make it appear that there was a unanimous feeling in that Province on this matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, having spent seventeen years of my life in that Province, and having witnessed personally its progress both commercially and from an agricultural point of view, I may perhaps be allowed to say that I know something of the feelings of the people. During the seventeen years I have lived in that Province I have been in political life, and I think I am able to say that in respect to this question of disallowance, there is far from unanimity existing among the people. Of course I do not pretend to say there is not an agitation. My Province, unfortunately, has been the theatre of agitations for a great many years. We have had the Farmers' Union agitation, we have had the better terms agitation, we have had the Hudson Bay Railway agitation. I suppose we are bound to have an agitation every year. Well, at the last general election, in my own county, where the population is, perhaps, most interested in having as many railways as possible traversing it, the only two questions of importance which were discussed during the campaign were the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway and the Riel matter. It was my lot also to be a candidate after I had sustained the policy of the Government with respect to the Riel question. It was also my lot to be a candidate again and to be elected by a population fully one-third of whom are French-speaking half-breeds. Well,

the Hudson Railway question was discussed at nearly every meeting during the campaign, which lasted over seven weeks, which in fact lasted over three months, and only three times was the question of disallowance discussed, or at least only incidentally mentioned. On account of the agitation in Winnipeg, and Winnipeg has been the point in Manitoba most favored by this Government as well as by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, some of my opponents wished to bring up this question, and of course the question was put to me whether I was in favor of disallowance or not. I stated that I was in favor of the discontinuance of that policy, but not before such time as the protection given by Canada to the railway company was thought to have no ground for being continued. I stated on every occasion that so long as that protection should be considered necessary for the maintenance of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which I considered to be a national undertaking, I would be in favor of that protection. I was returned by over 300 majority. My only colleague who is in sympathy with my views and in harmony with the Government on this question is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), and he was returned by acclamation. So much for the unanimity of feeling in the Province of Manitoba. Now, with respect to later events. We have seen a delegation from Manitoba to Ottawa, to interview the Ministers on this question. Who were those delegates; what part of the Province sent them; were those delegates from the rural districts as well as from the cities? They were delegates only from Winnipeg. The purport of their remonstrances and representations centred in Winnipeg. In fact, it was impossible for any one who attended the meetings and interviews at Ottawa not to be of the opinion that some of the delegates at all events would be satisfied if Winnipeg had railway rates cut in her favor; they wanted to make, and I believe their contention may be to a certain extent a rational and reasonable one, Winnipeg a favored centre as regards railway rates. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company declared that they had no favor to show Manitoba or any other territory in the Dominion; that their tariff was a settled one and gave favorable terms to every city. Those delegates were sent here from Winnipeg, and not from the rural districts of the Province. After their return to Winnipeg it was thought a mass meeting would advance the interests of the agitation. Circulars were sent out; notices were published in the newspapers calling on the reeves of all the municipalities either to attend a public meeting themselves or send a representative. In an Ottawa paper of this morning we read the following:—

"WINNIPEG, 25th.—The managers of the anti-monopoly meeting, which was held in Trinity Hall to-night, were greatly disappointed. Although invitations had been sent out to over one hundred of the mayors and reeves of the different municipalities throughout the Province to attend, only some five or six put in an appearance. Mayor Jones presided, and gave a history of the Winnipeg delegates' interview with the Government at Ottawa, as shown. Mr. Brock and the other delegates followed, all going over the same ground. Telegrams were read from prominent men in different parts of the Province, some favoring and others against disallowance."

Mr. WATSON. Have you seen the report sent down from Winnipeg, and published to-night?

Mr. ROYAL. I have heard part of that report read by the hon. gentleman, but this is another report. We know very well that in Lisgar there was a meeting held last week, and at that meeting, which was well attended by men of all parties, resolutions were passed favoring disallowance. In fact I believe, notwithstanding all that has been said upon the lamentable state of affairs in Manitoba, there are some patriotic men there, some men who believe that Manitoba is only a portion of Canada, that if Manitoba has been favored by the Government with railways, with better terms, and in every respect placed on an equality with the other Provinces, it has no right to rebel and more

especially to do as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated it would do to-night. No, I believe in Manitoba, with the exception of a few hot-headed politicians and ruined real estate men, the bulk of the people are patriotic men who well understand the position of the country and the interest of their own Province. With respect to disallowance and the assertions of hon. gentlemen opposite, some persons seek to adopt the same methods of opposition as they would with respect to a tariff policy. We know very well that this Dominion is composed of different Provinces which have different interests, some industrial, some agricultural and some in other directions. When the tariff applies to all and an agitation is made in one Province against the general tariff, the proposition is exactly the same as is that in the present case. Would hon. gentlemen opposite countenance such an agitation? Would they not look upon it as disloyal agitation? We have a right to grumble, to forward petitions and to show that some measure for the general good of Canada deals too harshly in some of its parts with Manitoba; but I am sure petitions will never go to the extent foreshadowed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The unanimity of feeling in Manitoba with respect to disallowance may be inferred from these two facts.

Now, with respect to the agitators. With the permission of the House I will read a few extracts from newspapers in order to show that those who are at the bottom of this agitation have changed their minds at different times. The *Free Press* which is the organ of the Reform party in Manitoba, on the 20th December, 1880, said with respect to the monopoly clause,—

Mr. MITCHELL. Question or adjournment.

Mr. ROYAL. It is not my intention to inflict a longer speech than I can avoid at this time of the morning. I will accordingly content myself to say that the *Free Press* in 1880 entertained a different opinion from that which it entertains to-day. The *Free Press* is the exponent of the views of the Reform party in the Province of Manitoba and it was decidedly in favor of disallowance. Here is the language at the date aforesaid:

"The one article in the (C. P. R.) agreement to which the *Times* appears to have some objection, is that which gives the syndicate power to build branch lines from any point to any other point in the Dominion, while independent companies are prohibited from going within fifteen miles of the international boundary. Even about this, however, our contemporary is only half-hearted. It does not object to the power thus conferred upon the syndicate of running lines to the boundary, but thinks there should be no discrimination between them and other companies. As a matter of fact the distinction is scarcely worth discussion in view of the other mighty interests concerned in the bargain."

Now, later on, in the month of January, it reiterated those views on this subject in the following terms:—

"We have never regarded the privileges respecting branch lines conferred upon the Stephen syndicate as in any way obnoxious. The extension of our railway system to the international boundary at points west of Winnipeg to meet and tap the American railways cannot, in the nature of things, be fraught with those evils whose contemplation has disturbed some minds. With the Canadian Pacific Railway, constructed even to Thunder Bay, and with the syndicate in control, the inevitable tendency must be to send the products of Montana, Dakota and Minnesota through Canadian territory to the water outlet. It is no reasonable to suppose that the owners of the Canadian Pacific would send freight to the lake through the United States, and in doing so share the receipts with rival railway organisations, when they have an outlet of their own through Canadian territory. The inference is plain, that it would be entirely in their own interest to divert to the Canadian Pacific all the American traffic they could command. The St. Paul and Manitoba road is much more likely to become a feeder of the Canadian Pacific, when the Stephen syndicate controls the latter, than *vice versa*."

The *Free Press* has stated to a large extent the agitations we have had in the Province of Manitoba. The *Free Press* was at the bottom of the Farmer's Union and several other agitations, and the construction of the

Mr. ROYAL,

Hudson's Bay Railway was as much spoken of by that paper as anti-disallowance is to-day. On the 12th of May, after having done all its editors could do to favor the agitation, the *Free Press* stated that even if the disallowance were discontinued it would not place the Province in a better state; that the effect of the existence of the interstate Commerce Bill in the United States was such that there was no result to be hoped for from the discontinuance of disallowance. I will quote the following from the issue of the 12th instant:

"But come to the boundary then what? Until the Inter-state Commerce Bill be abolished with its discrimination against long hauls, it will be impossible to compete with Canadian Pacific Railway rates to the seaboard. We may get our connection with the United States railway system, but as long as the Canadian Pacific Railway has the advantage of cutting on long haul rates at the expense of the short, it can laugh at our connection and maintain its own in spite of anything that can be done in the way of competition. Has Mr. Norquay thought of this? By all means get to the boundary if we can; but in the meantime a greater enterprise, and of more immediate and substantial advantage is awaiting that assistance which the Province may give without a grudge in order that it may be carried on to successful completion."

So much for the character of the agitation which it is said at present reigns supreme in Manitoba. But, Sir, if these agitators were in earnest, there is a very simple method for them to ask a remedy for the grievance, and that remedy is to be found in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act. It is within the knowledge of every member of this House that no petition has ever been sent from Manitoba against the tariffs of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—no petitions to any member of this House, or to the Government, with respect to the crushing effect—as the word goes—of that monopoly. If politics were not at the bottom of that agitation, I believe the people of Manitoba had a very simple way of asking for the redress of the grievance, and it was to petition the Privy Council with respect to the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. From these few observations you may infer what is the truth with respect to the unanimity of feeling which hon. gentlemen opposite say exists in the Province of Manitoba on this question, and to such an extent that in the eyes of some people we are on the verge of a revolution. There is no such thing in existence in the Province of Manitoba. It has been stated that the Grand Trunk Railway would prove the salvation of the North-West. Now, every hon. gentleman who read the report of the last annual meeting of the shareholders of that company at London, and read the remarks made by a certain Mr. Abbott, will know what is in store for Manitoba and the North-West if they are given over to the tender mercies of that institution. That gentleman took great pride in stating that the Grand Trunk Railway had carried nine hundred immigrants to Dakota and Texas, and prevented them from going to the Canadian North-West, which he represented to be an unfertile land and a country of perpetual winter. I believe I am in accord with the great majority of my constituents; I am in accord with my own feelings with respect to the interests of my Province and of Canada as a whole, when I say that I shall vote against the resolution of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am one of those who hold a contract sacred. I believe it is the duty of private individuals faithfully to carry out a contract, and if it is the duty of private individuals much more is it the duty of the Government to carry out faithfully and fully any compact they enter into. If there was anything in the Act of Parliament by which this contract was created, anything in the legislation of this House which bound them to a policy of disallowance, then I would say, by all means either carry out that policy or else by mutual agreement pay such a sum as would compensate the company for allowing it to lapse. However, Sir, there is no understanding of anything of that sort. There is nothing in the Act by which this contract

was created, nothing in the legislation of this House that gives any sanction to the idea that such an agreement was ever entered into. On the other hand, we have the statement of the hon. the First Minister, as well as the statement of the Minister of the Interior, that such action was never contemplated, that this policy of refraining from granting charters to railway companies was only intended to apply to the North-West, and not to the organised Provinces, and it was on that statement and understanding that Parliament sanctioned the granting of the contract. Such being the case, we have nothing of that kind to deal with, but we have simply to deal with the question on its own merits. A great deal has been said about the immense benefits that the building of the railway has conferred upon the country. I am willing to grant to the fullest extent all that has been said. I agree heartily with the statement of the Finance Minister with regard to the stupendous nature of the work which has been accomplished. It is a stupendous work. It was a great and a plucky undertaking. It is true that the company had all the resources of the country before them, but even with all that it was a great undertaking to build that road. The company are entitled to all the credit for successfully carrying it out, and I may state, too, that after having had the privilege of riding over it, it is a marvellously smooth road to ride upon. But, Sir, there are other considerations. While we all wish the Canadian Pacific Railway Company well, and value the work they have done at its true value, the country is also to be considered. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House for a few minutes to a question that has not been mooted to night. You are aware that the road, as it now runs, is not built on the route on which it was originally intended to run. That route was surveyed at the time the hon. Alexander Mackenzie led the Government, and it was selected by probably the best engineer in Canada. It was chosen because it was considered the most advantageous to the country, and when we look at the physical features of the country we can see that it was wisely chosen as the one best calculated to promote the development and settlement of the country, to bring immigration there, and to serve the interests of the country in the highest degree. Anyone who has been in that country or who looks at the map knows that the route as originally surveyed ran for a 1,000 or 1,200 miles through the most fertile part of the country, which is destined to be settled and to become a great agricultural country, and it must become such if this Dominion of ours is ever to be able to carry the great load of debt which it has assumed. But in 1882 the Government asked from this House the privilege of allowing the company to change the route. The House granted them that privilege, and the route was changed. Now, I do not wish to be understood as blaming the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for seeking that change. It was their right and privilege to make it if they thought it to be to their advantage. But it was otherwise with the Government of the country. It was their duty to decide which route was most in the interest of the country and to insist that the road should be built on that route. Now, I hold that anyone who looks at the physical features of the country must come to the conclusion that the route originally surveyed was the route on which the road should have been built. But the company evidently thought a more southerly route would be more in their interest, in securing the Australian and Asiatic trade, of which we have heard so much, and which I earnestly hope they will secure. They seemed anxious to obtain that instead of developing the farming resources of the country, and the Government allowed them to do it. Now, let me draw the attention of the House to the route on which the road is built. You are aware that what is called the Great American Desert drops down into our great North-West, where it ends. North of

that, on the line where the original route was surveyed, we have a fertile country; but anyone who has travelled over the railway and is acquainted with the country through which it runs—I speak not only from what I have seen myself, but from personal knowledge of others who are familiar with the country—knows that beyond Manitoba there is little or no land fit for general farming on the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know that this is a startling statement, but I make it without fear of contradiction. From Winnipeg to Moose Jaw the fertile land extends for only 393 miles, and beyond that point there is really no good land fit for general settlement until you get within 120 or 125 miles from the Rocky Mountains. That is, for about 307 miles from Moose Jaw to Gleichen the country is a sterile desert. The soil is there, and if the climatic conditions could be changed it would be fertile. But it is well known that no rain of any account falls in that country, as is the case with the North American Desert to the south of the boundary line. I believe that when the world becomes so populous that people require elbow room water will be brought all the way from the Rocky Mountains to irrigate the land, and then it can be cultivated and will become fertile; but that is a long way in the future, and we have to consider now what is best for the present interest of the country. After leaving that stretch of country you come into the ranching country, where the land is more productive, where rain falls, and everything exists for the production of crops; but the experience of those who have tried farming there, is that it is at such a high altitude, and the dangers from summer frosts are so extreme, that it is not safe for any man to venture his all in trying to carry on general farming there. Such are the features of the country, and I repeat that when the company sought the change of route, it must have been because they despaired of settling the fertile part of the North-West at an early day, and therefore decided to try and grasp the Australian and Asiatic trade in lieu thereof. But I claim that when they made that change the road ceased to be a national road, and, instead of being located so as to promote the highest interests of the country, it was simply built with the prime object of securing the through traffic for the benefit of the company which owns it. In what position does the country stand now? If we are to bear the load of debt which we have incurred, the country will have to build another road to do the work which the Canadian Pacific Railway was originally intended to do, and which according to their contract they were bound to do, but which the Government relieved them of. There is a road building as fast as the circumstances of the company permit them to build it on the identical route of the Canadian Pacific Railway as originally chosen; I refer to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. The sooner that road is built by the company the better, because until it is built we cannot hope for the rapid settlement of the North-West. In view of these facts, is it not too much to determine that that road, when it reaches the Canadian Pacific Railway must stop, and the company must depend on one road for an outlet, and must not have the benefit of any competition whatever in carrying their freight to the seaboard. Then there is another consideration. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not the only great railway in the country. We have an old established road that has borne the burdens and heat of the day, that commenced the enterprise of railway building when the country was nearly new. I refer to the Grand Trunk Railway, and I need not tell the House that the Bill now before it to enable the Grand Trunk Railway to carry its line through to the Sault and connect there with the road running to the North-West is one which is fairly entitled to our support. Is it not too much to ask that one road should have the monopoly of that country and that an old established road like the

Grand Trunk should not be allowed to enter. A great deal has been said about diverting traffic to the United States, and that is a very plausible pretension, but there is very little in it. What freight is there to be carried away? Do hon. gentlemen expect the people of Manitoba to go to the States and buy their goods in the face of our tariff? The thing is absurd. We have built a Chinese wall which will prove an effectual bar to any such trading. Are we to fear that the grain and other traffic of the North-West will be carried down south and around by Chicago? That supposition is more preposterous than the other. It is well known the traffic always seeks the shortest and most accessible routes, and we have happily the shortest route to the market. There is another consideration which affects Ontario. The Pacific Railway to-day only touches a corner of the settled parts of Ontario, and of the parts that are likely to be settled, but with the extension to the Sault we would have a road from the Sault running nearly the whole length of Ontario. To those who have been over the Canadian Pacific it is well known that probably the finest timber in the world will be found on the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but before we can avail ourselves of the timber we must have a market for it. Where is the market for it now? It is not in the Eastern part, because we get timber between here and Manitoba. Is it going away West to Australia and Asia? That may be possible, but, judging from the small progress made on the Pacific coast cutting and utilising timber I do not think there is much market there for it. If there is to be a market for that lumber it will have to be on these western prairies of our own, and a market will have to be created by settling up the country. Had the road been built on the route originally contemplated, as soon as you struck the Rocky Mountains you struck the timber, and all along the survey for 1,000 miles you have a market for the railway to distribute the timber and lumber to the settlers who would need them, while now, if the lumber is brought by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it must be brought down along one side of an acute angled triangle over 600 miles of country where little of it is needed, and then it will have to be carried back along the other side of the triangle 700 miles for distribution. Taking these things into consideration, we can see what the country has lost by the change of route. The company have saved something in the length of the road, but if you take into consideration the sharp curves and the heavy grades, I doubt very much if they have saved anything by saving distance, and possibly a road may yet be built on the line originally surveyed. Now, a word on the general principle of disallowance. I believe that the disallowance clause should never have been allowed into the Confederation Act. I believe that it was a great mistake, and that it was never intended it should be used. This will appear more evident if we will take into consideration the fact that it was from the Local Parliaments this Parliament received its power. It was found that the Provinces were willing to give up part of their rights to this House. Certain of their rights they reserved for themselves, so that this House is really the creation of the Local Houses, and the Local Legislatures are not the creation of this House, and when this Government infringes on the rights and privileges which the Local Governments reserved to themselves, it is acting against the constitution. The First Minister has claimed that this Government are under popular control just the same as the Local Governments, but we all know why the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec were led to seek confederation. They felt that as regards the local matters, people living in the one Province did not understand the questions that affected the other, and it was to reserve to the Local Legislatures their powers and rights that Confederation was entered into. As to the statement that the Dominion Government and Parliament are amenable to public opinion as expressed at the polls, we all

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

know how difficult it is, for instance, to get the people in British Columbia interested in a question that affects Prince Edward Island, and *vice versa*, so that on the whole, viewing the matter in this light, disallowance if intended to be used at all, should only be used very sparingly. If this is not the correct idea, then I submit responsible government is a sham. Once you lay down the principle that the Dominion Government may for any cause that they see fit veto any legislation of the Local House, you establish the principle that it is to the Dominion Government, and not to the people, the Legislature is responsible. I think it is a pity that disallowance should ever be resorted to. You are aware we have a very extensive country made up of several Provinces, which have their own desires and interests, and it is only by protecting the rights of each one we can ever hope to consolidate the country into one harmonious union. That can never be done by infringing on the rights of the people or by building up the one at the expense of the other. Unhappily this course has been pursued in the past. We have had a trial of it in Ontario, and simply because we have a Government there that is firm enough to hold its own, we have experienced no disagreeable effects. Do you suppose you can keep Manitoba in leading strings for all time to come and infringe upon their provincial rights for all time to come? The sooner we disabuse our minds of that idea the better. Manitoba may not yet have come to the years of adolescence, but she is fast approaching them, and, accustomed as these people are to the boundless extent of the country, breathing the free air of the prairies, and knowing their rights, I tell the House that they cannot hope to hold them in bondage, they will draw the strings too close, and then the results will be such as we do not wish to contemplate. The sooner we recognize their rights the better. The sooner this policy of disallowance, this policy of interfering with provincial rights in any Province is abandoned, the better for the Dominion.

Mr. WATSON. I have listened in vain for any reply to the arguments I advanced for doing away with disallowance from a Manitoban standpoint. I have heard the question argued from several standpoints, but not from the standpoint of a Manitoban. I have not heard refuted any of the figures I gave as to freight rates. They were not compared with those given by the Minister of Finance, but they are rates which the farmers of Manitoba have to pay. I am satisfied that the House must admit, if the rates which I gave are correct—and none of them have been disputed—they are an injustice to the Province of Manitoba. The member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) did not understand why I looked to him to second my resolution. I looked to him fully understanding it was his intention to second it, because I was to move the resolution and deal with it from a commercial standpoint; he was to second it and deal with it from a legal point of view.

Mr. DALY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; no such arrangement was ever made.

Mr. WATSON. I am giving that as I understood it, and as it was understood, I know, by the delegates who were down here and took part in arranging this resolution.

Mr. DALY. No such thing.

Mr. WATSON. There is one point which I omitted to refer to in the first place. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are to-day, as Mr. VanHorne, the manager of that Company has admitted, paying the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway 12 per cent. of the gross earnings on freight carried between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. That is in order to maintain the monopoly and keep the Manitoba, Minneapolis and St. Paul rates higher than they would otherwise be, because that company did try to run freight into Manitoba by boats on the Red River, and the Canadian

Pacific Railway Syndicate now give them 12 per cent. of the gross earnings between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, and have done so for two years past. As a penalty clause, the Manitoba, Minneapolis and St. Paul Company have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company 40 per cent. on all freight carried between St. Paul and St. Vincent, which is simply a prohibitory rate. With these facts before you I feel satisfied that this House, without looking at the matter from a party standpoint—and the party whip has been cracked pretty hard to-night—whatever hon. members do for party purposes, and individually to protect the Canadian Pacific Railway, they must be convinced that, as far as Manitoba is concerned, it would be a good thing for the Province and the Dominion if the policy of disallowance were to cease. The First Minister to night, in stating reasons why people should stop in the North-West instead of going to the United States, referred to the land laws, and stated that the land laws were much better than they were in the United States, and he also said that the land laws in Manitoba to-day were similar to those which were in force during the previous Administration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing about the land laws of Manitoba. I spoke of the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. They are exactly the same. The Dominion land regulations are the same in Manitoba and in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I spoke about the laws of the North-West, not the land laws.

Mr. WATSON. I think the hon. gentleman referred to the remarks made by the member for Selkirk where he had referred to the land laws, and said that the people would rather live in Manitoba than in the United States. I say that a number of people have left Manitoba in consequence of the vacillating policy which the Government adopted in regard to the land regulations. These regulations are much better now than they were in 1881 and 1882, because at that time the land laws were changed every few weeks by Order in Council, and people were dissatisfied on account of those regulations and a large number left the Province in consequence. I shall not have time to deal with all those matters as I would wish to-night. So far as the fear of a railway carrying the trade from Manitoba and the North-West to St. Paul or Chicago or to the seaboard over the American lines is concerned, there should be no such fear. We have to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway building across the Sault with the expectation of bringing freight from Minneapolis and St. Paul, and how could freight be carried past the points they expect to tap and away to seaports to the south. I believe the time will come in the very near future when a large portion of the freight, instead of going round by the north of Lake Superior, will be shipped either by Duluth or the Sault and through western Ontario. I have often felt that it was extraordinary, as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has said, how the people of western Ontario have submitted to the traffic coming in the way it does to-day. Their millers have to get the wheat brought by way of Toronto and then back to London, but in the other way it will come in a direct line and pass the mill doors. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) stated that the feeling against disallowance in Manitoba was not unanimous. I mentioned one exception, the only exception I believe in the Province of Manitoba, when a resolution was passed at a meeting of twelve men, who I suppose were electors, in the town of Selkirk.

Mr. ROSS. How does the hon. member know there were only twelve men at the meeting?

Mr. WATSON. I have already given my reason, that the anti-conservative disallowance association of Winnipeg reported that there were only twelve electors present at that meeting. The resolutions passed at a public meeting in the city of Winnipeg last night, and the telegrams received from the mayors and reeves of the municipalities are sufficient evidence that this is a burning question in that Province, whatever the people of the east may think of it. I would ask the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) if the representatives in the Local Legislature do not represent the public opinion of the Province of Manitoba? As I stated before, we have to-day a unanimous Legislature against the policy of disallowance—not a dissenting voice. I feel satisfied, knowing the temper of the people of Manitoba, knowing the feeling that exists in the Local Legislature where they have passed a resolution to vote \$1,000,000 to build a line of railway to the boundary line, knowing that the people will back up that measure—I say I feel satisfied that whether the Government accept this resolution or not, the people will insist on building that road to the boundary line. It will be much better in the interest of the Province and of the Dominion, that this House should adopt this resolution and allow local charters to be granted to build roads in Manitoba by private corporations. I have no doubt that if a charter were granted under which a company would feel safe in building a line of railway, that inside of three months a railway would be built in the Province of Manitoba to compete for the carrying of the freight in the North-West. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) says that because there are only a few people in Manitoba the freights ought to be high. That is no argument at all, because you tax the people so high that they ought to be exempted from high freight rates. Do away with this policy of disallowance and give us free competition in railways, and allow the Grand Trunk to be an immigration agent for that country as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the very near future, you will see that country filled up with a good class of people, happy and contented. We know that we have got a good country there, and we know that we raise good crops. I was surprised to-night to hear some hon. gentlemen opposite say so much about the frost and the drought. I have lived in that country eleven years and I have seen ten crops reaped, and where I reside we have never suffered once from frost. Some portions of the country may suffer from a frost or dry weather, but in a large portion of Manitoba, they do not suffer any from frost.

House divided on resolution of Mr. Watson (p. 543):

Yeas:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edwards,	Mallory,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Mills (Bothwell),
Barron,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Fisher,	Perry,
Blake,	Gauthier,	Platt,
Borden,	Geoffrion,	Préfontaine,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bowman,	Guay,	Robertson (King's, P. El),
Brien,	Holton,	Ste Marie,
Burdett,	Kirk,	Scarb,
Campbell (Kent),	Landerkin,	Server,
Cartwright (Sir Richd),	Lang,	Semple,
Casey,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Chisholm,	Laurier,	Trow,
Choquette,	Lavergne,	Turot,
Daly,	Lister,	Waldie,
Davies,	Livingston,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John),
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron),	Welsh,
Doyon,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin).—85.
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	

NAYS :
Messieurs

Audet,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Baird,	Guilbault,	Perley (Ottawa),
Baker,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Hale,	Porter,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hall,	Riopel,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Brown,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Bryson,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Burns,	Ives,	Ross,
Cameron,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Carling,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Kirkpatrick,	Shakespeare,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Labelle,	Skinner,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Small,
Cimon,	Landry,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Ontario),
Colby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Sproule,
Coughlin,	MacDowall,	Stevenson,
Coulombe,	McCarthy,	Taylor,
Coursol,	McCulla,	Temple,
Couture,	McDonald (Victoria),	Thérien,
Curran,	McDougald (Picou),	Thompson,
Davis,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Tisdale,
Dawson,	McGregory,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Denison,	McKay,	Tupper (Picou),
Desaulniers,	McLellan,	Wallace,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Ward,
Duchesnay,	Madill,	Weldon (Albert),
Dupont,	Mara,	White (Cardwell),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Masson,	White (Renfrew),
Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilmot,
Freeman,	Mitchell,*	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Gaudet,	Moucreiff,	Wilson (Lennox),
Gigault,	Montague,	Wood (Brockville),
Girouard,	Montplaisir,	Wright,
Godbout,	O'Brien,	Yeo.—114.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) was not in the Chamber when the resolution was read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for South Simcoe in the House when the motion was read?

Mr. TYRWHITT. I was not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then his name must be struck off the division list.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3:30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th May, 1887.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RETURN OF MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of George Moffat, Esq., to represent the electoral district of Restigouche.

THE DIVISION ON THE DISALLOWANCE OF MANITOBA RAILWAY CHARTERS.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the division which was taken last night, I voted nay, and I find my name omitted from the list.

* Mr. Mitchell's name having been omitted from the division list, the Clerk was ordered, on May 27th, to amend the same by an erratum in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed by the Clerk of the House that the hon. gentleman's name was not called, as he did not stand up.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was called. I never stand up. I generally make a nod. I made the nod last night, and I understood I was recorded as having voted.

Mr. WRIGHT. I heard the hon. gentleman's name called. There is a mistake evidently. His name was called immediately before my own, and that is why I happen to know it. His name was called first on this side.

Mr. HESSON. I think that the members ought always to rise in their places when they vote, as when they rise to speak to the House they always take off their hats.

Mr. LANDRY. I may say that I counted the votes as the voting went on, and I found one more majority than the Clerk did, although I thought I must have made a mistake. I certainly counted the hon. gentleman on this side.

Mr. MITCHELL. As to standing, I will always be as ready to stand up as anyone else, if that is made the rule. It is a matter of convenience, and has always been the practice for a member, if he has his hat on, to take it off to signify his vote. I had not my hat on that time, and I nodded to the Clerk, which is the usual practice. Everyone around me heard my name called.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the rule is that hon. members must stand up when they desire to vote, and they should not sit down until their names are called. But the practice has been that the members generally nod to the assistant clerk instead. In this case the difficulty is that the Clerk of the House states that the hon. gentleman's name was not called. I wish now to call the attention of the House to this fact, that the rules allow any member to ask for the reading of the names, after the result in figures is called out by the Clerk, so that if there are any mistakes, they may be detected at once. It is apparent to the House how inconvenient it is to correct such mistakes, and to alter the minutes of proceedings.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to say in vindication of myself, that if it was the custom of the House to stand up when voting, I would be as ready to rise on my feet as any other member. But not one in twenty members of this House rise when their names are called. I followed the usual custom. I care nothing whether my name is put on or not, I am not going to make any motion, but my name was called, and a number of gentlemen around me heard it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt it was called, and the assistant clerk had forgotten it. But I may say that I never knew a Clerk make fewer mistakes than the present Clerk. However, he did call the hon. gentleman's name, and I know it from this fact, that I was taking down the names of the division without looking up at all, and I always mark off a name as it is called, and I cannot be mistaken that the hon. gentleman's name was called by the assistant clerk, and not by the Clerk. In this case a mere erratum would do, I fancy.

The Clerk is ordered by the Speaker to insert the erratum.

QUEEN'S, N. B., ELECTION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved :

That John R. Dunn, returning officer in the last election for the electoral district of the county of Queen's, N.B., do attend at the bar of the House on Monday next, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, to be examined, touching his conduct as such returning officer in returning a candidate who had not a majority of votes in said election."

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill No. (112) for the protection of railway employes. He said: The Bill is intended to compel railway companies to do that which has been found by experience necessary in order to afford reasonable protection to the employes on railways. One matter is the packing of frogs; another is placing a proper running board and railings to freight cars; the third is in reference to oil cups. These are the principal provisions of the Bill. Most of them, I think, have been embodied, in so far as the Province from which I come is concerned, in an Act of the Local Legislature. But it has been found that the Act of the Local Legislature is only applicable to provincial railways. I introduce this Bill with the view of making it compulsory upon those railways which are subject to the legislation of this Parliament, to carry out those provisions, and to do what is necessary for the protection of employes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 113) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: This Bill has relation rather to the working of the Department than to any changes in the Act itself. The first clause requires that any person entering a homestead entry shall declare, at the time he goes to the land agent, under which of the systems of homesteading he makes entry. Under the present law he is not required to do this, and some difficulty has arisen as a result of it. The second provision has relation to abandoned pre-emptions. Under the law as it stands to-day an abandoned pre-emption may be opened for homesteading by the Minister. This provision makes it a statutory obligation that when an abandoned pre-emption is taken it must be taken by an actual resident, so as to increase the number of settlers in the country. The third clause has relation to providing simply for the cancellation of entries under the two new methods of homesteading which have been provided in recent Acts; that is, what is ordinarily called the two-mile limit homesteading, and the other the five-year homesteading. Another provision is with respect to second homesteading. Last year, in amending the Dominion Lands Act, we abolished second homesteading, but a provision was inserted, on the suggestion of a member of this House, by which it was provided that anyone who had obtained a recommendation for patent or a patent before the Act was assented to, might obtain a second homestead. It has been found that some persons in the North-West had so far completed the conditions as to be placed in almost exactly the same position as those who had obtained certificates of patent. This clause provides that, although they may not technically have received a recommendation for patent, yet, as they had practically performed the conditions and were entitled to a recommendation for patent last year, they should obtain a second homestead. The last clause is one recommended by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, owing to a difficulty which has occurred in the administration of the Department under the law which requires the settler to make declaration as to the fact of residence and the fact of cultivation. But there are other provisions in the law which are not covered by those two—such, for instance, as that a homesteader is not allowed to create a lien upon his property before he has complied with the conditions and is entitled to a certificate of patent. In those cases the Commissioner has been advised by the legal adviser of the Department at Winnipeg that no man can be proceeded against for perjury in consequence of misstatement, and this clause provides that the Minister may require any statement to be made

under oath or affirmation, which may be taken or made before any of the officers under the fifth clause of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: Last year the procedure with respect to the lists was simplified and considerable expense saved thereby. Further improvements are contemplated in the same direction, and the Bill I now ask leave to introduce proposes to dispense with the revision this year and keep in force the revised list for another year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Have not the revising officers already commenced work, and have not notices been given in some districts?

Mr. THOMPSON. The time fixed is 1st June. I am aware in some cases a little work has been done, but simply of a preliminary character.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it proposed to continue the old list for two years?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is proposed to make the existing list stand for the present year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think very serious inconvenience might arise.

Mr. TISDALE. I know that in my riding notices have been published.

Mr. TROW. Is there any provision to allow for change of property? Transfers are constantly taking place in the various municipalities, and difficulty and inconvenience will arise in cities and towns.

Mr. THOMPSON. The proposal is to take the lists as they at present stand without change.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In that case a large number of persons will be disfranchised. The sale of property, determination of leases, and the leasing of other property in place of that abandoned, would in a great many cases disfranchise at least 10 per cent. of those now entitled to vote. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) apparently does not think so, but he probably has not examined the lists. I have compared fifty or sixty, and I do not know a single instance in which, by comparison of one year with another, the lists do not show a variation of 10 per cent. If that is not so in the hon. gentleman's constituency, it is different from what it is in most constituencies in the west, and there are many young men attaining their majority every year who will not be entitled to vote at the time they ought to be entitled under the law as it stands. Moreover, there are many imperfect lists. I take the case of Kent. There were 1,450 names on the lists in that county to which exception was taken, and 300 odd were struck off. The revising officer made a ruling, to which certain parties in the constituency took exception. They appealed to the Superior Court in Toronto, and their appeal was allowed, and it was understood that the rule adopted in those particular cases should govern the rest. After the decision was given, the revising officer refused to be bound by that agreement made before the reference was had, and the result was that 1,000 names stood on the lists that in the estimation of some parties ought not to have been there. That is a condition of things which should not be permitted to continue, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes that a list which is a fraudulent list as it stands, shall continue to be the list of the constituency for another year. Now, it seems to me that this is a very serious objection. We pointed out to hon.

gentlemen on the Treasury benches, when the measure was introduced, that serious difficulties would arise and that very great expense would be entailed on the community, in consequence of the policy they had entered upon. But they persisted in that course, and now, finding that serious dissatisfaction is likely to grow up in consequence of the law that they put on the Statute book, they undertake to get over the difficulty by the perpetuation of these lists which are notoriously imperfect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt the House will grant my hon. friend leave to introduce the Bill. The objections taken to the measure will, of course, receive every consideration from my hon. friend, when it comes to its subsequent stages, and, perhaps, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be able to persuade him to agree to the objections he has taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We tried that for three months.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, fortunately for him, will not speak of the measure personally; he can speak disinterestedly on the subject, because I can congratulate him on the fact of his seat not being disputed, and, therefore, long before he will be required to visit his constituency, the whole machinery will be in good working order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking disinterestedly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I know the hon. gentleman is speaking disinterestedly.

Mr. IVES. It seems to me to be rather hard to please the hon. gentleman opposite. He speaks about the expense of the annual revision of the lists, and now when a proposition is made which should commend itself to the common sense of the House, inasmuch as we have had a general election, and there are not likely to be many elections in the coming year, he objects to that proposition.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The principle of this Bill has been attempted to be carried out by a Bill introduced by an hon. gentleman opposite, but I think the matter is one which the Government should take up. It provides, in brief, that the deputy returning officers and poll clerks are, and always have been, entitled to vote at the elections of the House of Commons of Canada. In another clause—sub-section 1 of the 57th section of the Act—the words “on recount” which were omitted, are inserted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Act respecting the Department of Agriculture. He said: This Bill is complementary to the other Bills now before the House, providing for the re-organisation of the different Departments, and I presume that with this Bill they will be discussed together. The Government think the time has come for a reorganisation of the Departments, in accordance with the increased wants of the country and its rapid development and extension. The first clause provides that, notwithstanding anything in the Act respecting the Department of Agriculture, the subjects of patents of invention and copyright may be placed under the management and direction of the Secretary of State, or of such other member of the Privy Council as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct. The second clause provides that the subject of industrial

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

designs and trade-marks may be placed under the management and direction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or of such other member of the Privy Council as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that it would have been much better if the hon. gentleman had provided for the constitution of all the Departments in a single Bill. He proposes that for convenience we shall discuss them all at the same time, but I think if his measures had all been placed in one Bill it would have been equally convenient. It always seemed to me that the departmental organisation of the Government ought to have been embraced under a law which might be called the Institutional Act, making provision for the various Departments of the Government, and pointing out what the function of each Department was. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Act relating to Indian Affairs, that the duties of the Superintendent General which was formerly in the Department of the Interior, but which is now separated and is discharged by himself as President of the Council, are set out in that Act. Nothing could be more anomalous than to provide for the constitution of a Department in an Act relating to the conduct of subordinates. It does seem to me that the Government, in proposing to deal with the subject, ought to give the matter full consideration, and to deal with all the Departments which are proposed to be reorganised by one Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman thinks more of the convenience of the House in discussing the measures, than of the convenience of the bar, the bench and the public in referring to them. I think, if we had only one general Act relating to the different Departments, amending half-a-dozen other Acts, it would cause a great deal of difficulty, as the hon. gentleman, being a professional man, must know. On the other hand, if every amendment of this kind is separated by itself it is obviously convenient that such amendment can be annotated in the particular chapter of the Revised Statutes which it affects. Say that you make an amendment in the Act with regard to the Finance Department. All you have to do is to turn to the Act in the Revised Statutes and annotate upon it the particular amendment, and so with any other amendments that may be made. That, at all events, I think, is the suggestion which has been made in England, with respect to the revision and codification of the Statutes. I think it is a more scientific mode to keep the separate subjects in separate Statutes; it will only be in the discussion that any convenience of the kind suggested by the hon. gentleman will be experienced. As these Bills are all short ones they can be read and understood very easily, and, no doubt, the hon. gentleman, with his usual diligence, has read all the Bills which have been printed, and he will be as fully charged with the whole subject as if they had all been embraced in one measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRIAL OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE CROWN.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that, on Tuesday next, the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That the salary of the Judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada shall be six thousand dollars per annum.
2. *Resolved*, That there shall be paid to the said judge, for travelling allowances, his moving expenses and the sum of five dollars for each day during which he is attending as such judge, any court at any place other than the city of Ottawa.
3. *Resolved*, That in case the judge of the said court has continued in office for fifteen years or upwards, or in the said office and that of one or more of the Superior Courts of Law and Equity, or of the Court of Vice-Admiralty, or the county courts in any of the Provinces of Canada, for periods amounting together to fifteen years or upwards, or becomes afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, then, in case such judge resigns his office, Her Majesty may, by letters patent, under the Great Seal of Canada,

reciting such period of office, or such permanent infirmity, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of his salary as such judge, to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life, and to be payable by monthly instalments, and *pro rata* for any period less than a year, during such continuance.

4. *Resolved*, That the registrar of the said court shall be paid an annual salary at the rate of \$7,000, and that in addition thereto, there shall be payable, out of any moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, such salaries to clerks, stenographers and servants of the Exchequer Court, as the Governor in Council determines.

5. *Resolved*, That the provisions of the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Superannuation Act shall, so far as applicable, extend to the registrar, clerks and servants of the Exchequer Court at the seat of Government.

6. *Resolved*, That as vacancies occur in the office of Official Arbitrators, the Governor in Council may appoint Official Referees of the Exchequer Court, not exceeding three in number, who shall be paid such fees and travelling allowances as the Governor in Council prescribes.

7. *Resolved*, That any moneys or costs awarded to the Crown by the Exchequer Court shall be paid to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, and that he shall pay, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, any moneys or costs awarded to any person against the Crown by the said court.

8. *Resolved*, That all fees payable to the registrar of the Exchequer Court shall be paid by means of stamps which shall be issued for that purpose by the Minister of Inland Revenue, who shall regulate the sale thereof; and that the proceeds of the sale of such stamps shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY COMPANY'S AGREEMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON, in the absence of Mr. POPE, moved that, on Tuesday next, the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the agreement entered into between Her Majesty and the Western Counties Railway Company, in relation to the completion of the line of railway from Yarmouth to Annapolis, in the Province of Nova Scotia, bearing date the 31st January, 1887, be hereby confirmed, and that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be hereby granted to Her Majesty to enable her to comply with the provisions of section five of the said agreement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this agreement been laid on the Table of the House yet?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not able to state.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because we ought to have that before we proceed to discuss the resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, certainly. The agreement will be laid before the House, if it has not already been laid before the House, before the resolution is discussed.

Mr. MILLS. And the Orders in Council?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, all the papers necessary to discuss the subject.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Finance, now that we are commencing on the Estimates, that it will facilitate business if we have an understanding that we will go through them in due rotation. Sometimes they have been shifted about from point to point, and there has been unnecessary delay in consequence. I think it will serve both his purpose and ours if we have an understanding that we go through with them in rotation, and, if he wishes to vary the order for any special purpose, that he should give notice the night before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it will be much more convenient to take them up in that way. As he knows, sometimes it is necessary, owing to the absence of some particular Minister, to postpone his estimates; but in that case, we will endeavor

to give notice, so that the committee will always know what is coming up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, as I understand, you will give notice the night before, barring some extraordinary accident.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Charges of Management.

Office of Assistant Receiver General, Halifax \$10,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is here a reduction of \$2,400. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain how he has been able to make that saving? I assume that it is a substantial saving, and not a transference to some other Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The decreases in the offices at Halifax and St. John arise from the proposed closing of the auditors' offices in those places, which will yield a saving of \$2,000 and \$1,950 respectively. It is expected that the balances of the reduction of \$400 at Halifax and \$1,000 at St. John, can be made and yet leave sufficient to carry on the work of the offices of the assistant receiver generals. The duties of the auditors are now performed here without the transference of offices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the gentlemen who were formerly assistant auditors general at those places?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Howe at Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to become of him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not yet decided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is not yet superannuated or retired?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but the duties that he has formerly discharged are no longer discharged at Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman proposes to transfer virtually those duties to the Finance Department here. As for these two gentlemen, who is the gentleman from St. John?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Seely, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to these gentlemen, you will have either to provide superannuation allowance for them or find them employment elsewhere.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One or the other; that is not yet determined. Mr. Seely is a gentleman advanced in years; Mr. Howe is comparatively young. The disposition of these two is not yet settled.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the same change apply to Prince Edward Island?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I think not. I think the duties have not yet been transferred. That matter is not yet settled.

Auditor and Receiver General, Winnipeg, board allowance..... \$900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This used to be stated as special allowance in consequence of expense of living in Winnipeg. As living is as cheap there as elsewhere now, I do not precisely see the reason for this board allowance. Putting it in that shape, the hon. gentleman implies necessarily that the cause exists which induced him or his predecessors to make special allowance some years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will consider that point before next Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. What does the Finance Minister intend to do in regard to that item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I will strike it out, and if there is any special reason for retaining it, I can deal with it again.

Country Savings Banks, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia
and British Columbia \$16,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the course of the recent debate on the Budget, I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the deposits in these various savings banks had been very considerably abused; that is to say, that many persons were taking advantage of the rules to obtain a larger rate of interest than was defensible, looking at it as a mere bargain with them, and having reference to the current rate of money, and the Minister then stated he concurred with me that it was an abuse. I would like to know what is proposed to be done now with respect to these savings banks?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did entirely agree in the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, both as to the amount of deposits allowed in the Government savings banks, and also as to the use of the Government savings banks for performing banking operations. I think instructions have been given that no amount shall be received from any one depositor over \$1,000, and that the deposit shall not be made or drawn in such a way as to interfere with the legitimate business of the banks. It will have to be drawn in the place in which the money is deposited, and not be deposited in one section and drawn in another.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this rule apply both to the Government savings banks and also to the post office savings banks? There has been a different practice prevalent in both.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same practice will be introduced in both, for it ought to be uniform. As far as we can, we are putting in practice the principle of not opening new savings banks under the Finance Department, but having post office savings banks instead, and I quite agree as to the necessity of having the same practice adopted in both.

Mr. DAVIES. Why does the hon. gentleman require this year \$ 6,000? In 1885-86 the amount expended was only \$13,587; the amount asked for was \$16,000, and the Auditor reports simply over-estimate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You require a certain margin, because the amount of expenditure depends to a certain extent on the amount of deposits, and it is really of no consequence whether there is a thousand dollars too much or not.

Mr. DAVIES. You are supposed to be guided by the expenditure of last year.

Mr. CASEY. There must be room for serious question whether there is a necessity for continuing the savings banks at all. The hon. Minister himself has pointed out that he does not open any new ones, but prefers to use the post office savings banks instead. I do not see why the post office savings banks should not replace these Government savings banks everywhere. If the place is large enough to support a savings bank at all, there would be a postmaster there and an office large enough to manage a savings bank, and I do not see why we should have the two systems unless they are run on different principles. I do not know much about these Government savings banks, because we have none in Ontario, but I suppose they are simply banks of deposit. They do not do ordinary banking business, as I understand, and in that case I do not see why the post office savings banks should not serve the public as well as these. On the other hand, if there is any special benefit derived from the Government savings banks, instead of their being limited to certain districts they should

Mr. McMULLEN.

be extended. The fact that they are limited to these Provinces shows that there are no special advantages connected with them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The policy of the Government is to amalgamate these, but you cannot do that suddenly or forcibly. You have the existing officers. In some cases the postmasters whom you do not wish to displace are not adapted for the discharge of these duties, but, as far as it is found to be practicable, the policy of the Government is not to create new independent savings banks, but to amalgamate them with the Post Office Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be remembered that, during the last Parliament, we strongly urged that these Government savings banks should be discontinued, because of the expense connected with them. The leader of the Government, speaking in the city of Guelph, which is in my riding, said something in regard to the stand which I had taken in relation to the interest paid on deposits in savings banks, and he tried to represent that I was endeavoring to reduce the interest paid in the post office savings banks. I made no reference whatever to the post office savings banks. I referred to the savings banks of the kind we are now discussing. I say it is unfair that we should continue to pay the interest we have been paying, and to pay the additional expense, when we can utilise the post offices and get the work done at a much less expense than it is now. I fully concur with what the Minister of Finance has said in regard to amalgamating these savings banks as soon as possible. I think it would be better to do it at once and save the money to the country.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman forgets that there is an expense connected with the post office savings banks. The cost last year was \$41,000, while only \$16,000 is asked for here. The expense of running the post office savings banks is very much the same as that now under consideration.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, no. If the hon. gentleman compares the amount of expense with the amount deposited, he will find it is much less in regard to the post office savings banks.

Mr. McMULLEN. More than that, the postmasters are paid very small salaries in small towns where they receive deposits, so it would be an additional advantage to them to get the small percentage on these deposits.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In any remarks I made at Guelph or anywhere else, I did not discuss the question of the post office savings banks or the Government savings banks, but I alluded to the fact that the hon. gentleman had objected most strongly to the Government paying four per cent. interest, as that was an excessive rate of interest and interfered with the business of bankers, private or public.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point which we took was this. Whereas, the hon. gentleman and his friends pleaded that they paid 30 per cent. more than the money was worth at current market rates in the interest of the poor depositor, we showed clearly that the bulk of the deposits were in sums so large as to put the depositors entirely out of that category, and he did not make a fair statement of our case, or of the case of my hon. friend. That was the point at issue. We always agreed that it was desirable to encourage frugality and the saving of money on the part of the poorer classes of our people, and we were willing enough that on moderate sums this extra rate should be paid, but we did object to paying it on the larger sums, and I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance agree with me that an abuse had arisen, and that it

was going to be rectified. It is very much to his credit if he does rectify it; but that was the point at issue.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was not the point at issue. I know that the hon. gentleman himself took that line of argument, but the speech of the hon. gentleman who sits behind him (Mr. McMullen) was directly an attack upon the Government for giving four per cent. at all, and I appeal to the *Hansard* whether that was not the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better look at the *Hansard*.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing that you should refer to the *Hansard* to see what I said, and you will find that my remarks were entirely applicable to the savings banks and not to the post office savings banks. I found fault with the interest paid on the sums deposited in the savings banks, because if those parties were anxious to find investment elsewhere, the rate of interest charged to those who desired to borrow on mortgage would be less than it otherwise would be, having to pay that amount of interest in addition to one per cent. for handling the account.

Mr. McLELAN. No doubt the savings banks have been used by others than those for whom they were intended. When the present Government came into power, in 1878, they found this condition of things left by hon. gentlemen opposite, that anyone could deposit in those banks to the amount of \$10,000. The hon. gentleman says that was wrong; the present Government said it was wrong, and in 1880 they passed an Order in Council limiting the amount to be received from any one depositor to \$3,000. Then last year, when I had this question under consideration, an Order in Council was passed on the 7th July, 1886, limiting the amount of any one depositor in any one year to \$1,000, making the amount the same as in the post office savings bank. Any complaint which the hon. gentleman has now has therefore been fairly met. We remedied the evil in 1880 by reducing the amount from \$10,000 to \$3,000, and last year we went further and cut it down to \$1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understands the position that was taken. Our position was not so much against allowing a large amount of interest, but it was against allowing a larger amount than the current rate. He must be aware that, during the time terminating in 1878, the rate allowed in the Government savings banks was less than that which was obtainable in banks of good credit. What we objected to was paying more than the money was worth. It would not effect the question if he had kept the limit much higher than it is now, provided he did not pay more than the money could be obtained for in the open market. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether there is any limit to the amount which is to be received during one year, or whether the \$1,000 may be paid up in one year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not to exceed \$1,000 in any one year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the total amount, but you allow the total to be paid in any one year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any provision now for allowing those persons who wish to invest in Government funds, either four per cents. or 3½ per cents., to exchange their deposits for debentures for one year or some such term? Formerly, I think we permitted them to exchange into five per cents., when money was supposed to be worth that, and afterwards to exchange into four per cents. Is there any such regulation now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have to pay a premium of 2½ per cent. to invest in four per cents. now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What length of time would those four per cents. run?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think about ten years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You would allow any depositor to obtain a four per cent. bond at 2½ per cent. for ten years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that is the present regulation. I will make a note of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like the hon. gentleman to bring me down a copy of the regulations on that point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of that.

Interest on Public Debt.....\$6,836,218.57

Mr. LANDERKIN. The commission on this amount, where is it paid, and to whom?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is paid in England to the financial agents.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that one-half per cent. was paid last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the same rate. It is calculated on the amounts to be invested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This interest charge, as the hon. gentleman knows, is made up of the interest on, perhaps, a dozen different loans, contracted at different times. Is the present arrangement that whatever number of loans you may make, you are to pay one-half per cent. on the payment of the interest?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so. I think that is the rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long does that extend?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that arrangement terminates in about two years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know the exact date for which that arrangement was made, if you will take a note of it. Then, brokerage on \$15,840, British Columbia Loan Sinking Fund—I observe a reduction here on the loans of 1874-5-6-7-8-9; how does deduction come about?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was an error in the last year's calculation, and it is corrected here.

Reduced 4 per cent. loans, brokerage and commission.....\$509,740.65

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What arrangement has been made as to the sum that had accumulated in the way of accumulated sinking fund on this reduced four per cent loan? I think that remains as an asset in our book, does it not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Should not that have been wiped out? In one sense it is a matter of account but it is just as well, I should say, that our debt should not remain nominally any larger than it need be. I do not see that there is any particular object to be gained in keeping it on both sides of the account. What is the reason for that? I never quite understood how that came to remain in our account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 44 of the Public Accounts, he will see that our investments are headed: "Sinking fund, Canada, reduced four per cent. loan, \$3,201,802;" that may possibly require some consideration. I am speaking now of the brokerage commission on \$509,000 reduced. The four per

cent. loan, I suppose, is mainly the interest on this sinking fund?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will get a statement of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see how that is made up, unless some other four per cent loan is included. The interest would not be sufficient to realise half a million a year. I would like to know if any objection has been taken by the agents, or by our creditors, to paying this sum in reduction? Do they require that to be retained in the hands of the trustees?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a question pending just now on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me it ought to be wiped out; in that case we would save something in these commissions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That question is now being dealt with. I will get a memorandum and show it to the hon. gentleman.

Estimated sum payable to Financial Commissioner
in England.....\$1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is our friend, Sir John Rose. In reference to this, I observe that our financial agent, Sir John Rose, apparently, was paid a commission of one eighth of one per cent. on the amounts of a number of loans with the London and Westminster Bank. The total amount paid him appears to have been \$29,803 on transactions terminating in January, 1886. Well, I am not at all prepared to say that the charge made was extravagant, but it is a large sum to pay when we have other financial agents to whom we pay a large annual sum. But I want more particularly to call the attention to this of the hon. gentleman in his dual capacity of Finance Minister and High Commissioner. When he was High Commissioner he was expected to discharge the loan part of the business. We were told when we sent that hon. gentleman across the water, that one reason for appointing him High Commissioner was that he would be able to transact financial business, which otherwise would require special commissions to England, and would require employing parties there. Now, I should say that such a transaction as the renewals and loans from these banks in London were transactions which the hon. gentleman might very well have discharged; and yet I find that we had to pay nearly \$30,000 in 1886 to Sir John Rose for doing that precise class of business which I had understood was to form part of the duties of our High Commissioner in London.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to be able to inform the hon. gentleman that all that is corrected now. The payment to which he has drawn attention was an arrangement made by my predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, when he held the office of Finance Minister. And when he found it necessary to raise a considerable floating loan, something like £1,500,000 sterling, that arrangement was made through Sir John Rose, and the payment of one-eighth of one per cent. was a commission to him, as he made the arrangement with the London and Westminster, or through that bank with certain other parties. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not unfamiliar himself with payments to Sir John Rose for commissions on certain transactions and certain allowances in connection with floating loans. I think I am safe in saying that he had some experience of that himself, and that he availed himself of the services of Sir John Rose in that capacity. I am glad, however, to be able to inform the hon. gentleman and the committee that since that period the duties that have been, ever since the appointment of a High Commissioner, discharged to some extent by the Finance Minister, have been entrusted to myself, and on the last occasion on

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

which we required to effect a temporary loan in England I was able to dispense with the payment of any allowance or commission to any person, and I succeeded in negotiating with the financial agents themselves for whatever temporary loan we required without any commission, and on terms that, compared with the arrangements previously made, saved no less than £6,600 sterling. So the hon. gentleman will be glad to learn that whatever want of attention there has been to this subject in the past has been corrected, and the High Commissioner is now discharging this duty, and has been able to discharge it without having recourse to any outside assistance whatever.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a great satisfaction to me, as I am sure it will be to the country, to know that our worthy Finance Minister, for whose ability I have great esteem and respect, and whom I know to be possessed of talents of an unusual character, has succeeded in doing what he has stated. It is not new to me, because at the time the loan was made I heard that, although Sir Leonard Tilley went over to England to perform the duties of Finance Minister and to effect the loan, it was mainly due to the zeal and efforts of the present Finance Minister that it was accomplished on such satisfactory terms. I heard it mentioned at the time, and I am glad to bear testimony to the fact. In regard to the payment to Sir John Rose, I am not quite satisfied with the explanations offered. My idea of the duties performed by Sir John Rose for a number of years, and for which he has been paid, is that they were of a diplomatic character, and had reference to obtaining titles for gentlemen in this country. That seems to me to be the chief duty which Sir John Rose has performed for Canada. I think there are far too many titles in this country, and I hope we shall have no more. I do not know what is the opinion of my friends to the right. The financial operations performed by Sir John Rose for the Dominion never amounted to much; the regular financial agents of Canada would have done the work much more effectively. But Sir John Rose acted in a diplomatic manner, and by suggestion and manipulation accomplished what hon. gentlemen opposite desired, and as a result we have C.B.'s, G.C.B.'s and Knights all around us. I hope this has come to an end, and that we shall hear no more of payments to that gentleman. I suppose the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) used him when he was in power; I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite have not been above doing the same thing. But I trust the Finance Minister, if he goes back to London, as rumor says, and again occupies the position of High Commissioner, for which he is fitted by his talents, abilities and associations with high personages, and the power of addressing public meetings, and a reputation as an orator, statesman and public man, the country will be relieved of the necessity of retaining Sir John Rose for such duty as he has performed in the past. I am sure our worthy friend, the High Commissioner, will be able to perform the duties. No doubt Sir John Rose has instructed him how to perform these little duties, how best to accomplish them by gentle manipulations and attentions and by bowing and scraping, and I hope we shall hear no more of Sir John Rose receiving commissions which we subsequently find entered in the Public Accounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This, I imagine, is intended to cover the payment to Sir John Rose as trustee of the sinking fund, to which position he was appointed as hon. gentlemen opposite know.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would suggest—and in making the suggestion I am expressing the opinion of the people of Canada—that when the next distribution of honors takes place, the leader of the left centre should not be forgotten.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to find a suggestion of that kind made, for it is a recognition of the services I have rendered. If merit and public service were the test of rewards, honors and titles, I ought not to have been forgotten. I, however, want neither honors nor titles; I do not want to see them in the country, for we can get along very well without them. Every time a title or honor is given to a public man in this Dominion, it detracts from the good opinion in which he is held by the people. I do not want any of them, but I may say that I have rendered as much service, looking back at my career of 30 years in various public capacities, as many of the gentlemen who have obtained titles which they never really earned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the Finance Minister who is at present High Commissioner? Has a commission been issued since the hon. gentleman's resignation, and to whom has that commission been issued? The hon. gentleman and the First Minister promised to bring down this information some time ago, but it is not yet in our hands, and before certain items in the Estimates can be intelligently discussed, we should know how the matter stands. Parliament has decided that a High Commissioner is necessary in London, and it is very important to know whether the Government, as trustees for the people, appointed a High Commissioner on the resignation of the hon. gentleman, and who the party, so appointed, is. Certainly we cannot, for a moment, suppose that the Finance Minister is still holding a commission as High Commissioner, and that he is acting in the double capacity of High Commissioner in England and Finance Minister in Canada. Of course, we know that the rule laid down by the Hibernian will apply to the hon. gentleman, viz.: that it is impossible for a man to be in two places at the same time. His duties as High Commissioner require that the High Commissioner shall be in England; the duties of the Finance Minister require that the Finance Minister shall be here. I cannot assume that the Government have disregarded the law, and the intentions of Parliament, by issuing a commission as High Commissioner—to an hon. gentleman who is, at the same time, a member of the Government in this country, holding an important office like that of Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman will perhaps be disposed to give us some information on the subject, seeing that the papers have not been brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I will leave that in the hands of the First Minister, who promised the papers, and he, I am quite sure, will be prepared to give the House the fullest information on the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman's answer is quite satisfactory. We look to the First Minister to bring down the papers promised by Parliament. The House has carried a motion declaring that the papers shall be laid on the Table, the leader of the Government has agreed to that proposition, and Parliament has approved of that motion. But the information I asked from the hon. gentleman, in the absence of those papers, I think we are entitled to have from the hon. gentleman now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman was given the information. If I remember aright, the First Minister gave the hon. gentleman and the House, in plain, succinct terms, a reply to his previous enquiry. He said to the House that I had resigned the office of High Commissioner when appointed Minister of Finance, that subsequently the Government requested me to discharge the duties of High Commissioner without salary, fee or emolument of any kind, and the hon. gentleman will find that that is specifically provided for by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman received a commission, or is it a mere verbal arrangement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not received a commission.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, of course, the hon. gentleman is not High Commissioner, nor has he any right to discharge the duties of that office. The law provides for the appointment of the High Commissioner in a particular way, under the Great Seal; he cannot be appointed in any other way. The Government have no authority to make the appointment in any other way; they may advise the Crown to make it, but the Crown has no power to act except in the way indicated in the law, on the advice of a responsible Minister, whose name must be attached to the instrument. So the hon. gentleman when he gave us the information which he says the First Minister gave us before—that he is High Commissioner, has also given us the information to show that he is mistaken—that he is not High Commissioner, and that he has no right to discharge the duties which the statute imposes on the High Commissioner, until he is appointed under the Great Seal of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this sum paid to Sir John Rose, it is true, as the Finance Minister estimated, that on the occasion of floating permanent loans running over a considerable period of years, Sir John Rose may have received some small consideration, although much less, I think, than one-eighth per cent. However, if I understood the Minister aright the loan was a million and a half from the London and Westminster. We never obtained more than that, I think.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that was the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, this matter is one which I think deserves a little more attention, because I find that Sir John Rose has apparently received this commission of one-eighth per cent., not only on the original loan of one and a-half millions, but on two renewals of the same loan. In point of fact, on loans of very short character, not extending over eighteen months, three-eighths of one per cent. in effect have been paid him. Now, those charges, as the hon. gentleman knows, are very heavy indeed—far heavier than I should have considered myself justified in authorising to be paid on a loan of that kind. I am glad that practice has been stopped, but if the hon. gentleman looks into the Auditor-General's report he will see that to all appearance—of course if I am wrong, or if it is not correctly stated there, I will be glad to be corrected—to all appearance Sir John Rose has received this commission of three eighths of one per cent. I think it is altogether in excess of any sum which should be paid by Canada for negotiating a loan to any mercantile institution in London, more particularly as I think we had to pay four per cent., the full market value, for the money we obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This was an arrangement made, I believe, by Sir Leonard Tilley, and I will bring down any further information. I am also glad to be able to state that I have not found it necessary to avail myself of the services of Sir John Rose in any respect, and that in negotiating a similar amount of one and a-half millions of a floating loan, pending the time we received payment of the money from the Canadian Pacific Railway, which made it undesirable that we should float the loan—in the interim there was no charge whatever, and the terms upon which I was enabled to procure that loan from the financial agents were, as I have stated, such as to enable us to have the money at the current bank rate, which gave it at a low rate without any charges or commissions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman will furnish the correspondence relating to this matter to which I have called attention?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I have made a note of it.

Mr. DAVIES. With regard to this estimated sum payable to the Financial Commissioner in England, I understand that it is payable to Sir John Rose as trustee, or one of the trustees of sinking fund. Is he the sole trustee?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not; there are three trustees, I know he is a trustee for the sinking fund, and he acts as such trustee.

Mr. DAVIES. On what basis is it calculated?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman that information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the reduction of \$5,000 on bill stamps, postages, telegrams, &c., based on any calculation, or is it merely hap-hazard?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is estimated that no more than this will be required. The amount for printing Dominion notes shows an increase of \$5,000, owing to the number of new notes that may be necessary.

Mr. CASEY. It seems very inconvenient to have so many things jumbled together in one item. It is almost impossible to look these expenditures up in the Public Accounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Auditor General's report gives everything very fully.

Mr. CASEY. But it gives them under different headings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure last year for this service was \$61,000.

Mr. CASEY. Part of this item is for contingencies of country savings banks, which I think should be taken along with the salaries in connection with those banks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the financial inspector, T. D. Tims, receives a salary of \$2,600, and last year he received \$1,500 for travelling expenses for 300 days. I would like to know if he is travelling every day?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is travelling a great deal of the time. In order to be financial inspector he must be absent almost continuously.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. gentleman any memorandum showing what proportion of this mixed item is allotted to each service, or will it be drawn on promiscuously? For instance, could not the whole or the greater part of the \$20,000 be appropriated to savings banks contingencies, or to advertising, as the item stands?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing can be appropriated, the hon. gentleman knows, except with the authority of the Auditor General, and in that officer's report he will find a detailed statement of every shilling expended for these services. If the hon. gentleman wishes a separate account brought down, I will bring it down, showing how that money was expended last year.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, I would like that. But the point I was urging was not so much with reference to the expenditures of last year as to the inconvenience of voting money for so many different purposes in one item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not responsible for that inconvenience. This money has been voted in the same way year after year, and if the form of the item was changed it would be difficult to make comparisons of one year with another.

Mr. CASEY. There is something in that argument, but it has never stood in the way of changing the forms of items for other reasons, and as the hon. gentleman has made so many improvements, I thought he might make an improvement here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the sums actually expended in 1886 under these two heads, for which the hon. gentleman now demands \$50,000, were in the first case \$50,000, and in the next \$61,000, making in all \$111,000. I have not the slightest wish to spend more money in that or any other direction than cannot be avoided, but it appears to me rather doubtful policy for us to vote sums which are likely to be largely under the real requirements. Does the hon. gentleman believe that \$20,000 and \$30,000 will be sufficient for the wants of next year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that matter has been carefully considered, and I believe they will be found to be sufficient.

Printing Dominion notes.....\$30,000

Mr. MALLORY. There is an increase of \$5,000. How is that accounted for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is still less than the expenditure of last year was, but the vote is increased because the vote of last year was not sufficient.

Civil Government.

Governor General's Secretary's Office.....\$9,550

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some changes here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are two statutory increases of \$50 each; one third-class clerk additional, \$750; and an increase in the salary of one third-class clerk, \$150; making \$1,000 in all. There is a decrease in the second-class clerks of \$1,200, making a net decrease of \$200. It is a re-arrangement of the service in the Governor General's Secretary's office, by which the service is rendered more satisfactory and efficient. At the same time, a net decrease of \$200 is obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the second-class clerk whose service is dispensed with?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. McDermott was the second-class clerk who resigned during my absence.

Mr. MILLS. What is his age? Was he pensioned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice you put in here the names of two gentlemen who were appointed to third-class clerkships, Mr. Walker and Mr. Lawrence. On what principle are their salaries arranged? They are both new appointments, and I see one of them began at \$450 while the other appears to have been appointed as a third-class clerk at \$750. How has that been brought about?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the summer of 1886, Mr. McDermott, a second-class clerk in the Governor General's Secretary's Office, left the service. The office remained vacant for some time, and on the return of Lord Lansdowne from London, in the autumn, Mr. Courtney was sent for with reference to the filling of the vacancy. After conversation with His Excellency, Lord Lansdowne considered that the work of the office could be distributed and that greater duties should be thrown on Mr. Lawrence, the third-class clerk who, during the interval, had performed the work of Mr. McDermott as well as his own, and that it was not desirable to make an appointment of a new second-class clerk, as he was of opinion that a competent third-class clerk of good training in languages and capable of writing despatches would be sufficient. The returns of the Civil Service examination were looked through and no one was found possessing the required qualifications, and as Lord Lansdowne considered it desirable to appoint a Canadian to the position, he communicated with Dr. Wilson, President of the University College, Toronto, who recommended Mr. W. H. Walker, a graduate, and medalist in classics, of the University of Toronto. Mr. Walker was told that until Parlia-

ment voted the supplies his services would be temporary, and that he would be paid at the rate of \$2 per diem, with the understanding that he would be appointed at the rate of \$750 per annum, as soon as the supplies were voted by Parliament, and that he should pass the entrance examination and be treated as was Mr. Reid, of the Audit Office, and as other officers appointed in a similar manner have been treated. It was considered that Mr. Lawrence would be recompensed by adding \$100 to his salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What age is Mr. Walker? How has he been brought in? Has he been brought in under the provision which allows persons having special qualification to be specially introduced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I think so. He is a young man of about 22 or 23.

Privy Council \$25,902 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The changes here arise from thirteen statutory increases at \$50 each, \$650, one statutory increase \$30, one increase to messenger \$95, transfer of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery \$2,600 and one additional third-class clerk \$450, making a total of \$3,825 increase. The increase to the messenger is because his salary last year ought to have been estimated at \$375 instead of \$315.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I perceive the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been put in here, and also, fortunate individual, has had his salary increased. I suppose the necessity of devoting his attention to writing letters of explanation is justification for this increase. If I recollect aright, he received heretofore \$2,200. He appears here as receiving \$2,600, which is more than the statutory increase to which he is entitled.

Mr. WELSH. I am glad to see there is an item here to increase the salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If it had not been here I was going to suggest that a sum should be placed in the Estimates for that gentleman, but the sum I was going to recommend was \$2.15, for the purpose of getting an assistant at election time, so that members might be gazetted in due course, and also that the sum of \$1.07½ should be placed in the Estimates for the purpose of getting an illuminated copy of his letter to this honorable House, in explanation of his conduct in not gazetting the members, and that it should be issued in pamphlet form and bear on the inscription the word "Flapdoodle."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a favorable opportunity to bring again to the attention of this House the conduct of this particular officer. I am not going to raise to-day a discussion with regard to the legality of this gentleman's appointment. I assume for the present that he is legally authorised to discharge the duties that devolve upon the officer legally known as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I have twice before during this Session brought under the attention of this House the conduct of this man. The law of the land has imposed upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certain duties, one of which is that he shall, immediately after the receipt of the returns from the various returning officers throughout the country, gazette in the next issue of the *Canada Gazette* the members that are elected. This officer is sworn to discharge the duties that devolve upon him in his official capacity, and I have before called the attention of Parliament to the fact that he has flagrantly disregarded the duties that the law has imposed upon him. I shall, as I have given notice, bring the matter again under the attention of the House, but I think it is proper, when the Government propose to not only pay this officer the salary which he has heretofore had, but to pay him a considerable sum in addition, that this House should again take into consideration the manner in which Mr. Pope, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, has dis-

charged the duties which the law has imposed upon him. Now, I ask the attention of the House to the letter which that man has written in reply to the motion proposed and carried through this House by the First Minister. I asked that this House should refer the question of his conduct to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The hon. gentleman intercepted my motion with an amendment, and this House asked Mr. Pope to send to the Clerk of the House a letter showing what he did, what proceedings he took in order to discharge the duties that the law has imposed upon him. I hold that letter in my hand, and it is impossible to read that letter without seeing that it is an impudent and lying document, a document of such a character as would justify, if this House discharged its duty, or if this committee discharged its duty, his instant dismissal from office—such an impudent lying letter as was written to this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am in order; I understand my duty, and I intend to discharge it; and I trust that those hon. gentlemen on the other side who are in the most unparliamentary manner interrupting, will give some little attention to what is right and fair, and will discharge their duties accordingly. I wish to read this letter, and to call the attention of this committee to the manner in which this man says he has discharged his duties. I wish to say that that letter is not only not true, but it is impossible that it can be true; it is impossible that the proceedings he says he took would have resulted in the acts with which we charge him—in the dereliction of duty of which he has been guilty. It is the bounden duty of this House to see that its officers act in consonance with the law. It is the bounden duty of the leader of this House to see that the rights of the minority are not tampered with, and that those rights are not trampled under foot by an officer who is appointed under the statute to perform certain duties. A majority is always able to take care of itself. A generous majority, a majority led by one who is generous and fair in feeling and spirit, such as would elevate and not degrade the sentiment of Parliament, would not for one moment permit an officer who has acted in the way that Mr. Pope has acted to retain the position he now holds. There is scarcely room to doubt that this man has disregarded his oath and violated his duties under the direction of some hon. gentleman who sits on that side of the House; and, if we are permitted to refer this question to a committee, as we ought to have referred it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I believe I will be able to establish that this man, in disregarding the law and trampling on the rights of members on this side of the House, did so at the instance of some hon. gentleman who sits on that side of the House. Now, let me call your attention to what Mr. Pope says in this letter:—

"In obedience to the Order of the House of Commons of yesterday, respecting the gazetting by me of the returns of the last Dominion general election, I beg to say that when the returns first began to reach me, they came in slowly, and I endeavored, as far as possible, and did, gazette them in the order in which I received them; but afterwards they came in so fast, by every mail, some mails over thirty letters, and as many large bundles of papers, some of them being in size about two feet square, in addition to others, which, instead of being sent by mail, as the law requires, were sent by express in large boxes, all of which, before I could gazette the member elected, required to be arranged and assorted."

Is that true? Why, there is not a word of truth in that statement. Every hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Pope has but to look at the endorsement upon the writ of the returning officer, and obey that endorsement, and gazette the member whose return is endorsed on that writ. He has nothing to do with anything else. The law is perfectly clear. His duties are quite simple; and it would be very easy for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, if he discharges his duties fairly and efficiently, not only to gazette the return

of 20 or 30 members a day—which is not true, and the return shows that the statement is not true—but would be able to gazette the entire return of members to this House. Why, it is not two hours' work to examine those writs and see whose name is endorsed, and copy the name of the member returned for each constituency; and yet this statement that is made by this man—this lying statement that has been made by Mr. Pope in his answer to the order of this House—shows that he was not hurried, that he did not receive such a number of names returned to him as to make it impossible for him to discharge his duties. Then Mr. Pope goes on to say:

"It frequently occurred, also, that after opening and examining large piles of papers, oaths, statements and certificates."—

What had he to do with examining large piles of papers, oaths and certificates? He had nothing whatever to do with that. There is no such duty imposed upon him by the statute.

Mr. MADILL. Suppose the return of the writ was not received with the papers returned?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the member would not be gazetted. Then Mr. Pope would communicate with the officers. We have asked for those communications. We have his answer. We know in what particular they were deficient and we have his statement showing when he received these various returns, and I am going to show that the statement of Mr. Pope is not only not true, but that it is impossible that it could be true. Mr. Pope goes on to say:

"The certificates of the various officers employed at the election, nomination papers and numerous other documents that the return, or Form S, required by the Dominion Elections Act, to enable me to gazette the member elected, was wanting, and which in some instances, would arrive several days later, and in others would not reach me till I had written to the returning officers to send it, after waiting a considerable time, in the hope that they would do as others had done—send it later, without being written to for it."

Why, there is no foundation for a statement like that. Let any member turn up the Election Act and see what Form S is. It is the form endorsed on the writ, the statement as to which particular party was elected, and we know from Mr. Pope's own statement that the papers were not defective in this particular, except in two instances, both of which he gazetted before receiving this certificate. Then Mr. Pope says:

"Again, many of the returning officers, instead of sending the writ, return and report of proceedings in a separate envelope, put them in the large bundle of papers, together with the oaths, statements and certificates of all the various election officers—reports of proceedings, nomination papers, accounts, ballot papers, voters' and revisors' lists, all mixed together in one confused heap."

Well, what of that? All he had to do was to look at the writ and at the endorsement on the writ. Then he says:

"Owing to the quantity of letters and large bundles of election papers which reached me by every mail, and which I was consequently unable to assort and examine before the arrival of an additional batch by the following mail."

Now, this is the attempt to account for the delay and the failure to gazette some members, whose returns were received before those of others who were gazetted prior to them. He says:

"Before the arrival of an additional batch by the following mail, it necessarily happened from both want of time and space, that those which came last were put on the top of the others, and were in consequence, in many instances, gazetted before those which were underneath, and which had previously arrived."

Now, that is the explanation. I have taken the trouble to look over this list to see how far that explanation will account for what has happened. Thus, I find that in the case of the Russell election it was received on the 7th March and was gazetted on the 29th, 19 days after; Chambly received on the 7th, gazetted on the 26th; Montmagny received on the 7th, gazetted on the 26th. All the following were received on the 8th and gazetted on the 26th,

Mr. MILLS.

namely, North Waterloo, Laprairie, Megantic, Portneuf, St. Hyacinthe, St. John's, Verchères and Northumberland, New Brunswick. West Ontario was received on the 8th, and gazetted on the 26th, as was also Kamouraska. Now, all these were received before certain parties who were gazetted prior to them. Those received on the 10th, were placed, according to Mr. Pope's account, on the top of the others. He had not time to examine them, so that those received on the 10th would come first. Well, what do we find? Why, that some of those received on the 10th were not gazetted until after those received earlier. How did Mr. Pope get below those that appeared on the 10th, and gazette those that appeared on the 9th? How did he get below those that came on the 9th and succeed in gazetting those that came on the 7th? Sir, the statement is untrue. It is a statement that is wholly unworthy of a public officer of this House, a statement that shows this clerk, instead of discharging the duties that the law imposed upon him as the law required he should discharge them, undertook to obey some other parties, and failed to gazette members as they were elected and returned. I find the following: Bothwell, received on the 10th March and gazetted on the 2nd of April; Glengarry, received on the 10th March and gazetted on the 26th; East Lambton, received on the 10th March and gazetted on the 12th March, two days afterwards. Here were some gazetted two days after the receipt of the writs. Of those that would be in the same pile, according to Mr. Pope's account, some were not gazetted until the 19th of March, some not until the 26th, and some not until the 2nd April. How was it possible, according to Mr. Pope's account, that when he had disposed of those that were above those that were received subsequently to them, those that remained of the same date were not all dealt with at the same time? Why, Sir, it is because the statement was not true, because it is an impudent and shallow falsehood, and such as ought to subject this officer to immediate dismissal. Then I find that South Perth was received on the 10th of March, and gazetted on the 26th, North Simcoe, on the 10th and gazetted on the 12th; Maskinongé, on the 10th and gazetted on the 26th; Missisquoi, received on the 10th and gazetted on the 26th; Ottawa county, received on the 10th, gazetted on the 12th; Rimouski, received on the 10th and gazetted on the 26th; St Maurice, received on the 10th and gazetted on the 12th; Selkirk, received on the 10th and gazetted on the 12th; Winnipeg, received on the 10th and gazetted on the 12th. So hon. gentlemen will see that those that were received on the same day were not published in the same *Gazette*. Suppose some of them had been left over, suppose that they had been deferred until those that were received subsequently had been dealt with, is it not perfectly obvious to every hon. gentleman that when the remainder of that particular day were reached, they would all be dealt with simultaneously? Yet we find that is not the case, that in every case where a member was returned upon a particular day to support the Government, he was gazetted in the following issue of the *Gazette*, but when he was returned as a member of the Opposition, he was not gazetted before two, three, or four weeks after the return was received, had elapsed. Then, for Brockville, the return was received on the 11th and gazetted on the 12th; Halton, received on the 11th and gazetted on the 26th; Kent, received on the 11th, gazetted on the 2nd of April; South Oxford, received on the 11th, gazetted on the 26th; North Perth, received on the 11th and gazetted on the 19th, as were also Bellechasse, Montreal Centre, Montreal West, Beauce, Charlevoix and Chicoutimi. Dorchester, received on the 11th and gazetted on the 2nd of April; Jacques Cartier was received on the 11th and gazetted on the 12th; Lewis, received on the 11th March and gazetted on the 2nd April; Quebec County, Restigouche and Cumberland were received on the 11th and gazetted on the 12th; Charlotte was received on the 11th

and gazetted on the 2nd April. So hon. gentlemen will see that so far from their being 30 received on one day, there is not more than a dozen, and in no instance could the delay have arisen in the way stated in Mr. Pope's letter. Then, again, Addington was received on the 12th, that was on Saturday, and was gazetted the next Saturday, the 19th, as were also Waterloo, East Hastings, East Toronto, West Toronto, North York, Terrebonne, Cape Breton, Guysboro', Westmoreland and Provencher. The following were received on the 12th and gazetted on the 26th; West Elgin, South Huron, South Middlesex, North York, Prescott, Centre Wellington, South Wellington, Berthier, King's N.B., Lunenburg, Richmond, Yarmouth. L'Islet was received on the 12th and gazetted the 12th April; Sunbury was received on Sunday the 13th and gazetted on the 19th; South Essex, received on the 14th and gazetted the 2nd April; East Grey, received on the 14th and gazetted on the 19th March, as were also South Leeds, Lennox and Megantic. Prince Edward county was received on the 14th March and gazetted on the 19th April, a delay of 26 days. South Victoria, 14th, gazetted 19th; South Waterloo, 14th, gazetted 19th; Argenteuil, 14th, gazetted 19th; Beauharnois, 14th, gazetted 19th; L'Assomption, 14th, gazetted 26th; Richmond and Wolfe, 14th, gazetted 19th; Richelieu, 14th, gazetted 19th; Stanstead, 14th, gazetted 19th; Témiscouata, 14th, gazetted 19th; Yamaska, 14th, gazetted 19th; and at the same date Annapolis, Digby, Halifax, Hants, Queen's, Albert, N. B., and Prince, Prince Edward Island. I need not go through the entire list, but I have gone through enough to show that the statement of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an untrue statement, that it is impossible it can be true, that he has not dealt with the matter in the way he said he did deal with it, and that he disregarded the law. It was the right of every hon. member, whether elected to support the Government or the Opposition, to be gazetted immediately after the receipt of the return of the returning officer of the constituency by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That duty the law makes imperative. It is not a discretionary duty imposed on him: there is no discretion on his part; it is mandatory. It is his duty to obey the law, and hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches know that this officer has disregarded the law in this particular. And now we have before the committee a proposition to increase the salary of an officer who has done what? Done an act of gross injustice to hon. members on this side of the House; he failed to gazette over sixty on this side within the time fixed by the law of the land, and he subjected many of them to petitions affecting their return to this House after the time had expired, if he had discharged his duty as the law directs. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that it does not matter, if a member of the House has not violated the law, whether he is petitioned against or not. I say it matters very greatly. It is impossible that any seat can be contested without great expense and inconvenience, and it was the duty of this officer to have discharged his duty as the law directed. He has not done so, and hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing the fact that he has not discharged his duty, that he has violated the law, that he has disregarded his oath of office, come down and propose to increase his salary by \$350. It is impossible to look at this proposal and come to any other conclusion than that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches conspired with this man to violate the duties of his office and take an unfair advantage of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He has proved a mean, unprincipled minion of authority, and that is shown by what he has done. It is shown by the letter addressed by him to this House, a letter which on its face is false, a letter which is such as would have secured, where no improper motives intervened, the instant dismissal of any one who would venture to write it. Yet hon. gentlemen, instead of seeking to secure the true and honest discharge of

duties by a public officer, propose to offer a premium to the man who has violated his duty in this particular. Why, if there is any office with respect to which it was important that the man should act fairly, it is this office. He is not the officer of the Government, he is the servant of the law, and it is his duty to obey the law; and there is no rule or principle better settled in our law than that it is no excuse on the part of an officer to fail to discharge his duty and violate the law at the instance of his superiors. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have advised this man to act in the way he did. They were indisposed to have this matter go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where this man could have been examined on oath, where he could have been questioned with respect to any correspondence, conversation or interview had with the hon. gentleman or any of his colleagues. Yet the action of the Government, the course taken by the First Minister, shows very clearly that this officer felt that he was under the protection of the Government. My notice had scarcely appeared on the paper before the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was walking the corridor of the eastern block waiting for the Secretary of State one hour before he arrived at his office. Why was he so anxious with respect to this matter? The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery knew he had disregarded the law, that he had failed to perform the duties the law imposed on him, that he had not gazetted the members as the law directed, and that he had violated his oath of office. Yet we find the Government in this instance undertaking to prevent any enquiry into the conduct of this officer, and in the Estimates proposing to increase his salary by \$350. For my part I am opposed to this increase. I am opposed to any increase of the salary of an unworthy officer. It is as clear as noon-day that this man has violated the duties of his office. Hon. gentlemen opposite know it. How would they act in the case of an ordinary officer who had done as this man had done? Would they not dismiss him? If any officer were to conduct himself for one moment towards any hon. gentlemen on that side of the House as this officer has conducted himself towards three-fourths of the members on this side, his position would not be worth 24 hours' purchase; and yet hon. gentlemen not only endeavor to screen this officer, but they propose to reward him for his treachery to those who sit on this side of the House. I will oppose an increase of the salary of this officer, and when an opportunity occurs I will move his dismissal from office. I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite to take the responsibility before the House and the country that they have of defending a man who wrote an impertinent and mendacious production such as that which appears in the Votes and Proceedings. I want this country to know it if hon. gentlemen propose to strike below the belt; if they propose to carry on a war of this sort disregarding the law; if they are disposed to employ an instrument of this kind to take an unfair advantage of hon. members on this side of the House; if they are not willing to abide by the popular verdict; if they are not willing to rest content with the strength which an appeal to the country has given them. I intend, so far as I am concerned, that the public shall know precisely what this officer has done and what the Government propose to do in order to sustain him in the position which he occupies. I wish the country to know that hon. gentlemen opposite have used a public officer to violate the law, to take an unfair and illegal advantage of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that they propose to reward him for those services out of the public Treasury.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I heard the hon. member for Bothwell mix my name with the name of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and those abominations of which he has been speaking. The hon. gentleman says that the

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been walking sentry at my office. Now, it is not parliamentary for him to charge me with being late at my office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not charge the hon. gentleman with being there late, but I said that the Clerk of the Crown was there early.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Well, I will give this information to the hon. gentleman, that I have not spoken to, I have not corresponded with, I have not seen, either at my office or elsewhere, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery since long before the last general elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there could hardly be a more indecent thing than the proposition to add \$350 to the salary of an officer who, on the evidence of his own letter, to which my hon. friend has called attention, has evidently been guilty of acts which appear to me to be in direct violation of his oath of office, and certainly the violation of his duty. I say that no human being can read the letter of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, addressed to our Clerk at the Table, and believe for one moment that it has resulted from any honest intention; no one can believe that, from the statements which he has made in that letter, such a state of things could have arisen as my hon. friend has depicted. My hon. friend is perfectly right in stating that every line of this letter shows conclusively on the face of it that the explanation offered by this officer cannot possibly be true. There is no possibility, if that gentleman did as he said, if he pitched all these letters promiscuously into a waste paper basket, or whatever it may be—there is no possibility that the results which appeared in our *Gazettes* could have taken place on any other principle than that when the pot boils the scum comes uppermost; and if hon. gentlemen admit it is on that principle that their *Gazettes* came first, there may be some justification for the allegations made by this officer that, when he placed some twenty, thirty, forty or fifty returns or large bundles of paper together, by some unexplained, mysterious fatality it always happened that five or six or seven times as many returns affecting gentlemen on the other side of the House came to the surface as returns affecting members on this side. Sir, I must say that I agree with my hon. friend that a more impudent letter was never communicated to a body like this by any officer in its service—a more impudent letter; I say that distinctly; and I say it reflects exceedingly little credit on hon. gentlemen opposite that when they were charged, as they were repeatedly from this side of the House, with having been in collusion with this officer, to induce him to abuse his position for the purpose of giving an undue and unfair advantage, in the matter of gazetting these returns, to hon. gentlemen on that side over hon. gentlemen on this, that they should have refused an investigation. If their consciences are clear, if their skirts are clean, if they had no transactions, as the Secretary of State declares he had none, and no intercourse with this clerk, what on earth had they to fear from an investigation? Here we have a letter brought to us by this gentleman in which he states:

"Owing to the quantity of letters and large bundles of election papers which reached me by every mail, and which I was consequently unable to assort and examine before the arrival of an additional batch by the following mail, it necessarily happened, from both want of time and space, that those which came last were put on the top of the others, and were in consequence, in many instances, gazetted before those which were underneath, and which had previously arrived."

Now, does any hon. gentleman opposite pretend to say, in the teeth of the evidence of the *Gazette* returns, that that is a true statement of what happened? Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that it could by any conceivable combination of circumstances have occurred that eighteen or nineteen gentleman on that side should have been

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

gazetted as against three or four on this side, if those documents were all piled pell-mell in one huge receptacle and taken up by accident? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself would be the very first to pour the most withering scorn and ridicule on gentlemen on this side if they offered such a statement as that as any exemplification of the doctrine of chances. Moreover, the Clerk of the Crown intimates that it was his duty to examine large piles of papers, oaths, statements and certificates of the various officers employed at the election, nomination papers and numerous other documents. Well, I must say that this is the first time we have heard that that was his duty—that he was to go over all these papers. For what purpose is he to go through them? He is not to sit in judgment on the proceedings taken by the returning officer. As my hon. friend stated correctly, and as the Act states in the most explicit terms possible, it is his duty to take the declarations of the returning officer, and, on that declaration, within the shortest time possible to gazette the man returned. Now, I would not make any disturbance about a matter of this kind, if the proportion was only two or three in excess; but no man can look at the *Gazette* returns and believe that what actually happened was an accident. Why, Sir, in the first week eight gentlemen on that side were gazetted and one on this side. Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that what took place in the second, the third or the fourth week—does any hon. gentleman pretend that that kind of thing could have arisen from accident, or that it is satisfactorily explained by this precious document? If hon. gentlemen have any regard for their own honor, after the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who has very expressly, in his place in the House, intimated his belief that these hon. gentlemen have dealt with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and induced him under these circumstances to make a return contrary to the directions given in the law—if they have any regard for their own honor, they will, now that he has given the so-called explanation, which I venture to say nobody in the House can pretend to say is a satisfactory one, they will at once cause this letter to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and have a full investigation made into the circumstances to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I think thus and thus only can they possibly clear themselves from the imputation which will otherwise rest upon them, of having abused their power as Ministers of the Crown for the purpose of inducing this man, a servant of the Government, to act in the way he did, in a way contrary to all reason and fair play. I regret exceedingly that I should have to speak in such terms of the conduct of any official of this Government, and I regret still more that, on the present occasion, it should be proposed to reward this man, who has certainly discharged his duty at the best in the most careless and perfunctory manner possible—to reward him with a large increase of salary. Taking the circumstances altogether it is quite impossible for us to regard this as anything else than the wages paid for a gross breach of duty; and I certainly agree with the hon. gentleman in saying that we must move for a reduction of this item at the proper time. I think we cannot—and I believe the country will sustain us—we cannot possibly permit a matter of this kind to go without the severest censure it is in our power to inflict, and though we cannot, perhaps, deprive him of the wages of his iniquity, we will at least pillory and gibbet him as he has already pilloried and gibbeted himself by the letter he has written. I say that it is not the letter of an honest man; it is not the letter of an honorable public servant; it is not a letter which in any shape, form or way can be taken as an excuse or justification of the extraordinary irregularities which have occurred in connection with the gazetting of members on this side of the House.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act incorporating the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company, and to change the name thereof.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. Scarth)

Bill (No. 80) to revive the charter of the Quebec Railway Bridge Company, and to amend the same by extending the delay for commencement and completion of its works, and in other respects.—(Mr. McGreevy.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Dominion Oil Pipe Line and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Anglo-Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Waterloo and Magog Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Labelle.)

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Hereford Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. Ives.)

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 86) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 97) to authorise certain extensions of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

COBOURG, BLAIRTON AND MARMORA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SMALL, in the absence of Mr. GUILLET, moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Railway Company.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to have an explanation of the nature of the provisions of this Bill. The reason I ask an explanation is that, as I understand it, there has been a company in existence at Cobourg, in the west riding of Northumberland, which has become insolvent and its property sold; and as the property extends into three or four different constituencies and some of the matters in dispute are in my own constituency, I would like to understand what this Bill is asked for.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend is not altogether correct. That railway does not run into North Hastings. All its proprietor desires is to have power to extend the road from the terminus at Rice Lake along the south side of the lake in order to connect with the short line that runs to the Blairton mines in the county of Peterboro'. That is all the owner of the road at present asks, as I understand from Mr. Pierce.

Mr. MALLORY. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that some of the property is not situated in the Township of Marmora.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing of the kind. I was speaking of the route upon which the railway is to run, and said

nothing of the property. The Bill does not provide for any disposition of the property. I am quite aware there are some 20,000 acres of land in the county of Hastings, township of Marmora, belonging to the proprietor of the road.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Privy Council \$25,902 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of at all entering into the discussion raised by the hon. member for Bothwell. I do not think that that discussion arises here, although it is, of course, in the hon. gentleman's power to deal with the subject now. What we really have to consider here is not an outside question of that kind, which can be brought up in any way the hon. gentleman chooses, but to consider the change that has been made by the transfer from the Secretary of State's Department to that of the Privy Council. This officer, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, has no duties in connection with the Department of the Secretary of State. His duties are necessarily incidental to the Department of the Privy Council, and the transfer has been made to that Department. The reason for the increase of the salary is occasioned by the largely increased duties that devolve upon that officer. Every person knows there is not only, at present, a large increase in the members of the House, but that under the existing Franchise Act, additional duties are thrown on this officer. I think it would be better to deal with this apart from the question raised by the hon. member for Bothwell, and which no doubt will be raised in another way, and confine ourselves to the question as it appears in the Estimates.

Mr. WELDON. He is removed from the Secretary of State's Department to the Privy Council.

Mr. TUPPER. This increase is not an increase at all, so far as the transfer is concerned. It is the transfer of this officer from the Department of the Secretary of State, with which he was formerly connected, and which had no natural or necessary connection with the duties of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to the Department with which all his duties are connected, that is the Privy Council, and the increase has arisen from the increased number of members of the House, and the increased duties thrown upon the officer.

Mr. WELDON. Is it proposed that this officer shall not remain longer under the control of Parliament? His duties, as I understand them, are confined to this Parliament. What increased duties has he to perform?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no necessary connection between the legislation and the duties of this officer. The duties are connected with, and his instructions are given by the Department of the Privy Council, and the natural position for the office seems to be there, and it is in that view that the transfer was made, and not at all to remove the officer from the control of the House. He is just as much under the control of the House now as he was before.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the explanation given by the Finance Minister will be considered as satisfactory to the House. The House cannot ignore the statement of facts which have been made to it on the responsibility of two hon. members who addressed the House to-day. We are face to face not only with the fact that an officer holding the responsible position of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery who has certain statutory duties devolving upon him affecting the rights of members of this House, and the privileges

of those they represent, has been transferred from one Department to another. That is a mere matter of detail. But the matter does not stop there. That officer has been charged with serious dereliction of duty. It has been charged that he has prostituted his office for party purposes, that he has been guilty of treating this House with contempt in a matter respecting its privileges and its rights.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I proposed was this: I believe the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has a notice on the paper for a motion to refer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think the discussion of the conduct of the officer would come up on that or on confirmation of the vote in Supply. The hon. gentleman can bring the question up in any way he chooses, but I do not see the necessity for dealing specifically with the charge of improper conduct on the part of a public officer in connection with the appropriation for the salary of the office. Suppose it was found that a gentleman had so failed to discharge his duties, or had so improperly discharged his duties as to involve his dismissal, still you would require the provision to be made for the office, and it is the office and not the officer I am proposing to deal with now. As we are now in committee, and that is not a convenient place, as the hon. gentleman will see, to bring in any issue in relation to this matter, I have suggested whether it would not be better to deal with the question of this estimate now, and, at the suitable time, in whatever mode hon. gentlemen opposite might feel disposed to adopt, to deal with the conduct of the officer.

Mr. DAVIES. If I understand the position of matters aright, there is no time more apt than this to discuss the conduct of this officer and for these reasons: In the first place, some time ago a very serious charge was brought against this officer by a member of this House from his place in the House; after making that charge, that hon. gentleman moved that it be referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges to examine into, and the leader of the Government moved an amendment that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery be requested to write a letter to this House explaining away, if he could, the charges made against him by the member. The amendment was carried, and then the hon. gentleman who made the charge in the first instance gave notice of a substantive motion which may or may not be reached at a subsequent stage of the proceedings of the House. It may be true that, if the Government had left matters as they were, the conduct of the officer might have been more properly discussed when that motion was reached, but the Government have challenged enquiry, they call upon the House not only to ratify the conduct of the officer, but to give to him a certificate of character by increasing his salary, and the House is now sitting in committee upon a motion, not in so many words to declare that this officer is entirely free of any charges of malefeasance against him, but to approve of his conduct, give him a certificate and increase his salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. This matter was disposed of before the elections. This transference was made in October last, before the elections. It has had no relation whatever to them, and the proposed increase in the salary and everything connected with it was antecedent to the elections. These estimates were prepared before any charge of this kind arose. That has only come up incidentally. The committee may be a convenient place for discussion in some respects, but I am sure we all want to save the time of the House and to avoid having half a dozen discussions on the same matter. I have therefore suggested, as I suppose the hon. gentleman does not propose to bring this to an issue upon the question not of the officer but of the salary of the office which has to be provided in any case, whether it would not be more con-

Mr. DAVIES.

venient and whether it would not answer his own purpose better to take some other occasion, because he cannot bring it conveniently to a satisfactory termination in the committee, and there are abundant opportunities of moving in it. If his motion is not reached, he can make a motion on any day on going into Supply, and can raise the question in any way most convenient to himself. I suggest whether, at this period of the Session and in this hot weather, it would not be well to economise our time and avoid a repetition of the same discussion by confining the discussion in committee to the office and leaving the question of the officer's conduct aside until the hon. gentleman finds it convenient to raise it in another form. Of course, I am in the hands of the committee, but I throw out this suggestion, which I hope will commend itself to their approval with a view to the convenience of members on both sides.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no one who is more anxious to facilitate the business so as to bring the Session to a close than I am; and, speaking for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I am sure it is the general wish to forward the business as much as possible, having due regard to the interests of the public service. But the hon. gentleman cannot ignore the fact that the committee is as convenient an occasion to discuss the conduct of an officer of this kind as can be obtained. There is no desire to prolong the discussions. I wished to express my regret that, at a time when the Government is proposing to increase the salary of this important public officer, and makes a proposition to that effect, and that proposition is met by serious statements of the character of those which were made by my hon. friends before dinner, these statements should have been allowed to go unchallenged. Do hon. gentlemen, do the leader of the Government and his friends expect that this matter will lie quiet? The hon. gentlemen know, as I was proceeding to say when the Minister of Finance made his appeal, that this is a proposition to increase the salary of this officer. The hon. gentleman says it was determined upon before the malefeasances mentioned occurred. It may have been; that is not the point; this is the first time that the proposition has been brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. MADILL. No.

Mr. DAVIES. When was it brought to the notice of the House?

Mr. MADILL. It was brought by the Secretary of State two weeks ago.

Mr. DAVIES. My hon. friend surely does not understand—and allowances will no doubt be made for him as a new member—the position in which the House now stands. We are now for the first time passing this vote in the Committee of Supply. We are passing upon it at the only time when members have a full and free opportunity of discussing every matter in connection with the proposed increases in the public service. Here is one of those increases, and this is the time when it can be discussed, not in formal set speeches which, once made, a member has no opportunity of explaining or commenting upon, but in friendly discussion across the House. If the statements which have been made are overcharged, if they are untrue, if the Government are perfectly spotless in the matter, if there has been no collusion between any member of the Government and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I think it is due to the House and to this committee, and to the members on this side at least, that such an explanation should be given. It cannot be given. The fact that the Government are so silent shows that it cannot be given. There never has been an officer in the public service I will venture to say, at any rate within the recollection of the younger members of this House, against whom such serious charges have been made as have been made against this

officer, and those charges have been made against him furthermore alleging that he acted in collusion with the Government to put the members of the Opposition at a disadvantage, to lengthen unduly and illegally the time allowed by law for petitioning against their return, lengthening it in defiance of the express words of the statute, going out of his way and omitting to do what the statute says he ought to do, but doing directly what the statute says he should not do. When the First Minister moved that he be permitted in explanation of his conduct to send a letter to this House, the letter was sent, and I would like to know if there is an independent member on either side of the House who will venture to say that that officer in that letter has given us a satisfactory explanation of his conduct. Specific charges were made against him in regard to certain members of this House, whose names were given, that he had improperly and illegally, for improper political purposes, delayed the returns in some cases for 15 days, in some cases for 30 days, and in one case for 35 days. The name of the member was given, the time that he delayed was given, and he was asked for an explanation, and he gave none. He treats this House with contempt. It was agreed by those who took part in the previous debate that theoretically, at least—and that was practically—the members on both sides should stand on an equality. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is not and ought not to be a Government official. He is a statutory officer to discharge certain statutory duties. He has no discretionary power. The reply he makes to this House is that his time was taken up in looking over the qualifications, and the oaths, and the statements made by deputy returning officers. Why, Sir, that is all nonsense. He had nothing to do with these oaths, the oaths may have been taken properly or improperly, the qualifications of the candidates may have been correct or incorrect, the elections may have been run properly or improperly, but that is a matter with which he had nothing to do. That is a matter which this Parliament in its wisdom has relegated to the proper judicial tribunals. He had a simple statutory duty to discharge, to look at the certificates sent him by the deputy returning officer, and to publish in the next issue of the *Gazette* the name of the man who had been returned as having the majority of votes. He had no discretion to alter it. Whether he found the preceding papers correct or incorrect, he had no discretion to send them back, or to do anything other than that which the law prescribed, and in mandatory terms directed him to do. He was charged with a dereliction of duty, for a vile and improper purpose, and he was asked to give an explanation to the House of his conduct. He has not done so, and we are asked to-day, in the face of these facts, to give him a certificate of character, and to increase his salary. Now, I ask the House if this is to be passed without discussion? The Finance Minister, in the few general observations he made, says that this man's duties have been increased under the Franchise Act, and, therefore, the salary must be increased. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that the Franchise Act does not increase the duties of the Clerk of the Crown in any way. That officer's duties are set forth under the Election Law, and, whether the Franchise Act is in existence or not, his duties remain exactly the same. Therefore, the excuse falls to the ground, and the hon. gentleman must invent some other excuse. It may be that the Government can satisfy the House that the salary is altogether too small. The Government may be able to show the House that his duties justify an increase of salary, but they certainly cannot do it by a statement like that of the Finance Minister, that the Franchise Act has increased the duties of this officer. I do think that in this matter, which affects so seriously the privileges and rights of the members on both sides of the House, we should consider for some time before we not only vote what seems to be an approval of the conduct of this officer, but also to

grant him an increase of salary. Sir, we have arrived at a pretty stage in the proceedings of elections at this period, when a returning officer sets the law at defiance and sends a man to represent a district who was never elected by the people, and who sits in the House, and Parliament takes no notice of it; and when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sets at defiance the law of the land, which is as direct and peremptory in its language as it can be made. He says, I will not gazette the members as the law directs me to do, but I will gazette the members of the party which has my political sympathies, I will gazette them first and let the others take their chances after 30 or 40 days, and then the Government come down here and in consideration of this officer having neglected his duty, they propose to increase his salary. I do think the House, the committee, and every member of it who has been outraged, and whose constituents have been outraged by this officer, are entitled to some fuller and further explanation from the Government. If the First Minister will rise in his place to-day and say he is perfectly willing that the conduct of this gentleman should be referred for examination to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, then there might be something to be said. But I have not heard a hint, I have not heard a word from any hon. member on the ministerial side that they intend to accept the motion of my hon. friend. The House knows, those who have sat here for any length of time know, that if this vote passes, my hon. friend's motion for an investigation will be voted down. The facts will never be reached, and the officer who has outraged—I will not say his oath, because I want to have the full facts before me before I make that statement—but who *prima facie* has acted in direct defiance of the law, is now to be patted on the back, and his salary to be increased, while hundreds of respectable gentlemen who are working twice as hard as he is, have no increase proposed to them at all, because they have done their duty. I look upon this as a most serious matter, not serious in the aspect that it increases by three or four hundred dollars the salary of a public officer, but serious because charges have been made against him by members on the floor of this House, charges which he is called upon to answer, and which he failed to answer, charges which it is proposed should be investigated and which up to this moment, I understand, the Government refuse to allow to be investigated. Under these circumstances, I think it is right to prolong for a time, at least, this discussion. If the Government choose to disavow his conduct, of course we will go on to some other matters. But, I think that while the Secretary of State thought it was necessary for him to disavow any connection with this disgraceful proceeding, and while the other members of the Government have remained quiet, the suspicion is naturally aroused that they are not able to make the declaration he did. I wonder if the First Minister can rise in his place and declare that neither directly or indirectly had he any communication with this officer with respect to the publication of the returns. I think he might do so if he is perfectly innocent. I dare say he knew something about it. We make no charge against him directly without proof; we are not in the habit of doing so on this side of the House. We always support our charges with proof, and in this case the proof is on the record of our proceedings. The names of the members, the time when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the returns, the times when they were published, the fact that in the intermediate period he had received returns of Conservative members and had gazetted them and kept the Liberal returns over—all these facts are on the record—and with the absurd, ridiculous letter, which is almost in contempt of the House, which the Clerk sent here, I do not feel disposed to vote for this increase of salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it right that we should permit this matter to pass without entering indi-

vidually and collectively our solemn protest against the proceedings that have taken place. We know perfectly well that if hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side of the House a howl would have been raised if we had acted as they have acted towards us. We hold that the action of this officer deserves to be condemned, and we consider it our duty to condemn it. While home for the holidays I called on the returning officer of my division and asked him as to the time he made my return. I am satisfied that it was received a considerable time before the 15th of March, which is the date on which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery says he received it. No less than three numbers of the *Gazette* were issued before I was gazetted. There is not a single constituency in the section from which I come represented by a Conservative that was not gazetted a week, and in some cases two weeks, before me, and consequently there was ample time to enter a protest against me as an offset to any action taken against a Conservative in that section. It is unfair to take this officer from the position he has occupied for years and place him in a higher position with an increase of \$350 to his salary as a reward for his action in this matter. Such a case is nothing less than a national disgrace. It is an outrageous act, after the people are appealed to, that every technical advantage should be taken by gentlemen on the Treasury benches to perpetuate their power. What a record we have to throw in the face of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to their actions in years past? There was the Gerry-mander Act; and I could name several hon. gentlemen opposite who would never have shown their faces in Parliament except for that Act. Then there was the Franchise Act, and the best evidence with respect to the character of that Bill is that the Government now propose to take last year's list for the present year; it has done its work, and after a quiet sleep they will resurrect it when they desire it to do duty again. In a word they resort to any measure to retain power and office. The Minister of Finance has made a very plausible and courteous suggestion, that we should allow the debate to terminate and should discuss the matter on a subsequent occasion. If we look at the reports for 1872-73 we will find that hon. gentleman and the Minister of Customs questioned every little item which was before the House, and moreover entered into a general and almost everlasting criticism. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that because the general elections have passed, we should allow this matter to pass. As a matter of justice to ourselves and our constituents we are bound to enter our protests against the continuance of this proceeding. What may we expect in the future? It has been remarked that there is a member in this House with a majority of 60 votes against him. And then there is the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery taking advantage of his position to gazette Conservatives and hold over the gazetting of Reformers, and yet it is proposed to give him \$350 additional because he allowed himself to be made a dupe for the purpose. It must be remembered that the Government had a fair opportunity of clearing their skirts from this matter had they acceded to the request of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who proposed that it should be investigated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where the clerk could have been examined under oath. If that had been done, the Government would have had an opportunity to clear themselves of all responsibility for what happened, but they felt that they dare not do this. When the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was under oath, he would have had, in reply to questions, to have confessed the truth and admit that insinuations were made, that advice was given, and thus this political crime was perpetrated in connection with this gazetting business. The Government should have taken advantage of that proposal; and if they had done so we would have got over this difficulty, and the Finance Minister would not have had to make the suggestion he has made.

Mr. McMULLEN.

But hon. gentlemen opposite declined to do so, and requested the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to send a letter of explanation to the Clerk of the House. And a poor explanation it is. It has been thoroughly sifted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has shown that it is nothing short of a tissue of falsehoods, and one that does not bear investigation. It is our duty to make the country acquainted with this gross injustice. But this is only one of a series of acts of injustice perpetrated for years; we have almost got accustomed to them, and to the fact that the people of the country are prepared to always shut their eyes to the facts presented.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think that with the facts before the House and the assertions made by hon. gentlemen in their places with respect to the action of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the matter should be fairly investigated before this increase of salary is voted. If we do not, we are simply giving away the case presented. Under the resolution moved by the First Minister, he was called on to give an explanation, and certainly no man who will read the papers can feel that that explanation is satisfactory. If he had, on the contrary, shown clearly and explicitly how the acts which he is accused of doing intentionally were committed, matters might have been in a different position; but no man can read that letter without feeling that it is an entire evasion of the matter which he was asked to explain. It is due to the honor and dignity of the House, it is only justice to the members of this House who make the charge, and the Clerk of the Crown himself, that this matter should be investigated, and that before asking the committee to increase the salary of an officer who has been charged with a dereliction of duty, the Government should either give an assurance that the matter will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or else the item should be allowed to stand over until the matter is fully investigated.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is very evident that charges of a serious nature have been made against this officer and these charges do not bear on the officer alone, but by insinuation it has been stated that the Government of the day are responsible for the course he pursued. If, then, the Government will not allow the matter to be investigated as against this officer, they must themselves be held responsible for his conduct; and it appears to me to be a very strange course on their part that they should sit quietly by and not make any explanation of these charges. If the charges made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) are true, that officer should not occupy his position for a single day. If they are true the Government is bound to remove him from his position, and if they do not remove him they virtually acknowledge that they alone are to blame for his conduct, because he was responsible to them. If they do not offer any explanation of his conduct the country will regard them as the guilty parties, and will believe that that officer was merely an instrument by which the wrong was intended to be inflicted upon some members of this House. It is all very well for the Minister of Finance to say that we should allow this matter to pass, and that this is not a proper time to discuss it. It may not be a proper time to suit his convenience, and I believe any discussion of this matter is not a proper time, so far as the Government is concerned. Are there not other members of the Government who can rise in their places and state that they had no communication, directly or indirectly, with reference to the course of this officer? But as they sit quietly in their seats they put themselves in the position of admitting their guilt—admitting that they had some communication with that officer in the way of directing him to pursue the course he did pursue. I ask, is there a single member of this Government who would dare to go before an audience at the present time

and defend himself against the charges which have been hurled against this officer and against the Government? It is true they are capable of defending many outrages but this one is the height to which they have arrived, and I believe there is no member of the Government so lost to shame, I might say, as to dare to defend their course before this House. Are we to reward an officer for doing that which he ought not to do by giving him a larger salary? They say this was a transfer from one office to another, but when was this transfer made? Was it made before the elections, when they were trembling at the prospect of being defeated at the polls? It is not a thing that they would leave to the last moment, for in 1882, before they went to the polls, they took good pains to make themselves secure, and before this election they assumed control of the voters' lists, and, not content with that, they resorted to the scheme of inducing a servant of this House to violate the duty he had sworn to perform faithfully. Did he do that through their instructions or advice? Had they a knowledge of it themselves? Did they tell him what course he was to pursue, how he was to find out who were Reformers and who were Conservatives, and to lay by quietly the returns of the Reformers and take up the returns of Conservatives as soon as possible? I ask any unbiassed man on that side if he can possibly come to any other conclusion than that there was a method in the manner of gazetting, and that it could not possibly be done as it was by accident. I do not believe any member of this House believes but that it was a deliberate intent, either of this officer or of the Government, that the Conservative party might have an advantage over the Reform party in this respect. If that is so, are we not justified in asking for an explanation when the Government are proposing to promote this officer? I say that it would not be proper to allow this item to pass without censuring him, and if the Government will not defend him, then they must be held guilty of the wrong which has been imputed to this officer. They should rise in their places and explain upon whose shoulders the blame really rests. Are we as a Parliament to let it go to the country and the world at large that an officer who deliberately violates his oath and neglects to do his duty will not be defended by the Government whose officer he is, nor will they take his responsibility themselves of his conduct. They do not display that high moral tone which ought to characterise a Government at all times. I believe it is the bounden duty of every member of this House to declare at once that this officer ought to explain what he has done and the reason he did it. We can easily understand now why the Government refused to allow this matter to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Before that committee the officer could have explained the whole matter; he could have been examined, and he would have been obliged to tell who was the instigator of this fraud and wrong upon the Reform party. Perhaps it would have been very uncomfortable to some members of the Government. Perhaps some things would have come to light that they would not have cared to see exposed. I believe this is something on which we should raise our voices. I believe it was the intention of our opponents to have as many Reform members seats protested as possible. I happen to be one of the happy ones who have received protests.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend over there cries "hear, hear." I have no doubt he would cry "hear, hear," if the seat of every member on this side was protested. That is his appreciation of honesty and justice. I have no hesitation in saying here that had it not been for the neglect or wrong-doing on the part of this officer there would have been no protest. I say that to allow an officer to inflict a wrong upon me, and then in a short time afterwards to

come and ask me to vote an increase of his salary, is something that I am bound to protest against. I hope the Government will give some explanation of the absurd and unreasonable course they are now pursuing. I see the Minister of Customs sitting there and smiling as if he had never committed a wrong in his life; but I too well remember his handiwork in the Gerrymander Act to believe that he is above suspicion; and I venture to think that there are others sitting on that side of the House who, if we could only get at the truth, would have to admit that they had a part in the course that officer pursued.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I have a peculiar sympathy with my medical brother who has just sat down. If my friend will undertake to show, and does show, that any relief has been given by any infringement of the election law to any supporter of the Government by any action of this gentleman, and no greater criminality can be attached to any infringement of the law by a member of the Opposition, I am prepared to vote condemnation to that gentleman's conduct.

Mr. MADILL. I cannot understand why the hon. member for East Elgin is desirous to condemn the Government in regard to his constituency unless it is because, as he says, he has been presented with a protest. If that gentleman or his friends in the riding are not guilty of any corrupt acts in connection with the recent election, he has nothing to fear. Those gentlemen seem to be afraid of being gazetted. They are desirous that the thirty days allowed by law for the purpose of scrutinising the acts of themselves and their officials in the election should be limited. If they have not been guilty of any illegal acts by themselves or their agents in that election, then they have received no injury at the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. But these gentlemen have been in the habit, since we came into the House this year, from the leader of the Opposition down, of arraigning the Government officials of every riding and every municipality in the Dominion where a Conservative has been returned to this House. Now, these gentlemen have not an opportunity of defending themselves from the attacks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Attacks were made on the officials of my riding both by the hon. member for South Oxford and by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I did not venture to defend those officials, because I thought that the hon. leader of the Opposition would not get up in the House and make such charges against officials unless these charges had some foundation. He charged that the returning officer in my riding was the secretary of the Conservative Association of North Ontario. I hesitated to question that statement at the time, but when I went home I ascertained that it was at variance with the facts. The secretary has occupied that position for twenty-five years, and he is just as respectable a man as the hon. member for West Durham, or any other member on that side of the House. Now, why should the characters and reputations of these gentlemen be brought up here, gentlemen who have the confidence of the people whether they are Conservatives or Reformers? The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, has been a policy of slander against Conservative members and Conservative Ministers. I recollect my opponent in my riding getting up on a platform and saying: "Sir John Macdonald is a liar, and I can prove him to be a liar." I think these men would do well to note what the Bible tells them when it says, "Speak no evil of the leader of thy people." But the leaders of that party have no policy but the policy of slander against the leaders of the Government, and how can we expect any other policy from the rank and file? Hon. gentlemen opposite must be aware that the hon. Secretary of State, stated a few weeks ago in this House, that the officer against whom the present charges have been

preferred was transferred from his department to the Privy Council long before this charge against that official could have been formulated, and yet these gentlemen get up and assert that his salary was raised in consequence of the way in which he performed his duty in connection with the election returns. I say it is unfair for hon. gentlemen opposite to drag up the question of the character and reputation of officers of the Government before they have had an opportunity of defending themselves.

Mr. EDGAR. I am not at all surprised that the hon. member for North Ontario should be perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on this occasion. There are three ridings in Ontario, north, south and west. The north happens to be represented by two Conservatives in this House. I happen to have the honor of representing the west riding. I find, from the return laid before the House, that the returning officer sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a return from each of those ridings on the same day, the 9th of March. It is a very extraordinary accident that on the 12th of March, on the very first issue of the *Gazette* after the returns reached the Clerk of the Crown, the two ridings of North and South Ontario, represented by my hon. friend and another Conservative colleague, were gazetted.

Mr. BOWELL. Has the hon. gentleman read the return?

Mr. EDGAR. Oh, yes, I have read it.

Mr. BOWELL. If I read it correctly, it shows that the return in the north riding was on the 9th of March, and the gazetting was on the 12th of April.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was no *Gazette* issued on the 12th of April. It should be 12th of March.

Mr. EDGAR. The date of the returns was the 9th in the three ridings. The return of the north and south were gazetted on the 12th March, and my return was not gazetted until the 26th March. No wonder the hon. gentleman is quite satisfied, no wonder he supports the increase in salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and declares it is a policy of slander the Opposition adopt when they take exception to conduct of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the attention of the Finance Minister to a paragraph or two in the paper which this officer has submitted to the House. The Minister of Finance says this is not a proper occasion for a discussion of this question. I would not have thought of bringing it to the attention of the committee if the hon. gentleman had not proposed to increase the salary of this officer who is guilty of misconduct. When he proposes to increase the salary of an officer against whom certain charges are pending, he must certainly expect that we should point out to the committee why we think this increase ought not to take place. It is a matter of no consequence whether this increase was proposed in October or February; it is not of the slightest consequence to this House when the contract, the understanding, or bargain, was entered into between the members, or some member of the Government and this officer; but this we do know, that the law of the land imposes certain duties upon him, which he has flagrantly violated. Look at the statement made by this officer, and I specially call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this statement. He gives as a reason for delay in gazetting, that some of the papers were not received in time, and that certain returning officers had not made their returns in the form required in the statute. This statement is found on page 186 of the Votes and Proceedings. I turn back to page 60 of the Votes and Proceedings, and I look at the return which this officer forwarded to this House, in obedience to its Order, and I find there are two instances he

Mr. MADILL.

himself reports—and he was asked to report them all—in which the returning officers neglected to make their returns. He said:

“On the 23rd March I wrote the returning officer for East Peterborough that I could not find the return form S among the election papers he had forwarded me on the 11th March. On the 26th March I received an answer from him, enclosing the return form S, stating that he had inadvertently omitted to send it on the 10th March with the other election papers.

“I wrote a similar letter to the returning officer for Brockville, and received the return form S from him in reply.”

Let me call the attention of this House to what this officer did. Will it be believed that, before he received these returns, he gazetted these members? Will it be believed that in the case of the return of the hon. member for Brockville, he gazetted it, although he had not received the proper certificate. Did he not do the same thing in the case of the hon. member for Peterboro'? Yet this officer, after having gazetted these men without having received the certificate, said the delay in receiving the returns was the reason for the delay in gazetting in the case of men whose returns were properly made. We have in this statement an impudent, and lying statement put upon the records of this House in reply to an Order of this House, and it is beneath the dignity of the House that the Government should retain such an officer an hour in its service. What does the law require? I do not care whether we were injured or not by this. The law says that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall discharge a certain duty. Has he discharged that duty? Has he complied with the law? Has he dealt with the members of the House as the law requires he should deal with them? There is not an hon. gentleman opposite but knows he has not. Yet in the face of this scandalous dereliction of duty, the Government propose to increase the salary of this officer. An hon. gentleman stands up and talks about a policy of slander. Who has slandered this man? Has any hon. gentleman on that side stated that this officer has done his duty? Has any hon. gentleman on that side stated that this officer has complied with the law? Have not the charges against him been sustained by his own confession and reports? There is no room to doubt that. The hon. the First Minister says: Oh! If none of your agents have violated the law, what have you to fear? But is it a matter of no consequence to be put to the trial and inconvenience and expense of a controverted election? Why, I had a contest two years ago, through the rascality and scoundrelism of a public officer appointed by the Government, and I vindicated my right and my innocence, and the innocence of those who were associated with me and supported me in that election; but I know that it cost me between \$3,000 and \$4,000. And the hon. gentleman thinks proving my innocence ought to be sufficient satisfaction. That is the way these hon. gentlemen talk. Why did not they act upon that principle? Why did this officer in every instance gazette these hon. gentlemen in obedience to the law? I can name those men sitting on the Treasury benches who were gazetted 48 hours after the returns were received. They were hurried into the *Gazette*, and this minion of a party, this janissary, this man who was ready to be the assassin of hon. gentlemen on this side, at the instance of hon. gentlemen opposite, is now about to receive his reward at the hands of this House. I protest against such conduct; and I tell the hon. gentleman what was once said by Mr. Pym, when he was about to be betrayed by Lord Wentworth: “You may desert us now, but I will never leave you while your head is on your shoulders.” I tell these hon. gentlemen they may compel this man to violate the law, they may degrade Parliament by proceedings of this sort, but if there is a sense of justice in the people of this country, I will see, as one member of this House, that that sense of justice is invoked, and that the rights of the people's representatives in this House, the rights of those

who are in the minority and those whose interests require to be protected, are vindicated by the moral sense of the community against the misconduct and the conspiracy of those men who sit at this hour upon the Treasury benches, and who discredit free institutions by the defence of a man like this, and by the proposal to increase his salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may say to the Minister of Customs that I have here the official *Gazette*, issued under the authority of Government,—

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I see it is a mistake in the statement here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—which shows that it was on the 12th March that these two gentlemen were gazetted, and I may further say that there was no *Gazette* issued on the 12th April.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I admit that there is a mistake here.

Mr. MADILL. The hon. gentleman opposite endeavors to make it appear that there was a conspiracy between members on this side of the House and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in regard to gazetting the return of Conservative members. I was not aware—I had no communication whatever,—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no reference to you.

Mr. MADILL. My return was received on the 9th and gazetted on the 12th, and the first information I had of it was when I received the *Gazette* containing it. I think I ought to deny the statement made by gentlemen on the other side that there was any conspiracy entered into by the Liberal-Conservative members returned at the recent elections with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to do any injury to those on the other side. I had no notice of it whatever. I had no notice of my return until I received the *Gazette* with my name in it.

Mr. MALLORY. The hon. gentleman opposite has stated that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were in great haste that their names should appear in the official *Gazette*, knowing that they and their friends had committed acts which were contrary to the election law, and therefore it was in their interests that their names should appear in the *Gazette* early in order that no protest might be entered against them. I may be able to inform the hon. gentleman why I believe some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have acknowledged they were exceedingly desirous that their names should appear in the official *Gazette* as early as possible. I may remind the First Minister and some of his colleagues of an official visit paid to the east riding of Northumberland last fall, and I may call the attention of the House to the visit of that particular car, the "Jamaica," to my riding, and may inform the House of some of the promises that were possibly exacted from some of the followers, some contractors, men who are dependent upon the Government of the day for their very existence, their very living, for the money they were making, some of the promises which these men say, as the result of that visit and of other interviews with the Government, they were enabled to make to the Government of the day. These gentlemen have told my friends, and have told me, that they promised the First Minister, after that visit and on the occasion of that visit, that they would see to it that four members were returned from the four Bay constituencies to support the hon. gentleman opposite, and, in fulfilment of the promises which they had made, I know perfectly well, and so do my two friends who represent two other Bay constituencies here, what kind of tactics were brought to bear. They have said to me, and have said to my own friends and to their own that they promised the right hon. the leader of the Government that they would see to

it that four members would be returned from those four Bay constituencies to support the hon. gentleman opposite, that it would be to their disgrace and to their personal injury as contractors upon the Murray Canal, receiving large favors at the hands of the Government of the day, if they did not return four supporters of the hon. gentleman opposite from those four constituencies. When I accused these men of using unlawful means the day after the election, they said: "Well, a few more dollars would have done it." This is the kind of tactics we had to submit to, and, if that is the case, I do not wonder that the hon. member for West Hastings was gazetted as early as possible, for I see his return appears as early as possible in the official *Gazette*. I do not say that the hon. member has committed any illegal act personally, but I say that the contractors on those public works knew perfectly well that they had done what was incorrect according to the law, that they had expended large sums of money in those constituencies, and that they had told me and my constituents and the constituents in Prince Edward and East and West Hastings, that they had promised the Government that they would return four supporters, and that it would be a disgrace to the people of those constituencies, when large sums of money were being expended by the Government of the day, if they should not recognise that Government by sending supporters of them to the House. These matters were continually held before our people as bribes, and it ill-becomes any hon. gentleman opposite to accuse hon. members on this side of the House when they appeal to the fair sense of justice in the country and in this House, and ask nothing more than fair play and equal justice and equal rights, nothing more than that a fair proportion of their names should appear in the official *Gazette* with a fair proportion of the names of their opponents. We ask no undue advantage, but a spirit of fair play, a spirit of that British fair play which our opponents are so wont to ask from us. That has not been given us, and, if gentlemen opposite will look at the returns as brought down by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, they will see how truthful are many of the statements contained in his letter. He tells us that these returns came in in such a hurry that they had to be piled up, and he was unable to get at them and gazette the names as they came in. I call attention to the dates on which these returns arrived and the number of them. I find that, on the 1st of March, one return came in. Was that such a wonderful pile that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could not overhaul it and gazette that name? On the 5th, one came in; on the 4th, ten came in. Are these such wonderful numbers and such tremendous stacks of documents that this gentleman could not have got out these names and gazetted them? On the 7th, fourteen names were returned. Is this such a wonderful lot that he could not overhaul and gazette them? On the 9th, there were fourteen; on the 4th, ten; on the 8th, twenty-five; on the 3rd, two; on the 10th, nine; on the 14th, twenty-one; on the 16th, five; on the 15th, four; on the 22nd, only one; on the 18th, only one; on the 26th, two; on the 21st, two; on the 27th, one; on the 29th, one; on the 30th, one; on the 2nd, one. Is it not a fact that the statement which this man has brought down to the House is on the very face of it a fraud, a deception and an untruth, to put it as mildly as it is possible to put it. I maintain that, when an accusation as strong and severe as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has brought against this gentleman is made, it is only due to the Government itself and to this man that he should be called before the Committee on Privileges and Elections or before this House, and should be able to make his statement so that we should know exactly where the blame should rest. It is only fair to members of this House that we should know. My hon. friend from North Ontario has said that it is unfair and unjust that this man's character should

be dragged before the House when he has no chance of defending himself. Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman who it is that has deprived him of an opportunity of defending himself. Did not the hon. gentleman himself vote that this man should not be brought before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where he would be able to defend himself and his character from any suspicion of wrongdoing? If he is innocent, I should be exceedingly sorry that his character should be injured, but if he be guilty, why should the hon. gentleman from North Ontario, by his vote the other day, deprive that man of an opportunity of vindicating his character and throwing the blame upon some others? I ask the hon. gentleman to give this man for whom he pleads in such eloquent terms a chance to defend himself and his character against aspersions, and to throw the blame upon the shoulders of those to whom it properly belongs.

Mr. MADILL. Grave charges of dereliction of duty have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, not only against this official, but against other officials throughout the land who have performed their duty well. Their names also were dragged before this House and charges were made against them which we know now to be untrue. Yet the characters and reputations of these men were attacked on the authority of the ex-members of this House who, having been defeated, were desirous of sending to the leader of the Opposition the charges which they themselves could not make in this House. Now, I do say that it is a mean and disreputable thing for the ex-member of my riding to go to the returning officer before he was ever appointed, and tell him that he would be the returning officer appointed by the Government, that the appointment would be satisfactory, not only to the Conservative party but also to the Reform party, that he hoped he would receive the appointment; and when he did receive it the ex-member wrote to the hon. member for West Durham to say that the appointment was unsatisfactory to the people of North Ontario. The very man who approached the man that was appointed as returning officer, was told by the candidate on the Reform side that he would be the man selected and would give satisfaction to the Reform party, and then he went round and condemned the appointment which he had said was satisfactory to the party. That is what I condemn; and I say that the ex-member for North Ontario, in doing this, has come to a very small market with very small potatoes. Not only that, but he went to another Conservative in a different part of the riding and told him that he would receive the position, thus attempting to stir up strife between Conservatives as to that appointment. That is what I find fault with. Those men pretend to be favorable to the man to be selected, and then they go behind their backs and attempt to destroy their characters after they had told them that they would be satisfactory to the Reform party. I say that it is a dastardly piece of business for those men to come here and rake over the characters of the returning officers, who are honest men, and who have done well, and who have received the commendation of the Reform as well as the Conservative party from North Ontario in reference to their conduct. The same thing was done in reference to the revising barrister. The counsel in North Ontario, who attended all the courts in behalf of our opponents, got up in court and proposed a resolution that the thanks of the people were due to that revising barrister, because not a single decision given by him had been questioned in North Ontario. Then the ex-member came forward and attacked the character of this very man whom he had before commended. I say that those men and their characters should not be dragged up into this discussion, criticised and condemned, when the very men who have lived in the county and know them, have nothing to say of them but words of commendation. That is why I say hon.

Mr. MALLORY.

gentlemen are doing wrong in attacking those men here, when they have no opportunity of defending themselves. Now, our friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says that South Ontario has returned a Conservative, that West Ontario has returned a Reformer, and that North Ontario has returned a Conservative. Well, notwithstanding the Gerrymander Act of 1882, which returned three Reformers, we have two Conservatives elected for North and South Ontario, and the candidate for West Ontario got in by a very small majority. When we come back here five years hence, I hope the result will be that all the three ridings will return Conservatives. Now, a great deal has been said about the "Jamaica" car. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the leader of the Government went round the country electrifying the people. Now, there has been another car that has gone round the country, and that car was occupied by the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. member for West Ontario. That car honored North Ontario with a visit, and what was the result of the visit and of the visit of the hon. member for West Durham? The hon. member for West Ontario, in my hearing, made the statement that the Liberal-Conservatives were like the rotten carcasses of dogs thrown upon the stream and kept afloat by their own corruption. Why, although the ex-member for North Ontario received only a majority of six in 1882, he was in a minority of 126 in the last election. Hon. gentlemen may applaud, but the language used by the member for West Ontario is a disgrace to any riding in Canada, but I hope it will receive the same condemnation in other ridings that it received in North Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Kent). I think, considering the great importance of this question, it is to be regretted that the Government have not seen fit to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for full investigation. This is one of the most important subjects that has come before Parliament this Session. It is one affecting the rights and privileges not only of members of this side of the House but also of hon. gentlemen opposite. There can be no question that a great wrong has been committed. It has not been denied that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not properly performed the duties devolving upon him; and, that being the case, the matter should be thoroughly investigated in order to relieve the Government of the responsibility placed upon them and to clear the skirts of the officer in question. And the dereliction on the part of that officer has been so gross and unjustifiable that the Government ought not to hesitate for a single moment in granting the request for a full investigation. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that it makes no difference. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Mallill) stated that the Opposition seemed to be very much afraid of the result of protests which might be entered against them. But the fear has been shown by hon. gentlemen opposite, as is proved by the fact that they have taken every means in their power to see that their returns were gazetted at the earliest possible moment. One hon. gentleman told us the other night that as soon as the election was over, he hastened to the returning officer in order to get his return forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as soon as possible, knowing that the sooner his return was sent down the sooner it would be gazetted. Then as to the attack which hon. gentlemen opposite said we were making upon the officer in question, I say we have boldly brought forward our charges against that officer, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has made a most serious charge against him, one that should not be allowed to pass without the Government either justifying his conduct or permitting the charges to be investigated. Personally I have a grievance to complain of. My return was received on 11th

March, and the *Gazette* was issued the next day, but I do not suppose that the officer had had proper time to get it inserted. Surely, however, there was time for the issue on the 19th, or on the 26th, but it was not until the 2nd April that he found time to insert my return received on 11th March. On looking over the list, I find a great many returns received on that date, but in every case where a Conservative was returned they were gazetted either on the 12th or on the 19th. In fact returns of Conservatives received on 14th March were gazetted the next week or at all events the week after. In considering, therefore, the charges against this officer it is most absurd for the Government to come down and without giving any explanation refuse to have this matter investigated by a committee, and at the same time propose to grant him \$350 increase of salary. The position is one of the most absurd positions ever taken by hon. gentlemen having any feeling of fair play. I am much surprised that the Government should have made such a proposal, and no member of the Government except the Secretary of State has had the manliness to rise and say that so far as he was concerned his skirts were clean. But the Minister of Customs and other gentlemen have not risen and made such a statement, but they have allowed this officer to be maligned and charges brought against him, and yet refused to have the matter sent to a committee for investigation. I, therefore, think we have a perfect right to take the position, that if the Government will not consent to refer this matter to a committee where it can be fully investigated, but come down with a proposal to give him a higher position with \$350 more salary, we are entitled to enter our protest against such scandalous conduct.

Mr. PLATT. It appears that several months ago the Government determined to transfer the officer in question to another department of the service and to impose on him certain additional duties, for the performance of which he was to receive an increased salary. I am not disposed to say that the increase is out of proportion to the work done by the officer. It is no small matter for him to search over, as he must necessarily have done, that confused heap of papers, and the returns of which he speaks in his letter addressed to the clerk, in order to select the friends of the Government for gazetting purposes. It cannot be very well relegated to a junior clerk or assistant. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery must do it himself, because he is probably the only one who would know the political complexion of the member returned. There is considerable increased work placed on this official, and no doubt the Government were right in considering that an increased salary should be paid for performing the duty. In addition it requires no small amount of what I was going to call moral stamina for a man to undertake the performance of a duty so imposed. Only think of the position in which that officer has placed himself. I am satisfied that no member of this House and few persons outside of it would be willing to sell their reputation for honor and fair dealing for the paltry sum of \$350. We know that he has exposed himself to the ridicule, and I might say the contempt, of every honorable man in this House and out of it for the part he has acted in this shameful instance of foul play, and whether directed from the Treasury benches or not it certainly had its origin in some association either inside this House or outside. I am disposed to believe, Sir, that the scheme or design was known in different parts of the country. I am satisfied that communications were had with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery by representatives of the Conservative Association in different parts of the Province. It seems very strange that the very train which brought the return from my own county to Ottawa should convey hither two prominent members of the party of my opponent, and a few days after their return it was whispered not very faintly

on the streets of my own town, that the return would not be immediately gazetted. I have a moral certainty—I am not able to prove it, of course, but I believe that those gentlemen who came from the town in which I live had communication either with the Clerk of the Crown or with somebody intimate with him, and had the assurance before they left the capital that my return would be gazetted at a certain time and not before. If we compare the letter which that official has addressed to this House with the statements which were previously laid on the Table of the House, we find that it required a vast amount of ingenuity on his part to arrange the gazetting of the returns so as to give the advantage to the Government side which has really been given. The explanation which he gives, Sir, in connection with the receipt of those returns is entirely and flagrantly fallacious. It seems very strange indeed that the return which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) speaks of as having been received on the 11th and not gazetted on the 12th is only one of very many which had the same fate, and I do not know how the Clerk of the Crown succeeded, on the evening of the 11th, knowing that the *Gazette* was going to be published on the morning of the 12th, in culling out these particular returns which he wished to have gazetted on the 12th. I have taken the trouble to examine the returns which he received on the 11th of March, and I find that there were in all nineteen received on that day, that five of that nineteen were selected to be gazetted on the following day, and by a strange coincidence those five were, first Jacques Cartier, second Quebec County, third Cumberland, fourth Restigouche, fifth Brookville. There were five supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, some of them Ministers of the Crown, some of them from doubtful constituencies, some of them no doubt who feared that petitions would be filed against their return, and although in two cases the return is not properly endorsed the clerk did not wait for the corrected returns, but published them in the *Gazette* on the following day. It almost seems as if a messenger had accompanied the return from Brookville, in order to ensure its being gazetted the next day. It is said by the Clerk of the Crown that some returns being received early were placed under those received later, and that, therefore, they were the last to be found. I do not know what kind of a package the returning officer must have sent from Picton, but it must have been a very lively one, because it seems to have been kept at the bottom notwithstanding the efforts of the officer to resurrect it. It is stated that it was received on the 14th. I have proven in the House, and I am prepared to prove before a committee, that it was received on the 11th, and that the officer who brought down that return brought down a false return. But even supposing it was received on the 14th, how is it that while there were twenty-one of those returns received on the 14th, the very day on which he says the return was received from Prince Edward county, eighteen of those twenty-one returns were gazetted on the 19th, and three of them, one being the return from the county of Prince Edward, and one from the county of Kent, were left ungazetted? This was an instance in which criminal neglect is palpable. Now, I am not going to analyse further either the letter or the return brought down by that official. I have simply to say that I believe that at the instance of somebody, that some understanding was had with this official that he was to do a certain amount of work for the Government and receive a certain amount of extra salary, and I only regret that up to the present moment the Ministers have not risen in their places and given a direct denial to the charges which have been hurled at them from this side. But we have simply to place the facts together, that an increase of salary was proposed and that increased work was given. I have shown you, as have other members on this side, what the nature of this increased work has been, and the Government could relieve themselves

best, and I believe could only relieve themselves, from the charge which seems to be laid at their door by allowing this official to be brought either before this House or some committee of this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be horrified at the manner in which we dare to drag the characters of officials before this House and before the country, when they have, as they say, no opportunity of defending themselves. We sought to give this very official an opportunity of defending himself, and he has not been allowed that opportunity, simply because hon. gentlemen opposite refused to grant it to him. I would like to ask if hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Government of this country, are always so careful about dragging the characters of their officials before the country and before this House? If we go a little lower down in the ranks of official life, we find many instances where the characters of public servants are not very carefully dealt with, and an instance comes to my mind now in which, if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were careful to preserve the characters of those in their employ, the employé I refer to might have been left in his place until an investigation were had in his presence. How was it that a mail carrier in a humble position, earning \$300 or \$400 a year by doubling a mail route every day in the year, Sundays excepted, has had charges laid against him without his knowledge, has been tried for those charges by some Star Chamber court in the Post Office Department—tried in his absence, convicted in his absence, and the first thing he knew about it was the order for his execution? The public know that he is to be discharged and the contract terminated on the 30th of June, and for the reason that charges have been made by political opponents, and he has been tried and discharged without his knowing anything about them whatever. We do not propose to do anything like that. We ask that this official shall be tried by a tribunal before which he shall appear, and, if convicted, we ask for his dismissal. I am not going to use the harsh terms which come to my mind as to this official. Perhaps enough has been said in that direction to show the House and the country the indignation we feel; and I believe the country will have all the more pride in this Parliament, when they know that a certain proportion of its members, at any rate, are prepared to resent the insult and punish the perpetrators of this dastardly outrage.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no intention of prolonging this discussion; but I should be ashamed of myself as the representative of the people of my riding if I allowed a vote of this kind to pass without expressing my dissent. The proposal to increase the salary of an officer who has treated the representatives of the people in this House as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has seen fit to do, and the way the charges against that officer have been ignored by members of the House who are familiar with the way returns ought to be made, are significant facts in themselves. Sir, we have had to-night the spectacle of the defence of this officer being left to one of the junior members of the House, who, for the first time in his life, has been gazetted a member of the House. I think that indicated very strongly that the gentlemen of more extended parliamentary experience on the opposite side of the House feel that in a case like this the least said is the soonest mended. I say it is a discredit to the Parliament of Canada that we should be asked to increase an officer's salary, after the miserable attempt that he has presented to the House by way of defence for his partisan conduct. I was amused at the coolness of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill) in speaking about the feelings that ought to animate the hon. gentlemen opposite if they happened to have a protest filed against them. It does not matter how purely or honestly an election may have been conducted, if the hon. gentleman

Mr. PLATT.

ever had any experience in that matter at all, he would have known that it was not a very satisfactory position for any man to be placed in to have a petition to fight even if the result were satisfactory to himself. It may suit my hon. friend very well to talk that way after the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the returns of his election on the 9th and gazetted him on the 12th of the month, whereas other gentlemen had to wait from day to day, and week to week, until they could ascertain whether there was an open field for the attack on their seats in this House. But I mistake very much the spirit of fair play that animates gentlemen on either side of this House if they will justify that kind of conduct. The hon. gentleman went further and said the policy of the Opposition has been slander and personal abuse of members of the Cabinet. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen if the hon. member has not himself given evidence of personal abuse of one at least who has no opportunity of defending himself. I refer to the predecessor of the hon. member for North Ontario. For the purpose of attacking that gentleman he went entirely away from the record to-night. While we were discussing the conduct of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, he had to drag into this discussion some matters regarding the returning officer of North Ontario. Sir, it is not necessary for me to say a word in defence of the ex-member for North Ontario. That gentleman was no stranger in this House. I remember, when I first came to this House in 1873, he was seated here by the House over the action of a partisan returning officer.

Mr. MADILL. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I made no statement, personal or otherwise, against the ex-member for North Ontario, and that I have nothing to say against that gentleman; so that he is dragging that matter in voluntarily, and without any justification. I have never said a word against the personal character of my opponent.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). We heard the hon. gentleman's statement, and *Hansard* to-morrow will show it. The hon. gentleman travelled entirely out of the record, and proceeded to attack Mr. Cockburn for certain statements he had made. I would only remind my friend of what Artemus Ward said, that "it is a mighty limited cuss that cannot get himself up without dragging another man down." I say that Mr. Cockburn is no stranger in this House, and he is the very last man who would be going around slandering his opponent behind his back, under the circumstances in which his name has been dragged into this discussion. Now, if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is unable to defend himself against the charges made against him in this House, who but his friends on that side of the House prevented him appearing before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to explain his conduct? The resolution to send this matter to that committee was put before this House, and it was decided by the votes of my hon. friend and others that he should not be allowed to appear there. Does any one who reads his letter say that it is a clear and sufficient justification of his conduct? Does any gentleman say that it was purely by accident that the returns of members on this side failed to find their way into the *Gazette* without long delays, while the returns of supporters of the Government were hurried in frequently on the day following that on which they were received? And yet when that gentleman's conduct is criticised, they keep their seats, and they compel that official to keep his mouth closed when they ought to give him a chance to explain his conduct. Talk about a policy of slander and wrong. There are gentlemen sitting in this House prepared to find a salve for such a course of conduct by voting an increase of salary for it. Sir, I would fail fairly to represent my constituents if I did not rise and protest against it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to say a few words in support of the contention that has been set up that an injustice has been perpetrated upon the members of this House and upon the people generally, by the course pursued by the Government in exalting an officer of their own who has been guilty of criminal conduct in the discharge of his duty. It must be plain to every member of this House, I do not care whether he be a supporter of the Government or an opponent of the Government, that a great wrong has been done by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The law is made by this House, it is supposed to be initiated by the members who sit on the Treasury benches; and, I think the people of this country have a right to look to the law-makers, not as law-breakers, but as men who will respect the law, and see that the officers appointed by them discharge their duty and carry out the law. It must be evident to every hon. gentleman that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not discharged his duty. No hon. gentleman opposite has attempted to defend his conduct; no Minister of the Crown, from the first to the last, has attempted to justify his conduct. This being the case, we must come to the conclusion that no defence can be made of this officer whose salary is now being increased, as a reward, no doubt, for the services he has rendered to the Government in doing their dirty work, by securing the gazetting of the returns of Conservative members and delaying the gazetting of the returns of Opposition members. In justice to this House, the members of the Government ought from their places, either to defend this officer, or admit that he did wrong, and free themselves from the blame which must otherwise be attached to them. It is evident that this officer would not have acted as he did, had he not been so directed by members of the Government; it is evident he would not have gone out of his way to do injustice to any section of the people's representatives, had he not been under orders of some member of the Government. I do not know who the member of the Government may be, but that some member of the Government was guilty, I truly and verily believe. Every member of this House, whether on the Opposition or Government side, must believe that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would not have been guilty of this gross injustice against the liberties of the people's representatives and our free institutions, had he not been so directed by some member of the Government. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to draw a herring across the track by trying to make it appear that we are casting reflections on other public officers. But such an attempt is futile. We have here the proposition to increase the salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and, if any member of the Government is innocent in this matter, he should rise and declare his innocence, or we must come to the conclusion that he is chargeable with a share in this conspiracy, jointly with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. This act is but on a par with many of the other acts of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. We know that for many years the Government have been conspiring to do injustice to the people. In 1882 they did a gross act of injustice against the rights and liberties of the people by passing their infamous Gerrymander Act, an Act which they did not attempt to justify in the House at the time it was passed, and an Act which they have not been able to justify before the people in any of the contests which have been held since then. In preparation for the last election, in 1886, they passed another Act for the purpose of enabling themselves to secure by unfair means a favorable verdict. They passed their Franchise Bill, by which they sought to secure an unfair advantage over the Reformers of the Dominion, and in many cases they succeeded. And to day we have exhibited to us an instance of the outrages which they are prepared to commit against the rights and liberties of the people, by the fact that there sits in this House, as repre-

sentative of Queen's county, N.B., a gentleman who was not elected as the people's representative, but who was 61 in the minority in his constituency. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite sustain him in his place. It is this Government, which has been guilty of all these outrages on the people, who sit dumb in their seats, being afraid to vindicate the conduct of their officer. They say he wrote a letter explaining his conduct. I would like to know if Mr. Pope had not that letter dictated to him by some member of the Government. I would like to know whether it was not submitted to the Cabinet Council to ascertain whether it would suit the emergency. What sense of justice is there in the conduct of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches? They refuse to allow this officer of theirs an opportunity to vindicate his conduct before the Privileges and Elections Committee, yet they refuse also to vindicate in this House his conduct. They do not attempt to justify him in any way whatever. No other conclusion, therefore, can be arrived at but that the members of the Government supported the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in his wrongdoing, in order that they might obtain an undue advantage. I contend that, so long as the Ministers sit in dumb silence on the Treasury benches and refuse to explain their conduct, we can come to no other conclusion than that they are all guilty, and have made a scapegoat of Mr. Pope, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to carry their sins. I fancy, however, the people will be able to see through this conspiracy; I fancy the people will lay the blame on the proper shoulders; and although the time seems long before retribution reaches them, still I believe it is coming, and it may be nearer than hon. gentlemen opposite suppose. Justice will yet be done in these matters, and the people will insist, perhaps before a great while, that they shall be ruled over by men who will not be guilty of such gross injustice to the people, and who will not support men guilty of such conduct as that of which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been proven guilty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Chairman—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will hold his remarks, there will be ample occasion for him to discuss the question later, and in the meantime we could make some progress with the Estimates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not rise with a view to discuss this question, but with a view to suggest that the Finance Minister would see the obvious necessity of allowing this item to stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot waste another evening.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has heard how serious the charge is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has nothing to do with this item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, because we are discussing the increase of the salary of an officer against whom serious charges have been made. It has been charged by one member that parties had come from an outside constituency, and were in a position to say when they went back that the return would not be gazetted. Another member states from his place in the House that the return which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has sent to this House is a fraudulent return, that it is not true. Then you have the letter sent by him to the House characterised by another hon. gentleman as being false, as being a lying statement. We have had all those charges made and we have had no attempt at denial on the part of any hon. gentleman opposite of any of those charges; and the Finance Minister must see how absolutely necessary it is, when charges so grave and so circumstantial are made and not one word of denial is uttered, and when those gentlemen who make

them state that they are prepared to prove them, to give them the opportunity to prove them. Surely the Finance Minister will not ask this Committee, in view of these grave charges, in view of the fact that there is an utter want of denial on the part of any single individual, to increase the salary of that officer by \$350. It is asking too much of the Committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The item has been declared carried by the Chair.

Department of Justice.....\$18,672 50.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may state—

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think I have the floor. I have been standing here about five minutes. I will willingly give way to the Minister of Finance on any other matter, but it appears that this item has been declared carried, when I have an idea that this item should not be carried, and that this House should not stultify itself by passing it, an item which of itself is an offence against the dignity of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN. I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was carried.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking to the point of order, and I think I will confine myself to the rules of order. I seldom get out of order in this House, but this is a matter which is so important to the dignity of Parliament that I would be an unworthy representative were I to sit still.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. HESSON. The matter was decided three times; it was declared carried three times.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say—

The CHAIRMAN. I must call the gentleman to order. The resolution has been declared carried, and another resolution read and submitted to the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will speak to the present resolution, and I believe we have the utmost latitude in speaking in committee. As it is laid down by Bourinot, one of the most distinguished authorities we have in Canada, the utmost latitude should prevail in committees of the House in the discussion of matters of such grave import. Now, I say in reference to this matter, when an officer has violated the law—

The CHAIRMAN. I must call the gentleman to order. The gentleman is certainly showing disrespect to the Chair and to the House by persisting.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is the last thing I would do, to show disrespect to the Chair—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But I will say this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Allow me. I will say this, that I have very little respect for the House if it will pass an item to increase the salary—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order,

Mr. LANDERKIN,—to increase the salary of a man who has shown himself—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN—a rebel and a coward and the base slave of the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reference to the resolution now before the House, I may explain that the increases are caused by the statutory increases.

Department of Militia.....\$12,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the increases there are about \$900. Are they all statutory?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The increase is caused by fourteen statutory increases of \$50 each and by a promotion of a third-class to a second-class with an increase of \$200, making the \$900.

Department of the Secretary of State.....\$29,915

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You seem to have added a clerk there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are fourteen statutory increases of \$50 each, making \$700; two of \$30, making \$60; one new second class clerk at \$1,150, instead of one third-class clerk, at \$900, making \$250, or \$1,010 in all. The decreases are one second-class clerk at \$1,150 instead of one at \$1,200, and a difference in Mr. Roy's salary of \$300, \$330. The net increase in all is \$630. This part of Mr. Roy's salary was voted twice last year. On account of his name not appearing, it was put in the Supplementary Estimates.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery\$17,255

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the Queen's Printer is put down here as a deputy head. Is that under a recent statute?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is under the Queen's Printer's Act. There are nine statutory increases of \$50 each, \$450; two statutory increases of \$30 each, \$60; one promotion of a third-class clerk to second-class, \$100; making \$610. There is a decrease by the difference in the salary of a third-class clerk, \$950 instead of \$1,000, making a net increase of \$560 in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the items for the Interior and for Indians to stand, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) wants to have some discussion on those.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

Office of the Auditor General.....\$23,400

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase arises in this way. There are 11 statutory increases, \$550; two second-class clerks, \$1,100; promotions, \$2,200; one new third-class clerk, \$700; making \$3,450 in all. There is a decrease, three third-class clerks promoted, \$1,500; messengers, \$250; making \$1,750; leaving a net increase of \$1,700. With regard to promotions—one takes the part of principal examiner; the other is a very capable officer who, besides examining accounts, acts as secretary. Another third-class clerk was transferred from the Halifax post office, having passed a qualifying examination on two optional subjects, and is possessed of special qualifications for the work required of him. I am giving the explanations of the Auditor General. His services are important. He has new work in connection with the accounts and the examination of the revising officers' expenses. In fact a second-class clerk would be required, but his salary will be paid from contingencies.

Department of Inland Revenue.....\$41,890

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase arises from 18 statutory increases of \$50 each, two at \$25 each, and one at \$30. The salary of an assistant commissioner, \$2,500; promotions, \$500. This new office is caused by the transfer of an officer from outside to perform the duties of an

assistant commissioner while still discharging the duties that belong to his office, and making but slight additions. There are the ordinary statutory increases and promotions, and the appointment of a new messenger at \$300, making altogether \$1,280. There is a decrease in the difference of salaries of \$150, leaving a net increase of \$1,130. But it is an apparent increase, rather than otherwise, because the \$2,500, the principal item, as I have explained, is for bringing an officer from outside who performed the duty of tobacco inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there is another officer besides the assistant commissioner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the messenger.

Mr. BOWELL. The messenger was promoted to the third-class, and a new messenger appointed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very large increase for first-class clerks—four of them. There are now nine first-class clerks. I must say that it looks a little extraordinary that you require nine first-class clerks in the Inland Revenue Department, while in the Department of the Finance Minister but five are required.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Inland Revenue Department is a very important one. There is a good deal of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, it is a very unusual number. I do not think you will find as many in any other of the Departments, except, possibly, a great Department like the Post Office. For instance, in the Customs Department, the Minister does not appear to have a single first-class clerk.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a vacancy, but I have not filled it. I do not think it necessary just now.

Mr. DAVIES. It does seem extraordinary that you require so many first-class clerks in the Inland Revenue Department, which is not by any means one of the most important. We should have some information why there are nine first class clerks in that Department, an increase of four since last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of it and give the information on concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What figure does a first-class clerk come up to under the new rule?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$1,800, the same as before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will involve heavy additional expenses.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that in 1835-86 there were only three first-class clerks in that Department; last year there were five, and now there are nine. I think the hon. gentleman had better give the names of these parties when he brings down his information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the names.

Department of Customs \$33,400 .

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does that include the salaries of the special detectives of the Customs Department?

Mr. BOWELL. No, they are charged to the outside service.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In reference to the salary of Mr. Wolff, \$1,600, I think he is a special officer?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that, in addition to his salary of \$1,600, he has been allowed travelling expenses of \$944.51, a total of \$2,544.51. Are there any other sums to which that gentleman is entitled?

Mr. BOWELL. He is entitled to a certain proportion of any seizure he may make, the same as any other seizing officer. The apparent large sum paid to inspectors as travelling expenses is accounted for from the fact that to be of any value at all an inspector must be constantly on the road, and from the extent of territory over which they have to travel the expenses are necessarily large. Although it does not strictly come under this item, I have no objection to state now that a large proportion of the expense of travelling is paid from the seizures, whenever seizures are effected and condemnations are made. It is laid down as a principle as far as possible to deduct all the expenses before allowing any distribution to be made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) How much is that gentleman's proportion from seizures during the past year?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in possession of that information. It is a question I have never investigated. When a seizure is made and the expenses are deducted from the total sum, the distribution is made under the law. I do not take the trouble to ask who obtains the amount. The practice is, to ascertain the fact: That a seizure has been made, that information had been given upon which it was made, and then the seizing officer and informant receive the proportion to which they are allowed by law. If no information is given, but it is simply done by the officers, only one-third of the net proceeds is distributed. And that is done under an Order in Council based on the Act passed in 1868.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand the hon. gentleman that when a seizure is made and a distribution is effected, there is a sum of money which goes for the payment of the travelling expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. The expenses are deducted. If there are travelling expenses connected with it or any other expenses, the amount is deducted from the gross proceeds of the seizure, and then distribution is made. I presume in the case referred to, the travelling expenses have been incurred in investigating some frauds, or officers may have been sent to look into cases respecting which information had been given and from which nothing resulted. For instance, on the frontier an officer may travel a week and nothing may result except incurring travelling expenses.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand that permanent officials by laying information can obtain, under the statute, a proportion of the fruits of seizure. Suppose they give information to an officer in another Province, would they share the fruits of the seizure?

Mr. BOWELL. They would share under the law.

Mr. DAVIES. Is that not a great advantage given to those officers in the service? It has been brought to my notice by outside parties that officials here, acting on official information, have been enabled to make seizures and obtain their proportion of the fruits of the condemnation. I would suggest for the consideration of the Minister whether this does not lead to very serious and improper results. The Minister says he has not given his consideration to that matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood that he had not examined into the amounts of the seizures, the divisions made or the amount which the officers had derived respectively from seizures.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a different matter. I have given a great deal of consideration and attention to the very point to which the hon. gentleman first alluded.

Mr. DAVIES. When the hon. gentleman furnishes the information he has promised I should like him to be able to

say, and I have a good deal of confidence in his departmental judgment, whether the continuance of that system is in the public interest.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has made a statement, and no doubt he believes his information is correct. But I am not aware that official information is often used by permanent officials so as to enable them to take the advantage which the hon. gentleman has indicated. If an officer here obtains information from outside parties, not from the official records in the Department, and he informs the seizing officer, he obtains his share of the fruit of the seizure. The hon. gentleman is aware that there are a number of clerks whose special duty it is to check all the entries made at the different ports. For instance, Montreal returns are checked by a number of clerks, those of certain ports of Ontario by other clerks, and so on. Their special duty is to see that no errors are committed in the entries, that no improper classification has taken place. Hundreds and hundreds of entries made at the different ports every month are sent back for correction. No matter how much may be obtained from amended entries which it may be necessary to make, owing to improper classifications or improper multiplications, the clerk seldom receives any portion of the amount. But if information is obtained by such officer from outside, they are entitled to a share of the fruits of the seizure. I know objection has been made to this proceeding, but I have thought the matter over, and I see no reason to deprive them of that right more than an outsider, provided the officers do not use their official time in attending to that business.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have received similar information with respect to those officers receiving a share of the fruits of seizure, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies).

Mr. BOWELL. I will give an illustration. One of the clerks in my department, when taking his three weeks holiday, said to me: "I have reason to believe that certain frauds have been committed in a certain section of Ontario. Have you any objection to my occupying my time in ferretting them out?" I replied: "Certainly not." The result was that very large seizures were made, by which the officer profited, and the revenue profited in proportion.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will you give information with respect to the amount received by Mr. McLaren as well as by the other officers mentioned?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. McLaren has not received anything so far as I know, since his present appointment as inspector. Previous to that he made a good deal of money by seizures.

Department of Postmaster General.....\$185,230

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been the usual statutory increases, and the total increase in the Department amounts to \$16,595.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this Department, where the deficit is growing worse and worse every year, till it now amounts to about one million, we find the head office has increased its expenditure by \$16,595 and has added about sixteen new employes. I appears to me that this matter of post office expenditure is being conducted in the most reckless fashion. I dare say that certain conveniences may require to be granted to outlying towns and cities in various parts of Canada, and that the people are always glad to get them, but whereas, when we made an improvement some years ago it was in the distinct expectation that the revenue would increase and overtake the expenditure, we now find that the deficit is increasing very largely. It is now \$400,000 or more greater than it was six or seven years ago, and the expenditure at headquarters, speaking from recollection, is not much short of double

Mr. DAVIES.

what it was a few years ago. It seems to me that though expenditure in this particular office may be conducted with the view of granting increased accommodation it is done with an utter disregard of the exigencies of the Finance Department.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been a large increase caused by the opening of new lines of railway and new mail routes, in addition to the large number of offices opened in the North-West and British Columbia, as well as in the older Provinces. I may mention, however, that only \$9,000 of this increase is outside the statutory increases, as the \$50 in statutory increases amount to \$7,510 out of the \$16,000. Hon. gentlemen will also see that the vote for contingencies, out of which the extra clerks are paid, has been decreased about \$5,000. The work of the post office is continually increasing, and I think it better—as my predecessor did—to make arrangements that these temporary clerks should be made permanent, to a certain extent.

Mr. BARRON. I am quite aware that there is a continual demand for additional post offices, and I quite appreciate how the expenditure may increase in that way. I wish to say, however, that with regard to the Department requiring additional clerks, one of the officers of the Post Office Department—at least it was so reported to me—found his way into my riding during the last election, where he was in idleness, as it might be called, for a period of two or three weeks, supporting the candidature of my opponent. If officials of this or any other Department can do that sort of thing during elections, I don't think it lies in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say that they require additional clerks. I think it my duty to make this statement at this particular juncture, because I don't think it right that officials of any Department should take part *pro* or *con* in any election.

Mr. DAVIES. I don't think there will be any disposition on the part of members on either side to object to any judicious increase in the Post Office Department. At any rate, it has been heretofore regarded as a Department operated in the interests of the country generally, and we know that in very many sparsely settled parts of the country it is almost essential to have new post offices which must more or less increase the number of clerks here. I would like, however, to ask the Postmaster General if these increases are likely to go on as they have been going on, or if we have nearly reached high-water mark?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope we have.

Mr. McLELAN. With a large increase of work there will necessarily always be an increase of expenditure. I may say, however, that the revenue from the post office for the present year seems to be doing very well. For the nine months we have had a greater increase than last year, by about \$50,000, and the increase of the revenue will be more than double what it was in 1885. I think the expenditure will not increase so rapidly as it has in the last two or three years, as it is probable there will not be so many mail routes to be opened on new lines of railway.

Department of Agriculture.....\$48,225

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increases here are all statutory increases.

Department of Marine.....\$24,462

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increases in this department, as well as in the Department of Marine, are all statutory increases.

Department of Public Works.....\$42,730

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase here amounts to \$710, and consists of statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe one thing upon which I think the House and the country are to be congratulated, and that is that we have apparently such an efficient body of civil servants that the Minister does not find it necessary to dock a single solitary man of his statutory increase. This is a state of things I believe unparalleled in any other Civil Service in the world.

Department of Railways and Canals.....\$47,675

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increase here amounts to \$227.50, made up of statutory increases.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

INDEX.

FIRST SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1887.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department, Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Reccom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry, Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the movers.

Amyot, Mr. G., Bellechasse.

Address to Her Majesty (remarks) 784 (ii).
C. P. R. Extension to Quebec Harbor (Ques.) 44 (i).
Cholera, Precautions against (Ques.) 670 (ii).
Commercial relations with France (Ques.) 1006 (ii); (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (ii).
Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 32, 1^o) 1142 (ii).
Evanturel, Lieut.-Col. A., on M. for Ret. (objection) 1199 (ii).
Grey, Lieut.-Col. and "C" Battery (Ques.) 1004 (ii).
Jubilee, Her Majesty's, grant for (Ques.) 20 (i).
Morin, Dr. J., Claim for services (Ques.) 1004 (ii).
North Shore Ry., purchase of, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners further, B. 158 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1126 (ii).
Quebec Ship Laborers (Ques.) reference to B., 1006 (ii).
Quebec 9th Battalion Drill (Ques.) 670; on M. for Com. of Sup., 708, 712 (ii).
— Expenses in the N. W. (remarks) on M. for Com of Sup., 1234 (ii).
Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 186 (i).
— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 686 (ii).
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).
Roy, Honoré, Suspension of (Ques.) 143 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

St. Charles, Bellechasse, Ry. crossing (M. for Cor.) 152 (i).
St. Michel Wharf, repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 982 (ii).
School of Navigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).
Ship Laborers Protection (B. 142, 1^o) 862 (ii).
Strange, Gen., Rep. of, *re* 9th and 65th Battalions (Ques.) 670 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Military College) 757 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Experimental Farms) 982 (M).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 814; in Com., 879 (ii).
Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1230 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex.

Coal Oil importation in Bulk, on B. 107, 1147, 1149, 1204 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on Res., 584 (i).
Elm Logs, Export Duty, on B. 107, 1204 (ii).
Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 455 (i).
Order, Ques. of, *re* Amt. (Mr. *Girouard*) to Res. on Prohibition, 846 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 937 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J.—Continued.

Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 622 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 455, 456 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., Wentworth.

Butter Substitutes, Seizures (Ques.) 101 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 346 (i).
 ——— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 610.
 Coal Oil importation in Bulk, on B. 107, 1149 (ii).
 Dundas, Public Offices or Buildings (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i)
 SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 610.

Baird, Mr. G. F., Queen's, N.B.

Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) to disagree with 2nd Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (explanation) 671–675 (ii).

Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B.C.

Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
 Cloth, &c., supplied Penitentiaries (Ques.) 14 (i).
 Iron pipes, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 524 (i).
 Representation Act, B.C., Amt. (B. 50, 1°) 223 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Indians (B.C.) 1097 (ii).
Militia (Barracks in B.C.) 766; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 764; (Permanent Corps) 761 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 1114 (ii).
Quarantine, 745 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 524 (i).

Barron, Mr. J. A., North Victoria, Ont.

Brokovski, E. D., conduct of (M. for Cor.*) 803 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1268 (ii).
 Fishing Bounties in Vic., N.S., applicants for (Ques.) 371 (i); (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 Gilchrist, W. C., compensation to relatives for loss of Property during Rebellion (Ques.) 154 (i).
 Merritt, Lieut., promotion (M. for Cor., &c.) 788 (ii).
 O'Donoghue, M. F., employment of (Ques.) 143 (i).
 O'Donoghue, W. B., Property of (M. for Ret.) 364 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 175 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent River Navigation) 835 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Postmaster Gen'l's Dept.) 614 (i).
Legislation : Franchise Act, conc., 1269 (ii).
Pensions (Militia, &c.) 747; conc., 1268 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 976. Canals (Trent Riv. Nav.) 836 (ii).
 Trent Valley Canal, construction Works (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 Uphill and Victoria Road Postal Service (Ques.) 364 (i).
 Whitefish River Indian Reserve (M. for Ret.) 802 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.

Bridge across St. Lawrence at Coteau, in Com. on Res., 1265 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to produce papers, 28 (i).
 Floods at Montreal and vicinity (Ques.) 101 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C.—Continued.

Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 286 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 359 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1265 (ii).

Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.

Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 287 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 933 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Kenny) re Official Rep. of Debates, 785 (ii).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 367 (i).
 St. Hyacinthe (84th Battalion (Ques.) 1005 (ii).
 St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic Manufacturing Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. Courso) on M. for 2°, 875 (ii).
 Wharf in Richelieu River (Ques.) 321 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.

Cornwall Floods (personal explanation) in Com. of Sup., 1238 (ii).
 Elm Logs, Export Duty, on B. 107, 1151 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 69 (i).
 Ont. Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s (B. 10, 1°*) 74 (i).
 Order, Ques. of, re Amt. to Res. on Prohibition, 851 (ii).
 Printing Committee's Rep. (remarks) 804; Ms. to conc., 839, 951, 1198 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 941, 944 (ii).
 Public Morals Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 278 (i).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 11, 1°*) 74 (i).
 Sessional Papers, Indexing of (remarks) 1074 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters (Ques of Priv.) 615 (i).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.

Chambly Canal, widening of (Ques.) 142 (i).
 Longueuil Wharves (Ques.) 142 (i).
 St. Hyacinthe (84th Battalion (Ques.) 1005 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, of Canada, French Edition (Ques.) 142 (i).

Blake, Hon. E., West Bruce and West Durham.

Address, on the, 10 (i).
 Agriculture and Colonisation Com., on M. to increase quorum, 153 (i).
 Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday, adjmnt. for (remarks) 319 (i).
 Auditor General's Rep. (remarks) 13 (i).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 229–231, 234 (i).
 Business of the House (remarks) 100 (i).
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s (remarks) 320 (i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 277 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery :
 — Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 33; ref. to previous deb. objected to, 40; on production of papers (remarks) 45 (i).
 — and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 325 (i).
 — on M. to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 299 (i).
 Creighton, Mr. J., Indian Agent at Saugeen, on M. for Ret., 314; on authority quoted by Sir John A. Macdonald, 316 (i).
 Debates Com., on M. for Com., 4, 6 (i).
 Deptl. Reps., Distribution of, on prop. Res. to change Rule, 145 (i).
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, on M. to appoint Mr. C. C. Colby, 370 (i).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on Order for Com., 150; (remarks) 370 (i).
 — on M. for Com. on Res., 568–576 (i).
 Dunn, J. R., examination of, 629 (ii).
 Fisheries, papers, &c., re negotiations (Ques.) 19, 73; (remarks) 112, 141 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act, on Order being called for Res. to Repeal, 364 (i).
 Gov. Gen.'s reception, on M. to adjn. (objection) 543 (i).
 — Warrants, 1873–1886, on M. for Ret., 268 (i).
 — 1886–87, on M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com., 294 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 79–86 (i).
 — on M. to make Res. First Order of the Day, 110; (explanation) 138 (i).
 Homesteads in Ry. Belt (Ques.) 670 (ii).
 Hudspeth, Mr., Election of (remarks) 44 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. B. 77 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for Com. on prop. Res., 302, 307; in Com., 312; on M. for 1^o of B., 361 (i); on M. for 2^o, 649 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 359 (i).
 Penitentiaries, reorganisation of Salaries B. 65 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. on Res., 275; on 1^o of B., 301 (i).
 Public Officers B. 5 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 225 (i).
 Public Stores B. 20 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 100; in Com., 273 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. to read papers 4, 100 (i).
 — on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 319, 369 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 361 (i).
 Ry. Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 226; on M. for 3^o, 364 (i).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 366 (i).
 Select Standing Com.'s Lists, (remarks) 13 (i).
 Senate Representation for N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1^o, 74 (i).
 South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 66 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for 1^o, 318 (i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Speaker, on Election of (remarks) 1 (i).
 Subsidies, Ry., Liabilities for (remarks) 15 (i).
 Trade and Commerce, Minister of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 361 (i).
 Upper Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (remarks) on B. not being printed in French, 320 (i).
 Voters' Lists, Revision (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
 Welland Canal Bridge (M. for Ret.) 295 (i).
 Winter Service, P.E.I., and *Northern Light*, on M. for Ret., 536 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., King's, N. S.

- Breakwaters in King's Co., repairs, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 803 (ii).
 Corn-meal and Coal, conc. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).
 I. C. R., Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 767 (ii).
 Kentville, N.S., Public Buildings (Ques.) 101 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Public Works—Incomes : Buildings (N. S.) 918 (ii).
 Railways—Capital : I. C. R. (Halifax Extension) 767 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 509, 510 (ii).
 Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co. and Ry. Dept., on M. for Ret., 148 (i).
 — prop. line from Kingsport (M. for Surveys, &c.) 803 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. F., St. John's, Q.

- St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic Manufacturing Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Coursol*) on M. for 2^o, 875 (ii).
 Tobacco, increased Duty on (Ques.) 313 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.

- Army and Navy, Imports for, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 Boiler Tubes, conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
 British Copyright Works, reprints, on M. for Stmt. of sums collected, 23 (i).
 Buggies, Carriages, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 427 (i).
 Butter Substitutes (Ans.) 101, 205 (i).
 Canadian Horses in U. S., prohibiting (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 Canned Goods Act Amt. (B. 121, 1^o) 638; in Com., 814 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 341 (i).
 — increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
 Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Ry. Co.'s B. 19 (Mr. *Guillet*) on M. for 2^o, 601 (i).
 Collars, Cotton, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1150; on M. for 3^o, 1220 (ii).
 — Collector at St. Germain de Rimouski (Ans.) 278, 321 (i).
 — at Guysboro', resignation (Ans.) 321 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 613 (i), 1129, 1195, 1237, (ii).
 — Laws Amt. (Ans.) 277 (i).
 — Regulations respecting Baggage (Ans.) 101 (i).
 Debates Com. (Ms.) 4, 6 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Debt, Public, and recent Elections, in Deb. on Ways and Means, 476 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 1°, 204; on M. for 2°, 542 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 898 (ii).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 456 (i).
- Garrison, Mr., appointment as Surveyor of Customs at Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 1133 (ii).
- Govt. Officials in Northumberland, N.B. (Ans.) 321.
- Immigration Act Amt. (B. 153, 1°*) 1028 (ii).
- Inland Rev., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).
- Iron and Steel Industry, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
- Iron Bounties, amounts paid (Ans.) 371 (i).
- (explanation) Deb. on Ways and Means, 499 (i).
- Bridges, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 502 (i).
- Duties, extension of time for entering good, in Com. on B. 107, 1220 (ii).
- Leather and Raw Hides Inspector (Ans.) 258.
- Montreal Cotton Co. and Customs Dept., on M. for Rep., 222 (i).
- Irregularities (Ans.) 102.
- on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 957 (ii).
- Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 834 (ii).
- Newspapers partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 447 (i).
- Oranges and Lemons, conc. in Ways and Means, 461 (i).
- Printing Presses, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
- Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 922, 1243 (ii).
- Red Wood, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
- Seizures by Detectives, in Com. of Sup., 1133 (ii).
- Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 514 (i).
- Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 451 (i).
- Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 464 (i).
- Sugar, in deb. on Ways and Means, 464 (i).
- SUPPLY :
- Canals—Capital* (Murray) 834 (ii).
- Civil Govt.* (Customs) 613 (i), 1237 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 613; (Privy Council) 606 (i).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 1129, 1195; (Excise) 1195 (ii).
- Legislation*: Elections, 1240 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Commutation in lieu of Duties) 1112; (Cornwall Floods) 1190 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 922; (P. E. I.) 924; (Ont.) 977, 1243 (ii).
- Quarantine*, 744 (ii).
- Tariff of Customs and Excise, distribution of (Ans.) 708 (ii).
- Tea Imports from China and Japan, on M. for Ret., 23 (i).
- Tobacco, increased Duty on (Ans.) 320 (i).
- Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 13 (i).
- Waters, T. J., payments to, as Seizing Officer (Ans.) 1002 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, 440 (i), 964 (ii).
- TARIFF CHANGES (boiler tubes) 506; (buggies, carriages, &c.) 427; (fertilisers, artificial) 456; (iron bridges) 502; (iron and steel industry) 508; (newspapers, partly printed) 447; (oranges and lemons) 461; (printing presses) 508; (red wood) 523; (shingle bolts, &c.) 514; (shirts, cotton or linen) 451; (shovels and spades) 464; (woollen fabrics) 440 (i).
- Woollen Fabrics, conc. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.

- Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35, 1°*) 190 (i).
- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 334 (i).
- Personal Explanation, *re* vote on Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 360 (i).
- Tea Imports from China and Japan (M. for Ret.) 23 (i)

Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 330 (i).
- Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 452 (i).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, 452 (i).

Brien, Mr. J., South Essex.

- Cable, Pelée Island and Mainland (Ques.) 786 (ii).
- Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 42 (i).
- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 346 (i).
- Essex, Dep. Judge for County (Ques.) 786 (ii).
- Fishing Licenses in Lake Erie (Ques.) 1199 (ii).
- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 130 (i).
- Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1124 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance and Repairs) 1066 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 1196 (ii).

Brown, Mr. A., Hamilton.

- Ballot Box Patents (M.) Sp. Com. to examine, 786 (ii).
- Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1248.
- Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1150 (ii).
- Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 97, 1°*) 479 (i).
- Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (i).
- Iron and Steel industry, in deb. on Ways and Means, 493, 507 (i).
- Manufacturers Life and Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 111; in Com., 539 (i).
- St. Lawrence Canals Enlargement (Ques.) 313 (i).
- Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 438 (i).

INDEX.

Brown, Mr. A.—Continued.

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 510 (i).

Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 451 (i).

South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s. incorp. Act Amt. (B. 86, 1°*) 413 (i).

Sugar, in deb. on Ways and Means, 466 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 736 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c.) 1248 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 438, 451, 466, 493, 495, 508, 510 (i).

Bryson, Mr. J., Pontiac.

Lake Témiscamingue Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Pope) 1263 (ii).

McKay, William, amounts paid for painting Deptl. Buildings (M. for Stmtnt.*) 369 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 102, 1°*) 515 (i); M. to place on Order paper, 1001; M. for Com., 1088 (ii).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 512 (i).

Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1263 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income; Slides and Booms, 1246 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 512 (i).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., East Hastings.

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 240 (i).

Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 328, 340 (i).

Dunn, J. R., examination of, 634 (ii).

Queen's, N.B., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 619 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, &c.) 763 (ii).

Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1231 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 871.

Burns, Mr. K. F., Gloucester.

Cod Liver Oil Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1071 (ii).

Fish Fry deposits in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 67 (i).

Moffat, Mr., late M.P., decease of (remarks) 112 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1070 (ii).

Winter Port of C.P.R., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 969 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., Inverness.

Ry. construction in Cape Breton, on M. for Ret., 796 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 923 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A. H., Kent, Ont.

Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 330 (i).

— increase of salary, in Com of Sup., 608 (i).

Corn-meal, Iron, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).

County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).

Delahanty, Patrick, Claims for injuries (Ques.) 668 (ii).

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 3°, 1224 (ii).

I. C. R. Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup., 768, 778 (ii).

— Grain Shipments, on M. for Ret., 381 (i).

Port Arthur Harbor, &c., in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).

Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).

Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 438 (i).

Salt in Barrels, Weight of (Ques.) 205 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (County Courts, N.B.) 656 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 608 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance and Repairs) 1065 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P.E.I.) 991 (ii).

Militia (Drill Sheds, &c.) 764 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Port Arthur Harbor) 917. *Incems*: Buildings (Ont.) 1184 (ii).

Railways—Capital, I.C.R. (Halifax Extension) 768, 778 (ii).

Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1232 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 438, 509 (i).

Cargill, Mr. H., East Bruce.

Can. Temp. Act Re peel (B. 64, 1°) 300 (i).

Teeswater and Inverhuron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 130 1°*) 715 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 849; (Amt.) 851; neg. (Y. 38, N. 145) 947 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J., London.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 19 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).

Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).

Cattle, Diseased, importation of (Ans.) 205 (i).

Census of Man. (Ans.) 44 (i).

Cholera, precautions against (Ans.) 670 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).

Concurrence, 1267 (ii).

Experimental Farms, B. C. (Ans.) 527; Man., 101; N. W. T., 16 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 720, 984 (ii).

Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 719 (ii).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).

Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).

Personal Explanation, re Vote on Clerk of Crown in Chancery question, 360 (i).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1136 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, (Agricultural Societies in N. W. T.) 1240; (Criminal Statistics) 718; (Dom. Exhibition) 718; (*Patent Record*) 717 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Civil Govt.* (Agriculture) 1184 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1136 (ii).
Immigration: conc., 1267 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.E.) 1242. Experimental Farms, 984 (ii).
Quarantine, 743, 746, 1170 (ii).
 White Population in Man. (Ans.) 14 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., Quebec County.

- Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 751 (ii).
 Annapolis Fort, purchase of Military Lands, on M. for Cor., 379 (i).
 Arms in the N.W. (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
 Barracks in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 769 (ii).
 Barrack Lands, Shelburne Harbor (Ans.) 668 (ii).
 Batteries, Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
 Bedson, Mr., complaints against, in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 Bergin, Surgeon Gen., services (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1267 (ii).
 Defences of Canada, in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 Drill at Ottawa College (Ans.) 1034 (ii).
 Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).
 Evanturel, Lieut. Col. A., indemnity (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
 Fortifications of B. C., Rep. of Col. O'Brien (Ans.) 102 (i).
 Grey, Lieut. Col., and "C" Battery (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 Jubilee, Her Majesty's, grant for (Ans.) 20 (i).
 Kit allowances to Volunteers (Ans.) 371, 525 (i), 717 (ii).
 Military and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 743 (ii).
 Militia and Defence, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 ——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
 Ordnance, improved Rifled, in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).
 Quebec (9th) Battalion, Drill (Ans.) 670; (remarks) 710, 715 (ii).
 ——— Expenses in the N. W. T. (remarks) on M. for Com of Sup., 1236 (ii).
 Queen's Own and Royal Grenadiers Kit Money (Ans.) 371 (i).
 Riddle, Fanny M., Relief B. 145 (Mr. Tupper) on M. for 2^o, 926 (ii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 755; conc., 1268 (ii).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 Pensions, Militia, &c., in Com. of Sup., 746; conc., 1267 (ii).
 St. Hyacinthe (84th) Battalion (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
 Scrip for services in Rebellion, outside Militia, on M. for Ret., 17 (i).
 Scrip to Veterans of 1837 (Ans.) 320 (i).
 Strange, Genl., Rep. of, re 9th and 65th Battalions (Ans.) 670 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Militia and Defence) 612 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 751; (Barracks, B.C.) 766; (Batteries, Artillery Schools, &c.) 759; (Bergin, Surgeon Gen.) 1240; (Campbell, G., payments to) 1170; (Contingencies, &c.) 754; (Drill Instruction) 753; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 763; (Military Branch and District Staff) 748; (Military College) 755, conc., 1268; (Permanent Corps) 759; (Rifled Ordnance) 763 (ii).
Pensions (Militia, &c.) 746; conc., 1267 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 659 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (1887-88) 1248 (ii).
 Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
 War Claims paid and rejected (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 York and Simcoe Battalion of Volunteers (remarks) 715 (ii).
- Cartwright, Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., South Oxford.**
 Address to Her Majesty, on prop. M. to consider (remarks) 706 (ii).
 Agriculture and Colonisation Com., on M. to increase quorum, 153 (i).
 Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 751 (i).
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 Army and Navy, Imports for, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 Assistant Receiver Gen., Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
 Auditor General's Rep. (remarks) 13 (i).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) on M. for 2^o, 194, 197; in Com., 227, 230, 234, 238, 242, 245 (i).
 Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).
 Batteries, Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
 Brokerage and Commission, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 BUDGET, The (Ques.) 258; (reply) to annual statement, 407-426 (i). See "*Ways and Means*."
 Business of the House (remarks) 100, 110 (i).
 ——— introduction of new measures, 804 (ii).
 ——— on M. to take in Saturday, 1077 (ii).
 C. P. R. in B. C., in Com. of Sup., 766, 1178 (ii).
 ——— See "*Rolling Stock*."
 Campbell, C., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 Campbell, Mr., late, M.P., decease (remarks) 1006 (ii).
 Carillon Canal, Valuator's services, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
 Census Ret. of Man. (Ques.) 44 (i).
 Chamberlin, B., extra pay, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Civil Service Officials and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 664 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 335, 342 (i).
 ——— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 Commercial relations with France (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 822 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1267-1269 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.) 15 (i).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651, 653 (ii).
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190, 1239 (ii).
 Counterfeit and Imitation Notes B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 808 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1220 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
 ——— Regulations respecting Baggage (Ques.) 101 (i).
 Debt, public, Interest on, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 Depl. Reps., Distribution of, on prop. M. to change Rule, 145 (i).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. to make Res. First Order of the Day, 384 (i).
 ——— on M. for Com. on Res., 559–564 (i).
 Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 707 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 884 (ii).
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Carduell*) in Com. of Sup., 895, 910 (ii).
 Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1136, 1197 (ii).
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 Dunscomb, Mr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 30 (i).
 Estimates, The, bringing down (Ques.) 100, 192 (ii).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 720 (ii).
 Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.*) 15 (ii).
 Finance and Treasury Board Act Amt. B. 93 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 884 (ii).
 Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 594 (ii).
 Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup., 1193 (ii).
 Fisheries, papers, &c. (remarks) 141 (i).
 ——— Protection Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1086 (ii).
 Franchise Act Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1227 (ii).
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s Loan B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1029 (ii).
 Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. to suspend Rules, 1028 (ii).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).
 Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 596 (ii).
 ——— Warrants, Order called for M. for Ret., 150 (i).
 ——— 1873–1886 (Ms. for Ret.) 258, 271, 280 (i).
 ——— 1886–87, (M.) ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 291 (i).
 Gowanlook, Mrs., (remarks) on conc., 1268 (ii).
 Grain, &c., exported from Dom. (M. for Ret.*) 15 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 978, 1184, 1246 (ii).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 High Commissioner, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 126 (i).
 Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
 House of Commons, in Com. of Sup., 1239 (ii).
 Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 728; conc., 1267 (ii).
 Imperial Trusts Co. B. 15 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 3°. 638 (ii).
 Inland Rev., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).
 I. C. R. Capital Account (Ques.) 102 (i).
 ——— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 772 (ii).
 ——— Machinery, in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).
 ——— Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 824 (ii).
 ——— Servis Tie Plates, in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
 ——— Locomotives, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
 Iron Duties (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1079 (ii).
 ——— extension of time for entering goods, in Com. on B. 107, 1220 (ii).
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
 Jones, L. K., salary as Priv. Sec., in Com. of Sup., 766 (ii).
 Kit allowance to Volunteers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832, 838 (ii).
 Land Sales in the N.W.T. (Ques.) 14 (i).
 Laviolette, Godefroi, allowance B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 889 (ii).
 Library of Parlt., in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 1197.
 Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
 Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 748 (ii).
 Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 833 (ii).
 N.W.T., Expenses of Govt., in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of, Independence of Members, 1011 (ii).
 Ordnance, improved Rifled, in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I.C.R., B. 77 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 648 (ii).
 Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 641 (ii).
 Perley, H. F., extra pay, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Bryson*) in Com., 1093 (ii).
 Postmaster Genl.'s Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 653. (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1135 (ii).
 ——— Irregularities in N.B., in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612 (i), 1113 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J. —Continued.

- Printing Committee's Rep., on M. to conc., 1198 (ii).
 Private Bills, Rules respecting, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sp. Com., 1116 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
 Prohibition, compensation to dealers (remarks) 951 (ii).
 Public Morals Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 278 (i).
 Public Works, Liabilities for (Ques.) 14, 15 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 158 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1032 (ii).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 182 (i).
 Rebellion, N.W., in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1187 (ii).
 Receipts and Expenditures, 1886-87, with Estimates, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 110, 223 (i).
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 Returning Officer for Algoma, in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838, 1268 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1044, 1046 (ii).
 Royal Commission on Canal Leases, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 755; conc., 1268 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1183 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832; conc., 1268 (ii).
 Savings Banks, country, in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
 — Funds, in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 Senate, in Com. of Sup., 660, 1233 (ii).
 — Representation of the N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 199 (i).
 Sittings of the House (remarks) on suggested change of time, 1271 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, distribution of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1033; in Com., 1123 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1117 (ii).
 — (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 1249; in Com., 1251, 1259; in Com. on B., 1266 (ii).
 Subsidies, Ry., Liabilities for (Ques.) 14, 15 (i).
 Subsidy to P.E.I. B. 139 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 815 (ii).
 Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1170.

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (N. W. T.) 654 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Agricultural Societies, N. W. T.) 1240; (Archives, care of) 717, 746; (Colonial Exhibition) 1166; (Dom. Exhibition) 718; (Experimental Farms) 720; (Health Statistics) 718; (Imperial Institute) 728; conc., 1267 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J. —Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Canals—Capital* (Cornwall) 832; (Lachine) 832; (Murray) 833; (Payment to Valuers) 1179; (Sault Ste. Marie Canal, construction) 832; conc., 1268; (Tay) 838; (Welland) 835; (Williamsburg) 838. *Income* (Lachine) 838; (Rideau) 838, 1180; conc., 1268; (St. Peter's) 1268; (Williamsburg) 838 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Receiver Gen., Halifax) 591; (Auditor and Receiver Gen., Winnipeg) 591; (Brokerage and Commission) 593; (Debt, Public, Interest) 593; (Financial Commissioner, Eng.) 594; (Savings Banks, N. B., &c.) 592 (i).
Civil Govt. (Finance, contingencies) 653; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 596 (i); (High Commissioner, contingencies) 651 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 613 (i); conc., 1267; (Interior) 1129, 1185; (ii) (Militia) 612; (Postmaster General) 614 (i); contingencies, 653 (ii); (Privy Council) 597; (Public Printing, &c) 612; (Sec. of State's Dept.) 612 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Canals) 1113; (Customs) 1129; (Dom. Lands) 1136, 1197; (Excise) 1195; (Liquor License Act) 1197; (Post Office) 1135; (Railways, I.O.R.) 1113, 1196; conc., 1269 (ii).
Dom. Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 1197 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1071; (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1086 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c) 730, 734, 742; conc., 1267 (ii).
Indians (Annuities, Robinson Treaty) 1093; (B.C.) 1094; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1103, 1186; (N.S.) 1094; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1093 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (additional messengers) 1239; (Debates, publishing) 667. Elections, 1240. Franchise Act (expenses) 1165. Library 667. Senate, 1238 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 1058; (Guinane, Mrs., gratuity) 1186 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (France and Quebec) 987; conc., 1269 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 751; (Batteries, Artillery Schools, &c.) 759; (Oampbell, C., payment to) 1170; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 764; (Military Branch and District Staff, salaries) 748; (Military College) 755; conc., 1268; (Military Properties) 764; (Permanent Corps) 759; (Rifled Ordnance) 763 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c.) 1248; (Chamberlain, B., extra pay) 1195; (Commercial Agencies) 1112; (Commutation in lieu of Duties) 1112; (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Dunscumb, Mr., claim for services) 1248; (Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties) 1193; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 1112; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 1189; (preparation of Returns) 1112; (Printing Bureau) 1113; (Rand's Micmac Dictionary) 1247; (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs) 1187; (Savings Bank Funds) 1189 (ii).
Mounted Police (Crozier, Major, gratuity) 1186 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (McPherson, W. M., refund) 1185 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 659; (Kingston) 658; (Man.) 659, 1238; (St. Vincent de Paul) 659 (ii).
Pensions (Militia, &c) 746; conc., 1267 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional Block, Ottawa) 916. *Income* (B.O.) 977; (Ont.) 975, 1183, 1242; (N.W.T.) 1245; (Que.) 971, 1183. Harbors and Rivers (B.O.) 980; (Man.) 980; (N.S.) 978, 1246; (Ont.) 1184; conc., 1269; (Que.) 1184. Miscellaneous, 1185. Repairs, Furniture, &c., 1269. Slides and Booms, 1247 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (B.O.) 766, 1172; conc., 1267; L. K. Jones, salary as Priv. Sec.) 766. I. O. R. (Halifax Extension) 772; (Machinery) 1177. (Rolling Stock) 824; (Service Tie Plates) 829. P. E. I. Ry., 1178. *Income* (Royal Commission on Leases) 1180 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Observatories, &c.) 1068 (ii).
Superannuation (Gratuity to O. S. Neville) 1170 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (1886-87) 1197; (1887-88) 1248 (ii).
 (Swing Bridge at Smith's Falls, conc., 1268 (ii).
 Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1075 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 192 (i); on M. for Com., 863; in Com., 870 (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language (remarks) on div., 703; withdr. requested, 704 (ii).
 Waters, T. J., payments to as Seizing Officer (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
Ways and Means—Budget, The (reply to annual statement) 407–426, 427, 434, 439 (i); 963–965 (ii).
TARIFF CHANGES: (advertising pictures) 426; (bleacking) 426; (blueing) 426; (buggies) 427; (buttons, ivory) 427; (cigars and cigarettes) 439 (i); (clothing, ready made) 965 (ii); (cotton fabrics, printed or dyed) 428; (cotton sewing thread) 427; (earthenware) 432; (fabrics, woollen) 440; (gold and silver leaf) 434; (jeans and coutilles) 428; (leather, enamelled, &c.) 434; (oil cloth) 434; (paper hangings) 434; (sewing machines) 434; (slates) 439 (i).
 Welland Canal, in Com of Sup., 835 (ii).
 Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Agreement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 591 (i).
 White Population in Man. (Ques.) 14 (i).
 Williams, barge, payment for, in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).
 Williamsburg Canal, in Com of Sup., 838.

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

- Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 752 (ii).
 Axes, chopping, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 461 (i).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 195; in Com., 227, 229, 231, 237, 242, 245 (i).
 Banff Springs, Claims to, &c. (M. for Ret.) 364 (i).
 Batteries, Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 760 (ii).
 Butter Imports from U. S., 1833 to 1887, on M. for Ret., 212 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *McNeill*) on M. for 1°, 443 (i).
 ——— Examinations, 1887 (Ques.) 143 (i).
 ——— Promotion Examinations (M. for Stmt.)* 388.
 Coal, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 510 (i).
 Coal Oil, Importation in bulk, on B. 107, 1147 (ii).
 Collars, Cotton or Linen, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 445 (i).
 Colonial Conference, Commission, &c. (M. for copy) 150 (i).
 Contingencies, &c., Militia, &c., 754 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1147 (ii).
 Debt, Public, and recent Elections, in Deb. on *Ways and Means*, 478 (i).
 Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 27 (i).
 Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 469 (i).
 Financial Inspector, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
 Fishing on Lake Erie, Claims for rebate of License (M. for Cor.) 379 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1029 (ii).
 Glue, Sheets, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 446 (i).
 Haldimand Election, Returning Officer's Rets. (M. for copies) 372 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 980, 1246 (ii).
 Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 516 (i).
 Hoes, Garden Rakes, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 462 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 62–65; (remarks) 140 (i).
 Insolvent Debtors B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 288 (i).
 Iron and Steel industry, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 508 (i).
 Labor Commission (remarks) 1273 (ii).
 Locomotives, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 504 (i).
 Malleable Iron Castings, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 503.
 Midland Ry. of Can. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Hudspeth*) on M. for 2°, 444 (i).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 447 (i).
 Paper Hangings, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 516 (i).
 ——— Manufactures of, in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 518 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 359 (i).
 Photographic Dry Plates, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 449 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 927–930; on Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 950 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 692–695 (ii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).
 Salt, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 435 (i).
 Savings Banks, N.B., &c., in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
 Screws, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 507 (i).
 Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 513 (i).
 Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 450 (i).
 Skates, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 507 (i).
 Steam Engines, portable, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 505 (i).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Country Savings Banks, N. B., N. S., &c.) 592; (Financial Commissioner, Eng.) 596 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 752; (contingencies, &c.) 754; (Drill Instruction) 753; (Military College) 757; (Permanent Corps) 760 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 980. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 980, 1246 (ii).
 Trunks, Valises, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 445 (i).
 Unparliamentary Language, 618 (ii).
 Vote on M. to allow Jno. R. Dunn Counsel *re* Queen's Election, 624 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 435, 440, 445–448, 450, 451, 459, 562, 478, 503, 504, 505, 507 (i).
 Woollen Fabrics, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 440 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet.*

- Adjmt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 320 (i).
 Dunn, J. R. (remarks) examination of, 624 (ii).
 High Commissioner, Acting (Ques.) 45 (i).
 St. Roch and St. Louise Wharf (Ques.) 1003 (ii).
 Upper Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 49, attention of Hse. called to B. not being printed in French, 320 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*

- Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure" (Ans.) 14 (i).
 Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 277 (i); 2° and in Com., 642 (ii).
 Civil Service Board, Examiners Rep. (presented) 44 (i)
 ——— Examinations, 1887 (Ans.) 143 (i).
 ——— Promotion Examinations (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 352 (i).
 ——— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
 Commercial relations with France (Ans.) 1006 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 820 (ii).
 Dunn, J. R., examination of, 629, 633 (ii).
 Electoral Lists for L'Assomption County (Ans.) 525 (i).
 Giasson, Napoléon, dismissal, on M. for Cor., 378 (i).
 Hébert, Hubert, balance due as Revising Officer (Ans.) 258 (i).
 Immigration into Dom. during 1886 (Ans.) 45 (i).
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Bryson*) in Com., 1092 (ii).
 Printing Com.'s Reps., on M. to conc. in 3rd and 4th Reps., 951 (ii).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 617, 620 (ii).
 Revising Barristers' Clerks, salaries (Ans.) 371 (i).
 Revising Officer at L'Assomption (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 ——— for Montmorency (Ans.) 45 (i).
 ——— salaries (Ans.) 21 (i).
 St. Charles, Bellechasse, Ry. crossing, on M. for Cor. 152 (i).
 Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 44 (i).
 ——— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, distribution of, (B. 159, 1°) 1033; in Com., 1122 (ii).
 ——— French Edition (Ans.) 142 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 599 (i); (Sec. of State's Dept.) 1162 (ii).
 Voters List for county of Montmorency, on M. (Mr. *Langelier*) to lay on Table, 529 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

- Adjmt., Ascension and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 320 (i).
 Axles and Springs, conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
 Blue Books and Deptl. Reps., distribution of (prop. Res. to suspend Rule) 295 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Boilers in Parlt. Buildings, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 383 (i).
 C.P.R., B.C. section, in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
 Collars, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
 Concurrence, 1269 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 347 (i).
 ——— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. (Seduction, &c.) (B. 4, 1°*) 20;
 Order for 2° called and B. withdn, 312 (i).
 ——— (Public Morals, &c.) (B. 21, 1°) 100; 2° 273; in Com., 278 (i).
 Cuffs, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1151 (ii).
 Debates, Official Rep. (remarks) re Rep. of Com., 1155 (ii).
 Debt, Public, and recent Elections, in deb. on Ways and Means, 483 (i).
 ——— Public, gross and net (Ques.) 14 (i).
 Deptl. Reps., Distribution of (prop. M.) to change Rule, 144 (i).
 Dominion Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 892, 898, 901; on M. to conc. in Amts., 1009 (ii).
 Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1151 (ii).
 Ferro-Manganese, conc. in Ways and Means, 489 (i).
 Glue, Sheet, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).
 High Commissioner's Taxes, in Com. of Sup., 652 (ii).
 Hoes, Garden Rakes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
 Indian School at Qu'Appelle, Medical attendant (M. for Ret.) 379 (i).
 Indians on File Hill Reserve, Vaccination (M. for Ret.) 379 (i).
 Iron and Steel Forgings, conc. in Ways and Means, 502 (i).
 ——— Bounties, amounts paid on Manufactures (Ques.) 371 (i).
 ——— Manufactures, conc. in Ways and Means 489, 495, 503 (i).
 Justice, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 National Policy, in Deb. on Ways and Means, 495 (i).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).
 Port Rowan, Harbor of Refuge, Engineer's Rep., &c., (M. for copies *) 318 (i).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
 Prorogation (Ques.) 804 (ii).
 Public Morals. See "Criminal Law."
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 362 (i).
 Revising Barristers' Clerks, salaries (Ques.) 371 (i).
 Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 435 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

Senate Representation for the N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 200 (i).

Shipping News and Telegraph Service (Ques.) 312 (i).

Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 450 (i).

Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 463 (i).

Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1119 (ii).

—— (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1254 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (High Commissioner's Taxes, &c.) 652; (Justice Dept.) 1162; (Privy Council) 1160 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) conc., 1269 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 734 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1243; (N.W.T.) 1245.

Slides and Booms, 1246 (ii).

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 1171 (ii).

Trunks, Valises, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).

Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 66 (i), 704, 1012 (ii).

Ventilation of the Hse. of C. (M. for Cor.) 786 (ii).

Voters Lists under Franchise Act (remarks) 805 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 435, 445, 446, 447, 449, 450, 451, 462, 463, 483, 489, 495, 499, 502, 503 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. D., New Westminster.

New Westminster Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 36, 1^{o*}) 190 (i).

C.P.R., Onderdonk Contract in B.C. (Ques.) 1003 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

Bolduc, Capt. L., dismissal of (Ques.) 525 (i).

Cap à la Corneille Booms (Ques.) 1001 (ii).

Cap St. Ignace, Station-house (M. for Ret.) 103 (i).

Durantaye Senatorship, applicants for (Ques.) 708 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 1226 (ii).

Grosse Isle Mail Service, in Com. of Sup., 975 (ii).

Hébert, Hubert, Revising Officer at Montmorency, Accounts, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).

I. C. R., Complaint against employés (Ques.) 20 (i).

—— Dismissal of Officials (M. for Ret.) 21 (i).

—— Proposals to Purchase (Ques.) 1004 (ii).

—— Station at St. Ignace (M. for Stmt.) 377 (i).

Kennebec Senatorship, applicants for (Ques.) 708 (ii).

Post Office in Montmagny (Ques.) 45; (M. for Ret.) 151 (i).

Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 177 (i).

Revising Officers' salaries (Ques.) 671 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 972, 975 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 813 (ii).

Vote on M. to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, *re* Queen's Election, 624 (ii).

Clayes, Mr. G., Missisquoi.

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 899 (ii).

Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 457, 459 (ii).

Hoes, Garden Rakes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 463 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 98 (i).

Richelieu River, &c., Buoys, Contracts awarded (Ques.) 321 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 457, 463 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Centre Toronto.

Banff National Park, B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 237 (i).

Can. Permanent Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 143, 1^{o*}) 876 (ii).

Fiscal Policy of Dom., in deb. on Ways and Means, 491 (i).

Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 692 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 491 (i).

Western Assurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 60, 1^{o*}) 300 (i).

Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.

Library of Parl. (M. to conc. in Reprs.) 1249 (ii)

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 430 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.

Christian Island Indians, compensation for Penetanguishene purchase (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

—— compensation for Timber cut on Lands (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

Chippewa Indians Annuity (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sales in Ont. (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 975 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N. B.

Canned Goods Act Amt. (B. 121, 1^o) 638 (ii).

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1115 (ii).

Flour, Inspection of, Legislation (Ans.) 143 (i).

Frauds on Customs, Whiskey *vs.* Vinegar (Ans.) 102 (i)

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 152, 1^{o*}) 1001; in Com., 1120 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 86-89 (i)

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).

Licensing of Weighers (B. 136, 1^o) 804; in Com., 1121 (ii).

O'Donoghue, M. F., employment of (Ans.) 143 (i).

Spirits and Corn, Exports and Imports (Ans.) 143 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Inland Revenue) 1163 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Excise) 1115 (ii).

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 19 (ii).

Whiskey, unlawful manufacture of (Ans.) 21 (i).

Coursol, Mr. C. J., East Montreal.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 91 (i).
St. John and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing
Co.'s (B. 119, 1^o*) 638; 2^o m., 875 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., Centre Montreal.

Customs Laws, changes (Ques.) 953 (ii).
Equity Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 69, 1^o*) 359 (i).
Floods, St. Lawrence (Ques.) 277 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 13, 1^o*) 74 (i).
Harbors and Breakwaters, Moneys voted by Parlt.
since Confederation (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, Order for prop. Res. called,
15; (prop. Res.) 46-52; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy)
122-126; prop. amt. of Res., 137; Res., 140; agreed
to (Y. 135, N. 47) 141 (i).
Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M.
for 2^o, 288 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, contradiction of newspaper para-
graph, 360 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr.
Jamieson) 857 (ii).
Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret.,
366 (i).
Royal Victoria Hospital incorp. (B. 150, 1^o*) 951 (ii).
St. Gabriel Levée and Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt.
(B. 12, 1^o*) 74; in Com., 538 (i).
Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) on
M. for 2^o, 1152 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., Selkirk.

Agricultural Machines, conc. in Ways and Means, 485,
487 (i).
Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on
Res., 564-567 (i).
Dominion Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell)
in Com., 893, 899, 911, 915 (ii).
Dunn, J. R., examination of, 632 (ii).
Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for
Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 40 (i).
Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 721 (ii).
Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Hudspeth) 2^o m., 444 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 721 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1196 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c) 730, 740 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 485, 487, 488 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P. E. I.

Anticosti Island, in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).
Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2^o,
804, 1021-1025; in Com., 1140; on M. for 3^o, 1221 (ii).
Asst. Receiver Genl., Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in
Com., 240 (i).
Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 918 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Chapleau)
in Com., 642 (ii).
Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 664 (ii).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref.
Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 335; (Amt.
to Amt.) 336; (explanation) 338; Amt. to Amt.
neg. (Y. 74, N. 104) 358 (i).
—— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 601 (i),
1160 (ii).
Colonial and Ind. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1168 (ii).
County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 655 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 613 (i), 1237 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on
Res., 579 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. Edgar) on M.
for 2^o, 541 (i); in Com., 886 (ii).
—— Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
Dunn, J. R., on Counsel's Argument, 627 (ii).
—— on examination, 624, 633 (ii).
Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup.,
1191 (ii).
Fisheries, Deptl. Rep., distribution of (remarks) 781,
805 (ii).
—— Hatcheries, in Com. of Sup., 1069 (ii).
—— Protection Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup.,
1081 (ii).
Franchise Act, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
Gov. Genl.'s Warrants, 1873 to 1876, on M. for Ret.,
267, 282 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 918, 1246 (ii).
House of Commons, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).
Imperial Trusts Co. B. 15 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 3^o,
638 (ii).
Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 613 (i), 1163 (ii).
I. C. R. Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup.,
776 (ii).
—— Passes to Members (remarks) 524 (i).
—— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 828 (ii).
—— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
Liquors, Conveyance on board H. M.'s Ships B. 122
(Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^o, 814 (ii).
Lobster Fishery in N.S., on M. for copies of Cor., 316 (i).
M. A. Starn, in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Northern Light and P. E. I. winter communication
(Ques.) 206; on M. for Ret., 533 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
Oranges and Lemons, conc. in Ways and Means, 461 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. Branch, I.C.R., B. 77
(Mr. Pope) on M. for 2^o, 646 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Thompson) in Com.,
642 (ii).
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 660 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Photographic Dry Plates, conc. in Ways and Means, 450 (i).
 Postmaster Genl.'s Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
 Printing Committee's Reps., on M. to conc. in 3rd and 4th Repr., 951 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Kenny) *re* Official Rep. of Debates 785 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 601 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 644 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 616, 622 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 677; (Amt.) 685; (explanation) 692; Amt. neg. (Y. 85, N. 104) 702 (ii).
 Revising Barristers Claims (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 — Clerks salaries (remarks) 371 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1040 (ii).
 — I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 828 (ii).
 Savings Banks, country, in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
 Senate Representation for N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 202 (i).
 Sessional Papers, Indexing of (remarks) 1074 (ii).
 Subsidy to P.E.I. B. 139 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res. 814 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (County Courts, N.B.) 655 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Criminal Statistics) 718; (Colonial Exhibition) 1168; (Dom. Exhibition) 718; (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Receiver Gen., Halifax) 591; (Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., &c.) 592; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 596 (i).
Civil Govt. (Customs) 613 (i), 1237 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 613 (i), 1163 (ii); (Postmaster Genl.'s Dept.) 614; (Privy Council) 601 (i), 1160 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1081; (Salaries, &c.) 1089. (ii).
Indians (N.W.T.) 1104 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 664, 1164. Franchise Act (Expenses) 1165 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, &c.) 1062 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (France and Quebec) 986, 1058; (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P.E.I.) 991 (ii).
Militia (contingencies, &c.) 753 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties) 1191; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 1248 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (*Northern Light*) 1247; (Winter Service, P.E.I.) 1058 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 660 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 978. Dredging, 981. Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 918; (N.S.) 1246 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax Extension) 776; (Rolling Stock) 828; (St. Charles Branch) 1176 (ii).
 Supplies to Str. *Lansdowne*, in Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 811; in Com., 873, 876 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 868, 872 (ii).
 Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
 Ventilation of House of Commons, on M. for Cor., 788.
 Vote on M. to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, *re* Queen's Election, 624 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 449, 450, 461 (i)
 Winter Service, P.E.I., and *Northern Light*, on M. for Ret., 533 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.

- Agricultural Machines, conc. in Ways and Means, 486.
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 235 (i).
 C. P. R., Town Site of Regina, &c., amounts realised (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 Creighton, Mr. J., Indian Agent at Saugeen, on M. for Ret., 314 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 19 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell) on M. for Com., 890; in Com., 897; on M. to conc. in Amts., 1012; (personal explanation) *re* paragraph in newspaper, 1015 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 41 (i).
 Experimental Farms in N.W.T. (Ques.) 16 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 99, 103–108; (Amt.) 126; neg. (Y. 60, N. 128) 137 (i).
 Mounted Police Pensions (Ques.) 16 (i).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 448 (i).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 809 (ii).
 — Council B. 163 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 1076; (personal explanation) *re* remarks of Mr. Mills, 1273 (ii).
 — Local Govt. (B. 2, 1°) 13 (i).
 — Real Property Act Amt. (B. 8, 1°) 20 (i).
 Order, Ques. of, misquoting statement from newspaper, 1014 (ii).
 Paper, News, in Com. on Ways and Means, 521 (i).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 174 (i).
 Regina and Wood Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 37, 1°*) 190 (i).
 Scrip for services in Rebellion, outside Militia (M. for Ret.) 16 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com. on Res., 1119 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1245 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 448, 449, 486 (i).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., Algoma.

Chippewa Indians, Arrears due, on M. for Ret., 382 (i).
Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters on M. for Com. on Res., 567 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 886 (ii).

Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1151 (ii).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 721 (ii)

Fish Licenses, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).

Geographical nomenclature in Repts. (M. for Ret.) 801 (ii).

Geological Surveys west of Port Arthur (M. for Ret.) 213 (i).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).

—— under Robinson Treaty, Claims (Ques.) 1199.

Licenses and Crown Titles and Settlers Claims (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).

Port Arthur Harbor, &c., in Com. of Sup., 916 (ii).

Returning Officer for Algoma, in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 830 (ii).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 511 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 721 (ii).

Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 830 (ii).

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1070 (ii).

Indians (Annuities, Robinson Treaty) 1093 (ii).

Legislation: Elections, 1240 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Port Arthur Harbor) 916 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 511 (i).

Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.

Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 34, 1°*) 153 (i).

Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 705 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., West Toronto.

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).

Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 71, 1°*) 359 (i).

Imperial Trusts Co. of Canada, incorp. (B. 15, 1°*) 74 (i); in Com., 637 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 748 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, relevancy of deb., 997 (ii).

Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 367 (i).

Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 755 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Drill Sheds, &c.) 764; (Military College) 755; (Military Branch and District Staff) 748 (ii).

Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1153 (ii).

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., Portneuf.

Franchise, Electoral, Act, Repeal of (Ques.) 205 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., Hochelaga.

Jacques Cartier Union Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1261 (ii).

Printing Committee's Rep. (M.) to conc., 1156 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1261 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Indians—(Annuities, Robinson Treaty) 1094 (ii).

Unparliamentary Language, protest against, 703 (ii).

Dessaint, Mr. A., Kamouraska.

Bélanger, P., and Caron, G., dismissal (Ques.) 1003 (ii).

Cap St. Ignace Station-house (M. for Ret.) 103 (i).

Dionne, Joseph, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 321 (i).

Hébert, Hubert, balance due as Revising Officer (Ques.) 258 (i).

Kamouraska Wharf (Ques.) 101; (M. for Ret.*) 110; damages by Ice (Ques.) 526 (i).

Postmaster of Alexandre, complaint (Ques.) 526 (i).

Revising Officer's account *re* Kamouraska Election (M. for Ret.*) 318 (i).

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 1003.

Doyon, Mr. C., Laprairie.

Caughnawaga Indian Lands, Indemnity by C. P. R. Co. (Ques.) 1199 (ii).

—— Survey (Ques.) 1006 (ii).

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s (explanation) Vote on div., 299 (i).

Giasson, Napoléon, dismissal of (Ques.) 364; (M. for Cor.) 377 (i).

SUPPLY :

Indians (N. W. T.) 1105 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.

Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 290 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 194, 197 (i).

Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).

Commercial Treaties, papers, &c., respecting (Ques.) 143, 154 (i).

Copyright, British works, reprints (Ques.) 15; M. for Stmt. of sums collected, 22 (i).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 708 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 46, 1°) 204; 2° m, 539 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 589 (i).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1030 (ii).

Imperial Federation, Instructions to Can. Representatives at Col. Conference (M. for Ret.) 219 (i).

Insolvent Debtors Discharge (B. 9, 1°*) 44; on Order for 2°, 272; 2° m., 292 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Interest, payments by Crown B. 137 (i); (remarks) on withdr. of B., 1121 (ii).
 Kit Allowance to Volunteers (Ques.) 371 (i); (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 North-West Council B. 163 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1^o, 1076 (ii).
 Pacific Mail Service (Ques.) 278 (i).
 Postmaster, Pickering, Ont. (Ques.) 277 (i).
 Private Bills, Rules respecting, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sp. Com., 1116 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 167-170 (i).
 ——— on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (remarks) 319 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 617; (Amt.) 618; neg. (Y. 43, N. 119) 623 (ii).
 Queen's Own Royal Grenadiers, Kit Money (Ques.) 371 (i).
 Ry. (Govt.) Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2^o, 192.
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1031 (ii).
 Statutes, Publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1122 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1117 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* (Privy Council) 606 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Agent, &c., B. C.) 1114.
Steamboat Inspection (Expenses) 1068 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 1075 (ii).
 Weighers, Licensing of, B. 136 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1121 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., Russell.

- Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1204 (ii).
 Examining Warehouse in Ottawa (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, reasons given for not voting, 126, 141 (i).
 Rideau River Floods (Ques.) 14 (i).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., Lunenburg.

- Fishery Protection Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1084 (ii).
 Fishing Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1072 (ii).
 Lunenburg, site for public building (Ques.) 154 (i).
 ——— amount paid (Ques.) 1003 (ii).
 ——— grant for same (Ques.) 1004 (ii).
 N. S. Central Ry. Subsidy (M. for Cor.) 214 (i).
 ——— in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1263 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Protection, Steamers, &c.) 1084; (Salaries, &c.) 1072 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Salaries, &c.) 1058 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 919. Dredging, 981.
 Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 979 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John, N.B.

- Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 228 (i).
 Batteries, Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
 Bell-buoy for St. John Harbor (Ques.) 257 (i).
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 666 (ii).
 Colonial and Ind. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1168 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3^o, 1212 (ii).
 Debt, Public, in deb. on Ways and Means, 476 (i).
 Fisheries Protection, Instruction to Masters (M. for copies) 221 (i).
 ——— Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1085 (ii).
 ——— Vessels boarded, &c., by Officers in Protection Service (M. for Ret.) 220 (i).
 ——— Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1072 (ii).
 Flagstones, conc. in Ways and Means, 433 (i).
 I. C. R., Grain shipments (M. for Ret.) 380 (i).
 ——— Rolling stock, in Com. of Sup., 825 (ii).
 ——— St. John, accommodation, in Com. of Sup., 1173 (ii).
 Iron Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1212 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 173 (i).
 ——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 687 (ii).
 Paper Hangings, in Com. on Ways and Means, 517 (i).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 660 (ii).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1123 (ii).
 Sugar, in deb. on Ways and Means, 465 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*, 1168 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1085; (salaries, &c) 1072 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 666 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (France and Quebec) 986; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1185 (ii).
Militia (Permanent Corps) 759 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 660 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 979 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (accommodation at St. John) 1173; (Rolling Stock) 825. P. E. I. Ry., 1178 (ii).

- Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1153 (ii).
 Wall Paper, conc. in Ways and Means, 514 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 433, 440, 465 (ii).
 Winter port of C. P. R. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 969 (ii).
 Woollen Fabrics, conc. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., North Leeds and Grenville.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 605 (i).
 Lavell, William A., Relief (B. 155) 1^o on a div., 1028 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 723 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 605 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.

Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 455 (i).
Welland Canal Bridge, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 455, 456.

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.

Blanche River, completion of Wharf (Ques.) 205 (i).
Chouinard, D., payment of Award of Arbitrators (Ques.) 1006 (ii).
Customs Officer at St. Germain de Rimouski (Ques.) 278, 321 (i).
Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 31 (i).
Father Point, Harbor of Refuge (Ques.) 144 (i).
Fishing Leases in River Matane (Ques.) 526 (i).
I. C. R., Notre Dame du Sacré Cœur station (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
Lalberge, A., enquiry against (M. for Ret.) 376; (Ques.) 1003 (ii).
Matane Wharf repairs (Ques.) 205 (i).
N. W. Rebellion Losses, Claims (Ques.) 543 (i).
Point du Père Breakwater, construction (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
Rimouski River Improvements (Ques.) 205 (i).
Ste. Cecile du Bic Wharf (Ques.) 526 (i).
St. Jérôme de Matane Wharf, amount expended (M. for Stmnt.) 788 (ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome.

Business of the House, on M. to take in Wednesdays 953 (ii).
Butter Substitutes (Ques.) 101 (i).
—— Importation of, &c. (Ques.) 205 (i).
Debt, Public, and recent Elections, in Deb. on Ways and Means, 479 (i).
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s (prop. M.) to rescind order of Standing Com., 296; neg. (Y. 66 N. 109) 299 (i).
Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 720, 722, 982 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, *re* Amt. to Res. on Prohibition, 851 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on postponement of Order, 788 (ii).
—— (Amt. to Amt.) 949; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 86) 950 (ii).
Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 188 (i).
Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 514 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 720, 727 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Experimental Farms) 982 (ii).
Quarantine, 744 (ii).
Vote on allowing J. R. Dunn Counsel, *re* Queen's Election, 624 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 479 (i).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.

Fisheries, Bounty, distribution of (Ques.) 257 (i).
—— Protection Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1083 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Ouiran) 56-58 (i).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Surveys, &c. (M. for Ret.) 789 (ii).
Lobster Fishery in N.S. (M. for copies of Cor.) 316 (i).
N.S. Better Terms., on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
Post Office and Custom House at Arichat (M. for Cor.) 790 (ii).
Ry. construction in Cape Breton (M. for Ret.) 790 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1083 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., King's, N.B.

Barrington Harbor, N.S., Tender for Lightship (Ans.) 383 (i).
Bell-buoy for St. John Harbor (Ans.) 257 (i).
Black Cod Banks, B.C., Rep. on Expedition (Ans.) 527 (i).
British subjects in Behring's Sea, protection (Ans.) 45 (i).
Bolduc, Capt. L., dismissal (Ans.) 525 (i).
Dalton, Wm., services on Lightship (Ans.) 1200; (remarks) 1249 (ii).
Debt, Public, in Deb. on Ways and Means, 474 (i).
Dipper Harbor Lighthouse, construction (Ans.) 785 (i).
Fisheries, Bounty, distribution of (Ans.) 257 (i).
—— Bounties in Vic., N.S., applicants for (Ans.) 371 (i).
—— Deep Sea Explorations in B.C. (Ans.) 102; in Com. of Sup., 1186 (ii).
—— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1237 (ii).
—— Dept. Rep. (presented) 707; (remarks) 805 (ii).
—— Fry, distribution of, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
—— Hoop Nets on Rty. St. Lawrence (Ans.) 101 (i).
—— Leases in River Matane (Ans.) 526 (i).
—— Licenses in East and West Lakes, Prince Edward Co. (Ans.) 322 (i).
—— Licenses in Lake Erie (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
—— Licenses in P.E.I. (Ans.) 1001 (ii).
—— Papers, &c., *re* negotiations (Ans.) 21, 112, 141, 238 (i).
—— Protection, Instructions to Commanders (Ans.) 21; on M. for copies, 221 (i); (Ans.) 1002 (ii).
—— Protection Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1087 (ii).
—— Vessels boarded, &c., by Officers in Protection Service, on M. for Ret., 221 (i).
Fish Trap at Tignish, P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 789 (ii).
Fog Alarm and Lighthouse, Murr Ledges (Ans.) 205 (i).
Govt. Officials in Northumberland, N.B., removal of (Ans.) 321 (i).
Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Gov. Genl.'s Warrants, 1873 to 1886, on M. for Ret., 281 (i).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
- Juan de Fuca Straits, Lighthouse at (Ans.) 102 (i).
- Kingston General and St. Catharines Marine Hospital (Ans.) 668 (ii).
- Life-saving Station on Vancouver Island (Ans.) 45 (i).
- Lighthouses, Maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1065 (ii).
- Liquors, Conveyance of, on board H. M.'s ships (B. 122, 1°) 638; 2°m, 814 (ii).
- Lizzie Lindsay and Fishery Protection (Ans.) 526 (i).
- Lobster Fishery in N. S., on M. for Cor., 317 (i).
- Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
- Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
- Miminegash Range Light keeper (Ans.) 372 (i), 1004 (ii).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners (B. 92, 1°) 442 (i).
- Northern Light and Winter communication with P.E.I. (Ans.) 206, 532 (i).
- Port La Four Harbor Light (Ans.) 785 (ii).
- Port San Juan Harbor of Refuge (Ans.) 102 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 858 (ii).
- Quebec River Police, appointment of (Ans.) 543 (i).
- Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 181 (i).
- Richelieu River Buoys, Contract award (Ans.) 321 (i).
- Roy, Honoré, suspension (Ans.) 143 (i).
- Sawdust in Rivers and Streams (Ans.) 257 (i).
- Schooner owned by R. Lindsay and Fishery Protection (Ans.) 527 (i).
- Seizure of British Vessels in Behring's Sea (Ans.) 21 (i).
- Shipping News and Telegraph Service (Ans.) 312 (i).
- Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°) 360 (i); 2°, 643 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1266 (ii).
- Supplies to Str. Lansdowne, in Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Civil Government (Fisheries)* 1237 (ii).
- Fisheries (Explorations in B. O., deep Sea)* 1186; (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1087; (Salaries, &c.) 1069 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, &c.)* 1062; (completion and construction) 1067; (Guinane, Mrs., gratuity) 1186; (Maintenance and Repairs) 1065; (salaries, &c.) 1058 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies (St. John and Basin of Minas)* 1185 (ii).
- Marine Hospitals,* 1068 (ii).
- Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay Expedition)* 1189 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers)* 1057; (McPherson, W. M., Refund) 1185; (Winter Service, P.E.I.) 1058 (ii).
- Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.)* 920 (ii).
- Scientific Institutions (Observatories, &c.)* 1068 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection (expenses)* 1068 (ii).
- Unprovided Items,* 1199 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff,* 474–476 (i).
- West Head Harbor Light (Ans.) 786 (ii).
- Winter Service, P.E.I., and Northern Light, on M. for Ret., 532 (i).

Freeman, Mr. J. N., Queen's, N. S.

- Coal, conc. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).
- Debt, Public (Ques.) in Deb. on Ways and Means, 484 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 542 (i).
- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 112 (i).
- I. C. R., Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 827 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson), 846–849, 944 (ii).
- Queen's, N. B., Election, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 619 (ii).
- on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 696 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies)* 1064 (ii).
- Railways—Capital: I. O. R. (Rolling Stock)* 827 (ii).
- Supplies to Str. Lansdowne, in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff,* 509 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.

- C.P.R. Laurentides Branch Lines, Tariff Rates (Ques.) 525 (i).
- Electoral Lists for L'Assomption (Ques.) 525 (i).
- Revising Officer at L'Assomption (Ques.) 1004 (ii).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., Rouville.

- Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 728 (ii).
- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 121; (explanation) 138 (i).
- North Shore Railroad, Purchase (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).
- SUPPLY:**
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms)* 728 (ii).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte.

- Canadian Horses in U.S., prohibiting (Ques.) 1004 (ii).
- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to ref. Ret. to Committee on Privileges and Elections, 339 (i).
- Fog Alarm and Lighthouse, Murr Ledges (Ques.) 205 (i).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1184 (ii).
- Lighthouse Keepers, in Com. of Sup., 1060.
- Port la Tour Harbor Light (Ques.) 785 (ii).
- Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 701 (ii).
- Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 452 (i).
- Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1124 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Lighthouse and Coast Service (Salaries, &c.)* 1060 (ii).
- Public Works—Income: Buildings (P. E. I.)* 924. Harbors and Rivers, 1184 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff,* 452 (i).
- West Head Harbor Light (Ques.) 786 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier.

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res (Mr. Jamieson) 845; (Amt.) 846; neg. (Y. 47, N. 136) 948 (ii).

Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 187 (i).

— on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (remarks) 369 (i).

— on Res. summoning John R. Dunn to Bar of House, 383 (i).

— on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 620 (ii)

— on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 688-690 (ii).

Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 705 (ii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., Vancouver Island.

Chinese Immigration (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i).

— amount collected, in Com. of Sup., 1134 (ii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s lands on Vancouver Island (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i).

Fisheries of B. C., deep Sea (Ques.) 102 (i).

Juan de Fuca Straits, Lighthouse at (Ques.) 102 (i).

Port San Juan, Harbor of Refuge (Ques.) 102 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1134 (ii).

Indians (B. C.) 1098 (ii).

Telegraph Signal Service in B. C. (Ques.) 102 (i).

Yukon River Exploration (Ques.) 102 (i).

Grandbois, Mr. P. E., Témiscouata.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s, attention of Speaker called to member not voting, 299 (i).

Quebec and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 87, 1°*) 413 (i).

Quebec Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 90, 1°*) 441 (i).

Témiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 81, 1°*) 383 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.

Customs Frauds, Whiskey vs. Vinograr (Ques.) 102 (i).

Ferry boats between Quebec and Lévis, &c. (Ques.) 258 (i).

I. C. R., St. Charles Branch Ry., Claims for Expropriation of Land (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).

Leather and Raw Hides Inspector (Ques.) 258 (i).

L'Evêque, Arsène, dismissal of (Ques.) 1200 (ii).

Mail Contracts in Lévis County (Ques.) 45 (i).

P. O. Inspector for Quebec, appointment (Ques.) 383 (i).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 257 (i).

Revising Officer for Montmorency (Ques.) 45 (i).

St. Charles and St. Joseph de Lévis, Station-house (Ques.) 101 (i).

St. Charles Branch Ry. Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (construction) 829 (ii).

Whiskey, unlawful Manufacture (Ques.) 20 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland.

Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 103, 1°*) 515; 2°, 601 (i).

Dunn, J. R., examination, 631 (ii).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 511 (i).

Paper Manufactures, in Com. on Ways and Means, 518 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 511, 518.

Haggart, Mr. J. G., South Lanark.

Concurrence, 1269 (ii).

Dunn, J. R., before Bar of House (remarks) on Ques. of Order, 618 (ii).

Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Ry. Co.'s (B. 133, 1°*) 782 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Swing Bridge, Smith's Falls) conc. 1269 (ii).

Hall, Mr. R. N., Sherbrooke.

Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 59, 1°*) 300 (i).

Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 156, 1°*) 1028 (ii).

Manufacturers Life and Accident Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Small) in Com., 539 (i)

Pension Fund Societies incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 277; in Com., 1152 (ii).

Private Bills, reception of Reps. from Com. (M. to extend time) 515 (i).

Public Bills, Rules respecting (M. for Sp. Com. to define practice) 668 (i).

South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 58, 1°*) 300; 2° m., 369 (i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., North Perth.

Agriculture and Colonisation Com., on M. to increase quorum, 154 (i).

Arms in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 1199 (ii).

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 223, 231 (i).

Canadian Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 104, 1°*) 515 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 5°, 1201 (ii).

Dunn, J. R., examination, 627, 629 (ii).

Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1201 (i).

Floods in St. Lawrence (Ques.) 277 (i).

Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).

Gas Meters, conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).

Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 290 (i).

Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 437 (i).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 511 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1243 (ii).

Quarantine, 745 (ii).

Vote on allowing Counsel for J. R. Dunn re Queen's Election, 624 (ii).

Vote on Disallowance, on Mr. Mitchell's explanation, 588 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 437, 446, 460, 511, 512 (i).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., Dundas.

- Butter, Duty and Inspection (Ques.) 154 (i).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 366 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 964 (ii).

Bolton, Mr. E., Chateauguay.

- Beauharnois P. O. Investigation (Ques.) 786 (ii).
 Bergin, Surgeon-Gen., services (Ques.) 1003 (ii).
 British American Bank Note Co.'s Contract (Ques.) 142 (i).
 Customs Fines and Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 1135 (ii).
 ——— Laws Amt. (Ques.) 277 (i).
 Indian and Colonial Exhibition and Geological Officers (Ques.) 526 (i).
 Painting, &c., Public Buildings, Ottawa, amounts paid (M. for Stmt.) 144 (i).
 Registered Letters, Loss at Beauharnois P. O. (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1135 (ii).
 War Claims paid and rejected (Ques.) 1003 (ii).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., South Victoria.

- Midland Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 75, 1°*) 360 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 701 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.

- Examining Warehouse in Ottawa (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Franchise Act, cost of Voters' Lists (M. for Ret.) withdn., 15 (i).
 Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 118, 1°*) 638 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Pensions (Militia, &c.) 747 (ii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe.

- Business of the House, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 953 (ii).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 242 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 542 (i).
 Dunn, J. R., examination, 634 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 27 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 590 (i).
 Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 105, 1°*) 515 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 128 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) motives imputed, 1007 (ii).
 Riddell, Fanny Margaret, Relief B. 145 (Mr. *Tupper*) 2° m., 926 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1873, Amt. (B. 40, 1°) 190 (i).
 Order Ques. of, re Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) to Res. on Prohibition, 851 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Order for Prop. Res. postponed, 788; Res., 840-845; on Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) 946; Res. neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 950 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., Gaspé.

- Lizzie Lindsay* and Fishery Protection (Ques.) 526 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G., Halifax.

- Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 752 (ii).
 Annapolis Fort, purchase of Military Lands (M. for Cor.) 379 (i).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 232 (i).
 Bartlett's work on Coal and Iron, in Com. of Sup., 1247.
 British Gum, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 445 (i).
 Civil Service Officials and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 660, 663, 666 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1263 (ii).
 County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1144, 1146; on M. for 3°, 1207 (ii).
 Customs Detectives, in Com. of Sup., 1130 (ii).
 Debt of Can., in deb. on *Ways and Means*, 467, 472 (i).
 Digby, N. S., representation of (M. to issue Writ) 1074 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 885 (ii).
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 26 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 722 (ii).
 Fisheries Protection, additional Cruisers (Ques.) 382; in Com. of Sup., 1084 (ii).
 ——— Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1223 (ii).
 Franchise Act Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1030 (ii).
 Garrison Mr., appointment as Surveyor of Customs, Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 1130 (ii).
 Halifax and West Indies Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 991, 996, 999 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Taxes, &c., in Com. of Sup., 652 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 71 (i).
 Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (ii).
 Insolvent Debtors B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 264 (i).
 I. C. R., Capital Expenditure, 1873 to 1886 (M. for Stmt.*) 110 (i).
 ——— Branch Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).
 ——— Grain Shipments, on M. for Ret., 38 (i).
 ——— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 768, 777, 1174 (ii).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 823, 1177 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- I.C.R., Supplies furnished by Contract or otherwise (M. for Ret.) 210 (i).
- Iron, bar, rolled, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 499 (i).
- Drawbacks, in deb. on Ways and Means, 467, 472 (i).
- Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1207 (ii).
- Joggins Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Pope) 1259 (ii).
- Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup. 750 (ii).
- Military Properties, in Com. of Sup., 765 (ii).
- Millson, Col. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
- Montreal Cotton Co.'s Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 959 (ii).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 168 (Sir Charles Tupper), in Com. on Res., 1156 (ii).
- Mounted Police, Gratuities, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1186.
- N. S. Better Terms (M. for Cor.) 215 (i).
- N. S. Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Pope) 1264 (ii).
- on M. for Cor. 215 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Kenny) re Rep. of Official Debates, 784 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I. C. R., B. 77 (Mr. Pope) on M. for Com. on Res., 302; on M. for 2°, 646 (ii).
- Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- Public Stores B. 20 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 273 (i).
- Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 367 (i).
- Riddell, Fanny M., Relief B. 145 (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 926 (ii).
- Rogers' Fish Ladder, in Com. of Sup., 1069 (ii).
- Rolling Stock, C. P. R. (B. C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1049 (ii).
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 755 (ii).
- Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 439 (i).
- Seizure of Vessels in N.S., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i).
- Senate Representation for the N. W. T. B. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 203; in Com., 248, 254 (i).
- Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 450 (i).
- Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
- Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 464 (i).
- Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 644 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1259 (ii).
- Sugar, in deb. on Ways and Means, 464, 472 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (County Courts, N.B.) 654 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 722; (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).
- Canals—Income* (St. Peter's) 1180 (ii).
- Civil Govt.* (High Commissioner's Taxes, &c.) 652 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 1190; (Post Office) 1136 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- SUPPLY—Continued.
- Fisheries* (Protection Steamers) 1084; (salaries, &c.) 1069 (ii)
- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 660. Franchise Act (expenses) 1165 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance and Repairs) 1065; (salaries, &c.) 1058 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies*, &c. (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P.E.I.) 991 (ii).
- Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 752; (Baird, Lieut.-Col., gratuity) 1171; (contingencies, &c.) 754; (Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges) 764; (Military Branch and District Staff) 750; (Military College) 755; conc., 1268; (Military Properties) 765 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c.) 1247 (ii).
- Mounted Police* (Gratuities) 1186 (ii).
- Pensions* (Militia, &c.) 747 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1245; (N.S.) 918; (Ont.) 1183, 1243; (Que.) 1183. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 978, 1246 (ii).
- Quarantine*, 746, 1170 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (Branch Lines) 1241; (Halifax Extension) 766, 777, 1174; (Rolling Stock) 823, 1177. Short Line Ry., 1178 (ii).
- Scientific Institutions* (Observatories, &c.) 1068 (ii).
- Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 867 (ii).
- Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
- Vote to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel re Queen's Election, 624 (ii).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, 438, 445, 450, 464, 467, 468, 472, 474, 477, 488, 498, 499 (i).
- Weighers, Licensed, B. 136 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 1°, 804; in Com., 1121 (ii).
- Western Counties Ry. B. 157 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1127 (ii).
- West Indies, Rep. of Commissioner (Ques.) 74, 278 (i).
- Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co. and Ry. Dept., &c. (M. for Ret.) 147, 149 (i).
- Winter Port of C.P.R. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 970 (ii).
- Yarmouth and Annapolis Ry. B. 157 (Mr. Pope) in Com. on Res., 1031 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.

- Corn-meal, conc. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).
- Customs Appraisers, in Com. of Sup., 1131 (ii).
- Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
- Eastern Can. Savings and Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 300 (i).
- Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 23 (i).
- Halifax and West-Indies Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 991, 993, 997 (ii).
- and West India Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 359 (i).
- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 55 (i).
- Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 289 (i).
- I. C. R., Grain Shipments, on M. for Ret., 381 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 767, 779, 1241 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—Continued.

Iron Industry, in deb. on Ways and Means, 473 (i).
 Londonderry Iron Co's incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 413 (i).
 Mounted Police Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1186 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Rep. of Official Debs., 784 (i).
 Royal Comn. on Rys., in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Senate Representation for N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 246 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1131 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P. E. I.) 991;
 (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 989 (ii).
Militia (Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges) 764 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Branch Limes) 1241; (Halifax
 Extension) 767, 779. *Income* (Royal Commission on Rys.
 1180 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 473, 509 (i).
 Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co. and Ry. Dept., &c., on
 M. for Ret., 149 (i).
 Winter Port of C.P.R., on M. for Com. of Sup., 971 (ii)

Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysboro'.

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in
 Com., 231 (i).

Customs Collector at Guysboro' (Ques.) 321 (i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1069 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (completion and construction)
 1067 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 989 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 923. Dredging, 981.
 Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 978 (ii).
 Lobster and Oyster Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 Lobster Fishery in N.S., on M. for copies of Cor., 317 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., on M. for Com. on Res.,
 310; in Com., 312 (i).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.

Boiler Tubes, conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
 Locomotives, conc. in Ways and Means, 505 (i).
 Midland Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Hudspeth*) on M. for 2°,
 444 (i).
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt.
 B. 26 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts.
 925 (ii).
 ——— (B. 149) 1°, 2°* and 3°*, 926 (ii).
 Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp.
 (B. 63, 1°*) 300 (i).
 Penitentiaries, reorganisation of Salaries, in Com. on
 prop. Res., 275 (i).
 Waterloo and Memphremagog Ry. Co.'s (B. 100, 1°*)
 515 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 504, 505 (i).

Labelle, Mr. J. B., Richelieu.

Marine School (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).
 Richelieu and Ont. Navigation Co.'s (B. 101, 1°*)
 515 (i).

Labelle, Mr. J. B.—Continued.

Sorel Harbor, Improvement in Management, Provision
 (B. 148, 1°*) 925 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Royal Military College) 757 (ii).

Labrosse, Mr. S., Prescott.

Prescott and Russell County Court (remarks) 1077 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com.,
 1259 (ii).
 Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on
 Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1259 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Cigars and Cigarettes, conc. in Ways and Means,
 439 (i).
 Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 666 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in
 Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 Colonisation Co.'s, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
 Creighton, Mr. J., Indian Agent, Saugeen, on M. for
 Ret., 314 (i).
 Debt, Public, Interest, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M.
 for 2°, 542 (i).
 ——— Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*)
 on M. to conc. in Amts., 1014 (ii).
 Dunn, J. R., before Bar of House (remarks) on Ques.
 of Order, 618 (ii).
 Fifteen Point, P.E.I., Breakwater (Ques.) 312 (ii).
 Fisheries Protection, Instructions (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
 Franchise Act, Costs of Voters' Lists (M. for Ret.) 15,
 16 (i).
 High Commissioner's Taxes, &c., in Com. of Sup., 652 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 77-79 (i).
 O'Donoghue, M. F., Claim of (remarks) on M. for Com.
 of Sup., 1077 (ii).
 Post Office at Corinth (Ques.) 320 (i).
 Queen's County, N.B., representation (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
 Returning Officers Expenses (remarks) 669 (ii).
 Sawdust in Rivers and Streams (Ques.) 257 (i).
 Settlement of N.W.T., encouragement of (Ques.)
 1002 (ii).
 Solicitor Genl., appointment of, B. 42 (Mr. *Thompson*)
 on M. for 1°, 191 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (High Commissioner's Taxes, &c.) 652 (ii); (Justice)
 612 (i).
Charges of Management (Debt, Public, Interest) 593 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 666 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 977 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir *John A. Mac-*
donald) on M. for 2°, 193 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 439 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N.B.

Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 665 (i).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on
 Res., 582 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A.—Continued.

- Dunn, J. R., examination, 636 (ii).
 Interest Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°) 443 (i).
 Lobster Fishery in N.S., on M. for copies of Cor., 317 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (explanation) to Mr. Speaker of Ruling, 1011 (ii).
 Penitentiaries, reorganisation of Salaries, in Com. on Res., 275 (i).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 170-173; (explanation) 176 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 623 (i).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1124 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Legislation : House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 665 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Cornwall Floods) 1190 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance, on Mr. Mitchell's explanation, 588 (i).

Langelier, Mr. C., Montmorency.

- Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ques.) 526 (i).
 Revising Officer for Montmorency (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Ste. Anne, schooner, Seizure (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 St. Charles Branch, Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
 St. François and Ste. Famille Wharves (Ques.) 21, 526 (i).
 Schooner owned by R. Lindsay and Fishery Protection (Ques.) 527 (i).
 Sheppard, E. E., and Toronto Magistrates' conduct (Ques.) 1199 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Railways—Capital : O. P. R. (construction) 829 (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language, attention of Speaker called to, 704 (ii).
 Voters' Lists for County of Montmorency (M. to lay on Table) 528 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., Centre Quebec.

- Electric Light, Montreal P.O., in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).
 I. C. R., River du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1174 (ii).
 ——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 158 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1125 (ii).
 Quebec River Police, appointment of Constables (Ques.) 543 (i).
 St. Charles Branch Ry. Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 830 (ii).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1122 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1266 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 1180 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Que.) 971 (ii).
Railways—Capital : C. B. Ry. (construction) 830. I. O. R. (River du Loup Branch) 1174; (St. Charles Branch) 1176 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.

- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 873, 880 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1075 (ii).
 Water Supply to Govt. Buildings, Que., in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).

Langevin, Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.

- Ascension Day, Adjmt. for (M.) 839 (ii).
 Ashcroft and Barkerville Telegraph Service (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
 Bracket Boards on Chisholm's Bay (Ans.) 659, 786 (ii).
 Brae Harbor, P.E.I., Dredging (Ans.) 321 (i).
 Blanche River, completion of Wharf (Ans.) 205 (i).
 Boilers in Parlt. Buildings, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 383.
 Cable to Pelee Island (Ans.) 786 (ii).
 Cap à la Corneille Booms (Ans.) 1001 (ii).
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 918 (ii).
 Canadian Horse Insurance Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. Small) in Com., 850 (ii).
 Chambly Canal, widening (Ans.) 142 (i).
 Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. B. 34 (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 479.
 Concurrence, 1269 (ii).
 Customs and P.O. Building in Picton (Ans.) 322 (i).
 Debates, Official, distribution to Municipalities (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
 Delahanty, Patrick, Claim for Injuries (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 Dep. Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s, on prop. M. to rescind Order of Standing Com., 298 (i).
 Dionne, Joseph, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 321 (i).
 Dipper Harbor Breakwater, construction (Ans.) 785 (ii).
 Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2°. 804 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 1°, 204 (i).
 Dredging Murray Harbor, P.E.I. (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 Electric Light, Montreal P.O., in Com. of Sup., 972 (ii).
 Esquimaux Graving Dock and Claim of McNamee & Co., on M. for Sp. Com., 527 (i).
 Examining Warehouse in Ottawa (Ans.) 45 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 982 (ii).
 Father Point, Harbor of Refuge (Ans.) 144 (i).
 Ferry Boats between Quebec and Lévis, &c. (Ans.) 258 (i).
 Fifteen Point, P.E.I., Breakwater, 312 (i).
 Fisheries, papers &c., re negotiations (remarks) 74 (i).
 Floods at Montreal and vicinity (Ans.) 101, 277 (i).
 Goderich and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3°, 533 (i).
 Gov. Genl.'s Warrants, 1873-86, on M. for Ret., 262, 264.
 Harbors and Breakwaters, Moneys voted by Parlt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1002 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 980, 1184, 1245 (ii).
 Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).

Langevin, Sir H. L.—Continued.

- I. C. R., dismissal of Officials, on M. for Ret., 22 (i).
 ——— Tender for Station at Cap St. Ignace, on M. for Stmnt., 377 (i).
 Kamouraska Wharf (Ans.) 101, 526 (i).
 Kentville, N.S., Public Buildings (Ans.) 101 (i).
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. 26 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 926.
 Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 ——— on M. to conc. in Repts. of Com., 1249 (ii).
 Longueuil, construction of Wharves (Ans.) 16, 142 (i).
 Lunenburg Public Building (Ans.) 154 (i).
 ——— amount paid for Site (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 ——— grant for same (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 Matane, Wharf repairs (Ans.) 205 (i).
 McGrath, H. J., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 527 (i).
 Miminegash, P.E.I., Breakwater, repairs (Ans.) 371 (i).
 Model Bill *re* Rules on Private Bills, 1272 (ii).
 Montmagny, P. O. in Town (Ans.) 45; on M. for Ret., 152 (i).
 Monteith, John, Relief B. 144 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for 2°, 926 (ii).
 Neguac Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
 Noel, Marie Louise, Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 1°, 804 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (prop. Res.) 273 (i).
 Painting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, amounts paid, on M. for Stmnt., 144 (i).
 Penetanguishene Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 1004.
 Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Port Arthur Harbor, &c., in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).
 P. E. I. Piers, condition of (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 ——— public Wharf, Repts. as to state (Ans.) 257 (i).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (objection taken to conc.) 1156 (ii).
 Private Bills, reception of Rep. from Com., on M. to extend time, 515 (ii).
 ——— Rules respecting (M.) Sp. Com. to revise, 638 (i).
 ——— M. to conc. in Rep. of Sp. Com., 1115, 1270 (ii).
 ——— M. to suspend Rule 60 respecting posting, 862 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Order for Res. (remarks) 788 (ii).
 Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
 ——— Liabilities for (Ans.) 14 (i).
 Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 258 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 158 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., 1031; in Com., 1032, 1125 (ii).
 Red Point Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 786 (ii).
 Rideau River Floods (Ans.) 15 (i).
 Rimouski River Improvements (Ans.) 205 (i).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).
 St. Andrew's Rapids, Red River Improvements (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 1002.

Langevin, Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Ste. Cécile du Bic Wharf (Ans.) 526 (i).
 St. François and Ste. Famille Wharves (Ans.) 21, 526 (i).
 St. Jérôme de Matane Wharf, amount expended, on M. for Stmnt., 788 (ii).
 St. John and Iberville Manufacturing Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Coursoi*) on M. for 2°, 875 (ii).
 St. Mary's and Sturgeon Bay Wharves (Ans.), 143 (i).
 St. Roch and St. Louise Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1183 (ii).
 Select Standing Com.'s, on M. to conc. in Lists, 18 (i).
 Senate, in Com. of Sup., 1238 (ii).
 Short Line Ry., Materials used in construction (Ans.) 383 (i).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 982 (ii).
Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 1180 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) conc., 1269. Senate (salaries) 1238. Miscellaneous (Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 1247. Library of Parl., 1165 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (additional Block, Ottawa) 916; (Farquhar & Co., settlement of claim) 1242. Harbors and Rivers (Ope Tormentine Harbor) 918; (Port Arthur Harbor) 918. *Income: Buildings* (B. C.) 977; (N. B.) 971; (N. W. T.) 977, 1245; (Ont.) 975, 1183, 1243; (Que.) 924, 971, 1183, 1242. Dredging, 980. Harbors and Rivers (B. C.) 980; (Man.) 980; (N. B.) 979; (N. S.) 978, 1245; (Ont.) 980, 1184; (Que.) 930, 1184. Miscellaneous, 982, 1185. Repairs, Furniture, &c., 978; conc., 1269. Roads and Bridges, 1185. Slides and Booms, 1246. Telegraphs, 932; (B. C.) 1114 (ii).
 Telegraphic Signal Service, B.C. (Ans.) 102 (i).
 Toronto Harbor Improvements, on M. for Ret., 793 (ii).
 Trent River Booms and Piers, repairs (Ans.) 708 (ii).
 Ventilation of House of Com., on M. for Cor., 787 (ii).
 Water Supply to Govt. Buildings, Que., in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).
 Wellington Harbor of Refuge, on M. for Ret., 369 (i).
 Westpoint, P.E.I., Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 21 (i).
 White Mud River, Man., Improvements (Ans.) 102 (i).
 York Village Public Works (Ans.) 1005 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Address to Her Majesty (seconded) 783 (ii).
 Briton Medical and General Life Association, policy-holders Claims (Ques.) 786 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 344 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1219 (ii).
 Flour, Inspection of, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 143 (i).
 Franchise Act, on Res. to Repeal, Order called, 364 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1224 (ii).
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 1116 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 74-77 (i).
 Lavolette, Godefroi, allowance to, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Thompson*) 111 (i); in Com. on Res., 806 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Libel, Imprisonment for (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1234 (ii).
 N. W. T. Council B. 163 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 1076 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mills*) re Amt. on Prohibition, on Mr. Speaker's ruling, 949 (ii).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) 949 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 158 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 952; on M. for Com. on Res., 1031; in Com., 1032 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 620 (ii).
 Revising Officers' salaries (Ques.) 21 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 659.
 South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. *Hall*) objection taken to 2°, 369 (i).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1124 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 659 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 972, 1242. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 980 (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language (remarks) on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 704 (ii).
 Vote on M. to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel re Queen's Election, 624 (i).

Laverne, Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.

- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 940 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

- Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 751 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 338 (i).
 Coal Oil, Importation in Bulk, in Com. on B. 107, 1145, 1148 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 32 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 449 (i).
 Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 930 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 700 (ii).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 180 (i).
 Slides on the Mattawa River, Contracts (M. for Ret.)* 803 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 751 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Port Arthur Harbor) 917. *Income*: Buildings, (N. S.) 920; (Ont.) 1244. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1246 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.

- Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 705 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 449 (i).

Lovitt, Mr. J., Yarmouth.

SUPPLY:

- Collection of Revenues* (Customs, steam launches) 1195 (ii).
Indians (N.S.) 1186 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 990 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., Carleton, Ont., and Kingston.

- Address to Her Majesty (prop. M. to consider) 706; (M.) 782; conc. in, 784 (ii).
 — The, 11; M. for Com. to draft, 13 (i).
 — His Ex.'s reply (presented) 153 (i).
 Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
 Agriculture and Colonisation Com., on M. to increase quorum, 154 (i).
 Agriculture, Dept. of, Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 590 (i).
 Adjunt, Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 300, 319; (M.) 320 (i).
 Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 233, 245 (i).
 Bélanger and Caron, dismissal (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 Blue Books and Depl. Reps., Distribution of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to suspend Rule, 296 (i).
 Budget, The (remarks) 300 (i).
 Business of the House (remarks) 100 (i).
 — M. to take in Thursdays, 479 (i).
 — M. to take in Wednesdays, 953 (ii).
 — M. to take in Mondays, 1116 (ii).
 — M. to take in Saturdays, 804, 1076 (ii).
 Campbell, Mr., late, M. P. for Digby, decease of (remarks) 543 (i).
 Campbell, Mr., late, M. P. for South Renfrew, decease of (remarks) 1006.
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) on M. for 1°, 442 (i).
 C. P. R., Onderdonk Contract in B. C. (Ans.) 1003 (ii).
 — Sale of Lands by Co., on M. for Ret., 222 (i).
 Canadian workmen in the U. S. (Ans.) 1046 (ii).
 Chairman of Coms., &c. (remarks) 320 (i).
 Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 642 (ii).
 Chouinard, D., payment of Award of Arbitrators (Ans.) 1006 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers (Ans.) 205; (remarks) 300 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. of Clerk of Crown to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 324; (Amt.) 325; agreed to (Y. 104, N. 74) 359 (i).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1270 (ii).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Creighton, Mr. J., on M. for Ret., 314; authority on procedure quoted, 316 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. reorganisation (B. 41, 1°) 190; 2° m., 884; prop. Res., 953; in Com. on B., 1029 (ii).
- Customs Laws, Changes (Ans.) 954 (ii).
- Deptl. Reps., distribution, on prop. M. to change Rule, 145 (i).
- Dep. Speaker, &c., on prop. M. to rescind Order of Standing Com., 297 (i).
- (M.) to appoint Mr. C. C. Colby, 370 (i).
- Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters (remarks) 370 (i).
- on Order for Com., 150 (i).
- on M. to make first Order of the day, 384, 480.
- on M. for Com. on Res., 576-579 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°) 590; 2°, 884 (ii).
- Dunn, J. R., examination (remarks) 624, 630 (ii).
- Durantaye Senatorship, applicants for (Ans.) 708.
- Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for production of papers, 25; (remarks) 32, 45 (i).
- Finance and Treasury Board Act Amt. (B. 93, 1°) 442 (i); 2°, 884 (ii).
- Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup., 1191 (ii).
- Fisheries, papers, &c., *re* negotiations, 19, 99 (i).
- Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1086 (ii).
- additional Cruisers (Ans.) 382 (i).
- Giasson, *Poléon*, dismissal (Ans.) 364 (i).
- Govt. Officials in Northumberland, N.B., removal of (Ans.) 321 (i).
- Gov. Gen.'s residence in Ottawa (Ans.) 154 (i).
- Warrants, 1873-1886, on M. for Ret., 265 (i).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 590 (i); in Com., 1227 (ii).
- Repeal (Ans.) 205 (i).
- On Order being called, 364 (i).
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1030 (ii).
- Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s B. 71 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 444 (i).
- B. 156 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. to suspend Rules, 1028 (ii).
- High Commissioner, Acting (Ans.) 45 (i).
- Resignation (remarks) 615 (i), 805 (ii).
- Home Rule for Ireland (Ms.) to make Res. first Order of the day, 110 (i).
- on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 132-135; (explanation) 140 (i).
- House of Commons, Ventilation, on M. for Cor., 787 (i).
- Hudspeth, Mr., Election of (remarks) 44 (i).
- Imperial, Naval and Military Officers, employed by Colonial Govts., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 144 (i).
- Imperial Trusts Co. B. 15 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 3°, 638 (ii).
- Indian Act Amt. (B. 160, 1°*) 1033; in Com., 1228.
- Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
- Indians, Caughnawaga Reserve, Survey (Ans.) 1006.
- Annuities under Robinson Treaty, in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).
- Chippewa's, Annuity (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
- Chippewa's Arrears due, on M. for Ret., 382 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Indians, Christian Island, compensation for Penetanguishene Purchase (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
- Christian Island, compensation for Timber cut on Lands (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
- File Hill Reserve, Vaccination, on M. for Ret. 379 (i).
- Indemnity to Caughnawaga's by C. P. R. Co. (Ans.) 1200 (ii).
- Lands, Sales in Ont. (Ans.) 1005 (ii).
- N.W.T., Expenses of visit East, 1110 (ii).
- School at Qu'Appelle, Medical Attendant, on M. for Ret., 379 (i).
- Six Nation, Claim to Land on Grand River, on M. for Sp. Com., 207 (i).
- under Robinson Treaty (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
- Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 287 (i).
- I. C. R., Notre Dame de Sacré Cœur Station (Ans.) 1002 (ii).
- proposals to Purchase (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
- Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 13 (i).
- "Jamaica" Pullman Car expenses, on M. for Ret., 314 (i).
- Kennebec Senatorship, applicants for (Ans.) 708 (ii).
- Labor Commission (remarks) 1273 (ii).
- Liquor Permits in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 527 (i).
- Main Ducks and Walpole Islands, Lease of, on M. for Ret., 369 (i).
- Merritt, Lieut. W. H., on M. for Cor., &c., 788 (ii).
- Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 13, 144, 153 (i).
- Midland Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Hudspeth*) on M. for 2°, 444 (i).
- Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 750 (ii).
- Moffatt, Mr., late M.P. for Restigouche, decease of, (remarks) 111 (i).
- Morin, Dr. J., Claim (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
- Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 784 (ii).
- Mounted Police Pensions (Ans.) 16 (i).
- Newcastle, Duke of, presentation of Bust by Sir Edward Watkins (remarks) 1273 (ii).
- N. W. T. Council (B. 163, 1°) 1075; 2° m., 1233 (ii).
- Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 3 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) Independence of Members, 1011 (ii).
- *re* Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) to Res. on Prohibition, 852 (ii).
- Pacific Mail Service (Ans.) 278 (i).
- Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
- Penitentiaries, Rep. respecting (presented) 15 (i).
- Pinette, P.E.I., Harbor, Dredging (remark) on M. for copies of Cor., 146 (i).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
- Irregularities in N.B., in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Prescott and Russell County Courts (remarks) 1077 (ii).
 Printing Com.'s Repts., on Ms. to conc., 839, 952, 1198 (ii).
 Privileges and Elections, Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 361.
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Shakespeare) 224 (i); (Mr. Kenny) 785 (ii).
 Prohibition, Govt. Policy (Ans.) 951 (ii).
 Prorogation (Ans.) 804 (ii).
 Public Bills, Rules respecting, on M. for Com. to define practice, 668 (ii).
 Public Officers Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. McLelan) in Com., 225 (i).
 Public Morals Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 278 (i).
 Queen's County, N.B., representation (Ans.) 1002 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. for Clerk of Crown to attend House with Returns, &c., 4 (i).
 — on M. to read papers, 4 (i).
 — on M. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) for returning officer to transmit papers, 5 (i).
 — payment of Costs and Expenses of Contest (Ans.) 206 (i).
 — on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (remarks) 319 (i).
 — on ruling of Mr. Speaker (remarks) 704 (ii).
 — on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 617; on Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 618, 622 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 640 (ii).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 367 (i).
 Representation Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Thompson) on M. to introd., 840 (ii).
 Resignation of Lieut. Governor of Que. (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1188 (ii).
 St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Skinner) on M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 707 (ii).
 Salt in Barrels, Weight (Ans.) 205 (i).
 Savings Banks, N. B., &c., in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
 Select Standing Committees (M.) 4 (i).
 — M. to substitute name of Mr. Mills for Mr. Blake, 6 (i).
 — Lists reported, 13 (i).
 — M. to conc. in Rep. of Lists, 17 (i).
 — Ms. to add names, 74, 154 (i).
 — Mr. G. Moffat's name substituted for Mr. R. Moffat, 668 (ii).
 Senate Representation for N. W. T. (B. 17, 1°) 74; 2° m., 197; in Com., 257, 302 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 640 (ii).
 Sittings of the House, on suggested change of time, (remarks) 1271 (ii).
 Speaker, Election of (M.) 1 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1251 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Subway to P. E. I. (Ans.) 101 (i).
 — Letter to Senator Howlan (Ans.) 527 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon) 1179 (ii).
Charges of Management (Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., &c.) 592 (Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) 1237 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1196; (Public Works, Agent, &c., B.C.) 1114 (ii).
Dom. Lands—Capital: Surveys (Ont. and Que.) conc., 1270 (ii)
Fisheries (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1086 (ii).
Indians (Annuities, Robinson Treaty) 1093; (B. C.) 1094, 1186; (Man.) 1186; (N.W.T.) 1102, 1186; (N. S.) 1094, 1186; (Ont. and Que.) 1186 (ii).
Legislation: Elections, 1240. Franchise Act, conc., 1270 (ii).
Militia (Military Branch and District Staff) 750 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1113; (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Duncomb, Mr., Claim) 1248; (Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties) 1191; (Govt. in N. W. T.) 1112; (Preparation of Returns) 1112; (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law costs) 1187; (Saving Bank Funds) 1189 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1111 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 1111 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 874 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce, Dept. of (B. 7, 1°) 20; prop. Res. (Minister's Salary) 191; 2° m., 192; M. for Com., 862; in Com., 867, 872, 890; in Com. on Res., 884 (ii).
 Unforeseen Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1111 (ii).
 Vote on allowing Counsel to J. R. Dunn *re* Queen's Election (remarks) 624 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance, on Mr. Mitchell's explanation, 588 (i).
 Voters Lists, revision (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 650 (ii).
 Western Counties Ry. Agreement, on prop. Res., 591 (i).
 Winter Service, P. E. I., and *Northern Light*, on M. for Ret., 534 (i).
 Valutors services, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 328 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 108 (i).
 National Policy, in Com. on B. 107, 1214 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 855 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 623 (ii).

MacDowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 903 (ii).
 N. W. Central Ry., construction (Ques.) 1198 (ii).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 147, 1°) 924 (ii).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.

Dunn, J. R., examination (remarks) 624 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 168
 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1156 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 445 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.

Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135, on M. for Com., 1137; on M.
 for 3° (Amt.) 1141; neg. (Y. 35, N. 85) 1141 (ii).
 Can. Joint Stock Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°) 111 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act. Amt. (B. 68, 1°) 319 (i).
 Collingwood General and Marine Hospital incorp. (B.
 14, 1°*) 74 (i).
 Companies' Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°) 111 (i); in Com.,
 1143 (ii).
 Crown Securities Act Amt. (B. 51, 1°) 277 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir John A. Macdonald)
 in Com., 884 (ii).
 Dunn, J. R., examination, 631 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 92;
 (Amt.) 98; (explanations) 122, 137; Amt. neg.
 (Y. 49, N. 103) 126 (i).
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*)
 111 (i).
 O'Donoghue, M. F., Letter read, 1080 (ii).
 Private Bills, Rules respecting (M. to adjn. deb.)
 1116 (ii).
 Public Bills, Rules respecting, on M. for Com. to define
 practice, 668 (ii).
 Queen's, N. B., Election (remarks) on Rep. of Com.
 on Privileges and Elections, 319 (i).
 Ry. Employés Protection (B. 112, 1°) 589 (i).
 Rolling Stock, C. P. R. (B. C.) Valuation, on M. for
 Com. of Sup., 1047 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr.
 Thompson) in Com., 877, 880 (ii).
 Western Can. Loan and Saving Co.'s (B. 123, 1°*)
 782 (ii).

McCulla, Mr. W. A., Peel.

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 725 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., Victoria, N. S.

Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref.
 Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 183 (i).

McDougald, Mr. J., Pictou.

Iron Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1209 (ii).
 ——— conc. in *Ways and Means*, 499 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.

Ry. construction in Cape Breton, on M. for Ret., 793 (ii)

SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 1061 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. O. R. (Rolling Stock) 828 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.

Winter Service, P.E.I., and *Northern Light*, on M. for
 Ret., 531 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., Hamilton.

Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act
 Amt. (B. 38, 1°*) 190 (i).
 Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*,
 515 (i).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 163 (Mr. Thompson) on M.
 for 2°, 1229 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 515 (i).

McKeen, Mr. D., Cape Breton.

Iron Industries, in deb. on *Ways and Means*, 468-470 (i).
 Ry. construction in Cape Breton, on M. for Ret., 797 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 463 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester.

Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
 Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ans.) 526 (i).
 Iron Drawbacks, in deb. on *Ways and Means*, 470 (i).
 Laberge, A., Postmaster, charges against (Ans.)
 1003 (ii).
 Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 13; distribution,
 668 (ii).
 ——— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i); 654, 1135 (ii).
 Post Office at Alexandre, complaint against Postmaster,
 (Ans.) 526 (i).
 ——— Beauharnois Post Office, Investigation (Ans.)
 786 (ii).
 ——— C. P. R., sums paid for postal service, 1273 (ii).
 ——— Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
 ——— Corinth Post Office (Ans.) 320 (i).
 ——— De Blois Postal Service (Ans.) 1004 (ii).
 ——— Inspector for Que., appointment (Ans.) 383 (i).
 ——— Mail Contracts in Lévis County (Ans.) 45 (i).
 ——— Milford, Postmaster appointment (Ans.) 322 (i).
 ——— Pickering, Ont., Postmaster (Ans.) 277 (i).
 ——— Registered Letters, loss at Beauharnois (Ans.)
 670 (ii).
 Public Officers Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°*) 20; 2° m., 195; in
 Com., 225 (i).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for
 Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).
 Savings Banks, N. B., &c., in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
 Sugar, in deb. on *Ways and Means*, 471 (i).
 Supplies to Str. *Lansdowne*, in Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Savings Banks, N. B., N. S., &c.) 592 (i).
Civil Govt. (Postmaster Gen.'s Dept.) 614 (i); contingencies,
 654; (Finance Dept.) contingencies, 654 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1135 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, &c.) 1063 (ii).
 Uphill and Victoria Road Postal Service (Ans.) 364.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 470-472 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.

Agricultural Machines, conc. in *Ways and Means*,
 497 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 725 (ii).
 National Policy, in Com. on B. 107, 1312 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J.—Continued.

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 936; (explanation) 939 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 725 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 497 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

Agricultural Machines, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 481 (i).

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 236 (i).

Bergin, Surgeon Gen., in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).

C. P. R., B. C. section, in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).

Canal Officers salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).

Civil Servants extra pay, in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1181 (ii).
—— and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 667 (ii).

—— Staff, names and addresses, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 383 (i).

—— Vacancies, Superannuations and Appointments (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).

Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 331 (i).

—— salary, in Com. of Sup., 603 (i), 1159 (ii).

Coal Oil, Importation in Bulk, in Com. on B. 107, 1146, 1149 (ii).

Colonial Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).

Cotton Sewing Thread, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 427 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1146, 1149 (ii).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1132 (ii).

Debt, Public, Interest, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).

Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).

Earthenware, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 433 (i).

Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 41 (i).

Electric Light, Montreal P.O., in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 723 (ii).

Export of Spirits and Imported Corn (Ques.) 143 (i).

Fabrics, Cotton, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 428 (i).

Financial Inspector, Can., in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).

Fish and Fish Oil, refunds, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).

Franchise Act, expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2^o, 1226 (ii).

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1886, on M. for Ret., 282 (i).

High Commissioner, Taxes, &c., in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 89-91 (i).

I. C. R., Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup., 780 (ii).

—— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 780 (ii).

—— Indiantown Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1175 (ii).

—— Pictou Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1174 (ii).

—— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 826, 1177 (ii).

—— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).

Lavolette, Godofroi, allowance B. 138 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 889 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

Mortgages, payment of (prop. M. to introd. B.) 111; 1^o, 142 (i).

Oil Cloth, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 434 (i).

Order, (Ques. of) digression from deb., 486 (i).

Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1181 (ii).

Postmaster Genl.'s Rep., distribution (Ques.) 668 (ii).

Preventive Officers on Frontier, appointment (M. for Ret.*) 223 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Kenny) *re* Rep. of Official Debs., 785 (ii).

Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 603 (i), 1159 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 933 (ii).

Returning Officers' Expenses (Ques.) 669 (ii).

Rideau Hall, Expenditure on, in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).

Rolling Stock, C. P. R. (B. C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1053 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).

Salt, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 435, 439 (i).

Savings Banks in N. B., &c., in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).

Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1122 (ii).

—— Revised, distribution to Justices (Ques.) 668 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1250 (ii).

Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).

Supplies to Indians of N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 1109 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial Exhibition) 1169; (Experimental Farms) 723 (ii).

Charges of Management (Auditor and Receiver Gen., Winnipeg) 591; (Debt, Public, Interest) 593; (Financial Inspector, Can.) 596; (Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., &c.) 592 (i).

Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 1181 (ii).

Civil Govt. (High Commissioner's Taxes, &c) 651 (ii); (Privy Council) 603 (i), 1159 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (salaries) 1113; Customs, 1132; Dom. Lands, 1197 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 731 (ii).

Indians (N.W.T.) 1109 (ii).

Legislation: Franchise Act (expenses) 1196. House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 667. Senate, 1238 (ii).

Militia (Bergin, Surgeon Gen.) 1240; (Campbell, C., payment to) 1170 (ii).

Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.) 1187 (ii).

Penitentiaries (salaries) 1237 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 977; (Ont.) 976, 1183, 1243; (Que.) 973. Repairs, &c., 978 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R., 1171. I.C.R. (Halifax Extension) 780; (Indiantown Branch) 1175; (Pictou Branch) 1174; (Rolling Stock) 826, 1177 (ii).

Territorial Accounts (1886-87) 1198 (ii).

Toronto Harbor Improvements (M. for Ret.) 797 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 427, 433, 450, 481, 486.

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

Agriculture and Colonisation Com., on M. to increase quorum, 153 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—Continued.

Civil Service Act Amt., prop. introduction of B., 413 ;
— (B. 49, 1°) 442 (i).

— Promotion Examinations (Ques.) 1199 (ii).

Customs Fines and Seizures, in Com. of Sup., 1135 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in
Com., 914 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 52 ;
(Amt.) 55 ; (explanation) 64 ; Amt. neg. (Y. 56, N.
133) 137 (i).

House of Coms. Ventilation, on M. for Cor., 788 (ii).

Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) on M. for 2° of B. 17, 200 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr.
Jamieson) 934 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Imperial Institute) 729 (i).

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1135 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., North Ontario.

Cattle, diseased, Importation (Ques.) 204 (i).

Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in
Com. of Sup., 605 (i).

Debt, Public, and recent Elections, in deb. on Ways and
Means, 481-483 (i).

Election Ret., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for
Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 29 ; (explanation)
32 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 605 (ii).

Militia (Military Branch and District Staff) 751 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 481-483 (i).

Mallory, Mr. A. E., East Northumberland, Ont.

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in
Com., 237 (i).

Bracket Boards on Chisholm's Bay (Ques.) 669, 786 (ii).

Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on
M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref., Ret. to Com. on Privileges
and Elections, 329 (i).

— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 607 (i).

Cobourg, Blairton and Marmorata Ry. Co.'s B. 19 (Mr.
Gullet) on M. for 2°, 601 (i).

Cod Liver Oil Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1071 (ii).

Colonisation Companies, amounts paid (Ques.) 786 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Mac-*
donald) in Com., 887 (ii).

Flasks, Phials, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 433 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*)
on M. for 2°, 1226 (ii).

Fish Fry deposits in Streams, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).

Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (ii).

Iron Industries, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).

Iron, bar, rolled, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 500 (i).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).

Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).

Picks, Mattocks, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).

Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).

Mallory, Mr. A. E.—Continued.

Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 607 (i).

Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 436 (i).

Skates, conc. in Ways and Means, 507 (i).

Slates, School, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 439 (i).

Stovenson, Mr. R., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 669 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Carillon) 1179 ; (Murray) 832. *Income* (St.
Peter's) 1180 (ii).

Charges of Management (Printing Dom. Notes) 596 (i).

Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 607 (i).

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1070 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (France and Quebec) 987 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 977 (ii).

Trent River, Booms and Piers, repairs (Ques.) 708 (ii).

Valuators services, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 433 436, 439, 500, 507 (i).

Wire, Steel Spring, conc. in Ways and Means 501 (i).

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

C.P.R. Rates in B.C. (Ques.) 320 (i).

Dom. Oil Pipe Line Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. (B.
96, 1°*) 479 (i).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in
Com., 1257 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (County Court Judges) 657 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 728 (ii).

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1071 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 1097 (ii).

Upper Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 49, 1°*) 223 ;
2° m., 320 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

Grange Trust, Limited (B. 39, 1°*) 190 (i).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and
Means, 511 (i).

National Policy, in Com. on B. 107, 1205 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res.
(Mr. *Jamieson*) 932 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 511 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

Agriculture, Dept. of, Act Amt. B. 116 (Sir *John A.*
Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 590 (ii).

Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°,
1027 ; in Com., 1139 ; on M. for 3°, 1221 (ii).

Axes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).

Ballot Box Patents, on M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com.
to examine, 786 (ii).

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M.
for 2°, 196 ; in Com., 234 (i).

Bedson, Mr., complaints against, in Com. of Sup., 659,
1237 (ii).

Bremner, Charles, Furs seized from, in Com. of Sup.,
1237 (ii).

Business of the House, on M. to take in Thursdays,
479 ; (remarks) 804 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Business of the House, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 953.
 Can. Horse Ins. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *Small*) in Com., 850 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 40 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on M. for 1°, 190 (i).
 ——— B. 91 (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) on M. for 1°, 442 (i).
 ——— Violations of (remarks) on M. for adjmt., 1115 (ii).
 C. P. R., B. C. section, 1173; in Com. of Sup., 766 (ii).
 Valuators services, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 642 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown and Returning Officers, Ms. to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 299, 322; (remarks) 337; on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) 343 (ii).
 ——— salary, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i), 1159 (ii).
 ——— gazetting Members (Ques.) 205 (i).
 Collars, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 445.
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1166.
 Commercial relations with France (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 822 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1266 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).
 Cotton Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 429 (i).
 Counterfeit and Imitation Notes B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 808 (ii).
 Creighton, Mr. J., Indian Agent at Saugeen, on M. for Ret., 314 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1217 (ii).
 Customs and Inland Rev. Depts., reorganisation B. 41 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 190 (i); in Com., 1029 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1144 (ii).
 Debates, Official Rep. (remarks) re Rep. of Com., 1155.
 Defences of Can., in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
 Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 708; in Com., 810 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 541 (i).
 ——— B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 885 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 898, 900, 912 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 Dunn, J. R., examination, 632 (ii).
 Elections, General, 1887, Votes polled (M. for Stmt.)* 110 (i).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of (M.) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 23; (reply) 43 (i).
 ——— 1874, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
 ——— on production of papers (M. to read) 45 (i).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock and Claim of McNamee & Co., on M. for Sp. Com., 527 (i).
 Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 595 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Finance Dept. and Treasury Board B. 93 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 442 (i).
 Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup., 1193 (ii).
 Fisheries, Deptl. Rep., distribution (remarks) 805 (ii).
 ——— Protection, in Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Amt. Act B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 589 (i); on M. for 2°, 1222; in Com., 1227 (ii).
 ——— Cost of Voters' Lists, on M. for Ret., 16 (i).
 ——— Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1029 (ii).
 Free List, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1876, on M. for Ret., 266 (i).
 ——— 1886-87, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 294 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
 Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 High Commissioner's Commission, papers respecting (Ques.) 708 (ii).
 ——— Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).
 ——— Resignation (M. for Ret.) 376; (remarks) 615 (i), 805 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 114-120; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 135; (explanation) 139 (i).
 Homesteads cancelled (Ques.) 784 (ii).
 ——— in Ry. Belts (Ques.) 670 (ii).
 House of Coms., salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).
 Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 728 (ii).
 Imperial Trusts Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 637.
 Indian Act Amt. B. 160 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1228 (ii).
 Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 1237 (ii).
 Inland Rev. Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
 Insane Asylum, Man., in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
 I. C. R. (accommodation at St. John) in Com. of Sup., 1174 (ii).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 825, 1177 (ii).
 ——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 Windsor and Annapolis Ry., Legal expenses, in Com., of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Iron Drawbacks, in deb. on Ways and Means, 473 (i).
 Iron Industries, conc. in Ways and Means, 501 (i).
 Justice and Fisheries Depts., in Com. of Sup., 1237 (ii).
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp Act Amt. B. 26 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 926 (ii).
 Labels for Fruit, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
 Libel, Imprisonment for (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1234 (ii).
 Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 Locomotives, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 504 (i).
 Locomotive Tires, conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Maccaroni, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).
 McLean, T. A., indemnity, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 Malleable Iron Castings, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 503 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 168 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1158 (ii).
 National Policy, in Com. on B. 107, 1217 (ii).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 809 (ii).
 ——— Council B. 163 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 1076; on M. for 3°, 1233 (ii).
 ——— Expenses of Govt., in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 N. S. Permanent Building Society's B. 131 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1142 (ii).
 Oil Cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 Oranges and Lemons, conc. in Ways and Means, 460
 Order, Ques. of, re Independence of Members, 1010 (ii).
 ——— re Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Cargill) to Res. on Prohibition, 852 (ii).
 ——— re Amt. (Mr. Sproule) relevancy of (Ques.) 949.
 ——— Mr. Speaker's attention called to B. to repeal Can. Temp. Act, being on Order paper, 858 (ii).
 ——— digression from deb. (remarks) 486 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I.C.R., B. 77 (Mr. Pope) on M. for 2°, 649 (ii).
 Paper Manufactures, in Com. on Ways and Means, 517, 519, 520, 522 (i).
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Thompson) 2°, 641.
 Penitentiaries, reorganisation of Salaries B. 65 (Mr. Thompson) in Com. on prop. Res., 275 (i).
 Pension Fund Societies B. 52 (Mr. Hall) in Com., 1152.
 Picks, Mattocks, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. Bryson) in Com., 1090 (ii).
 Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).
 P. O. Irregularities in N. B., in Com. of Sup., 1189.
 P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Printing Com.'s Reps., on M. to conc. in 3rd and 4th Reps., 952 (ii).
 Prisoners, Release of, on prop. Res. to exercise Executive clemency, 801 (ii).
 Private Bills, reception of Reps. from Com., on M. to extend time, 515 (i).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i), 1159 (ii).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 644 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (ii).
 Prohibition, Govt. policy (Ques.) 951 (ii).
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 160 (i).
 ——— on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (remarks) 319 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Queen's, N.B., Election, on Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections (remarks) 369 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 617 (ii).
 Red Wood, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 Representation Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Thompson) on M. to introd., 839 (ii). See "Senate."
 Revising Barristers' Clerks salaries (remarks) 371 (i).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1056 (ii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 758 (ii).
 St. Charles Branch Ry. Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
 St. Gabriel Levee Ry. Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Curran) in Com., 538 (i).
 Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 436 (i).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 Select Standing Com.'s, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Lists, 18 (i).
 Senate Representation for N. W. T. B. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 197; in Com., 301; on M. to conc. in Amts., 641 (i).
 Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 512 (i).
 Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 450.
 Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 463 (i).
 Sittings of the Hse. (suggested change of time) 1270.
 Six Nation Indians, Claim to Lands on Grand River, on M. for Sp. Com., 208 (i).
 Skates, conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
 South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Tisdale) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1122 (ii).
 Statutes Revised, distribution of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 1°, 1033 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com. on Res., 1118 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com. on Res., 1255; in Com. on B., 1266 (ii).
 Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).
Charges of Management (Financial Commissioner, Eng.) 595 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 1164; (High Commissioner's Taxes) 652; contingencies, 651; (Geological Survey) 1162; (Inland Revenue) 1163; (Indian Affairs) 1237; (Justice and Fisheries) 1237; (Privy Council) 597, 1159, conc., 1266; (Sec. of State's Dept.) 1162 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Janals (salaries, &c.) 1114. Dom' Lands, 1197. Liquor License Act, 1197 (ii).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1071 (ii).
Indians (Annuities, Robinson Treaty) 1093; (B. C.) 1095; (N. W. T.) 1106; (N.S.) 1094 (ii).
Legislation: Franchise Act (expenses) 1165. House of Commons (salaries) 1164. Library of Parliament, 1165 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance and Repairs) 1067 (ii).
Militia (Campbell, C., payment to) 1171; (Military College) 758 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Miscellaneous (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties) 1193; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1112; (McLean, T. A., indemnity) 1187; (Man. Insane Asylum) 1247; (Revised Statutes) 1247; (Savings Banks Funds) 1189; (Statutes, consolidation) 1190, (ii).

Penitentiaries (Man.) 659, 1237 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Port Arthur Harbor) 917. *Incoms*: Buildings (N. S.) 920; (Ont) 977, 1184, 1244. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1246; (Que.) 1184. *Miscellaneous*, 982. Telegraphs, 982 (ii).

Quarantine, 1170 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (B.O.) 766. C.B. Ry. (construction) 829. I.C.R. (Halifax Extension) 1174; (Law Costs) 1178; (Rolling Stock) 826, 1177; (St. Charles Branch) 1176. P.E.I. Ry., 1178 (ii).

Superannuation (gratuity to C. S. Neville) 1170 (ii).

Territorial Accounts (1886-87) 1197; (1887-88) 1248 (ii).

Unforeseen Expenses, 1111 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 1°, 525 (i); in Com., 873, 877 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 192 (i); on M. for Com., 865; in Com., 869 (ii).

Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1155 (ii).

Trunks, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).

Unparliamentary expression (wthdn.) 66 (i); Mr. Speaker's attention drawn to, 618 (ii).

Voters Lists, Revision (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 649 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 429, 436, 445, 446, 450, 460, 462, 473, 486, 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 505, 506, 507, 512 (i), 964-966 (ii).

Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Agreement, on prop. Res., 591 (i).

Williams, barge, payment to Owners, in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).

Woollen Goods, in Com. on Ways and Means, 522 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.

N.S. Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for Cor., 215 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 939 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1072 (ii).

Militia (Military Properties, care of) 764 (ii).

Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Agreement (B. 117, 1°*) 638 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.

Anticosti Island, in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).

Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. Small) in Com., 1138; on M. for 3°, 1141 (ii).

Baird, Col. W. T., gratuity, in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).

Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) on M. for 2°, 195; on M. for Com., 226; in Com., 230, 239 (i).

Banff Springs Reservation, in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).

Bank Circulation, Security for (Ques.) 205 (i).

Behring's Sea, papers respecting (Ques. and remarks) 455 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

Behring's Sea, Seizure of British Vessels (Ques.) 21 (i).

Butter, Duty and Inspection (remarks) 154 (i).

C.P.R., B.C. Section, in Com. of Sup., 1172 (ii).

Coal Oil Importation in Bulk, in Com. on B. 107, 1144, 1147 (ii).

Collars, Cotton or Linen, conc. on Ways and Means, 446 (i).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1169.

Corn-meal, conc. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).

Cornwall Floods, in Com of Sup., 1190 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1144, 1147; on M. for 3°, 1218 (ii).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).

— Regulations respecting Baggage (Ques.) 101 (i).

County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 655 (ii).

Dalton, Wm., Services on Lightship (Ques.) 1200; (remarks) 1249 (ii).

Dep. Speaker and Chairman of Com.'s, on M. to appoint Mr. C. C. Colby, 371 (i).

Division on Queen's, N.B., Election (remarks) 702 (ii).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. Thompson) on M. to introd., 708 (ii).

— Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 542 (i).

Dunn, J. R., examination, 629 (ii).

Election Rets. of 1874, on M. for Ret., 210 (i).

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 723, 982 (ii).

Ferro-manganese, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 488.

Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 456.

Finance Dept. and Treasury Board Act Amt. B. 93 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 442 (i).

Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 594.

Fisheries Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).

— Hatcheries, in Com. of Sup., 1069 (ii).

— Papers, &c., re negotiations (Ques.) 21, 112, 141.

— Protection, Instructions (Ques.) 21 (i).

— Steamers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1087 (ii).

— Vessels boarded, &c., by Officers in Protection Service, on M. for Ret., 221 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1225; on M. for 3°, 1228 (ii).

Free List, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1030 (ii).

Geographical nomenclature in Reps., on M. for Ret., 802 (ii).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1074.

Goderich and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3°, 538 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 480 (i).

— Officials in Northumberland, N.B., removal (Ques.) 321 (i).

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1886, on M. for Ret., 262-264, 282 (i).

— 1886-87, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 293 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- G.T.R., Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for 2°, 444 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).
 High Commissioner's Taxes, in Com. of Sup., 652 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 129 (i).
 Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
 I. C. R., Indiantown Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1174, 1177.
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1173, 1196, 1241 (ii).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).
 ——— Supplies furnished by Contract or otherwise, on M. for Ret., 211 (i).
 Interest, payment of, by Crown B. 95 (Mr. *Landry*) on M. for 1°, 804 (ii).
 Iron Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1218 (ii).
 Iron, Ry. bars, conc. in Ways and Means, 502 (ii).
 Jacques Cartier Union Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1261 (ii).
 Laviolette, Godefroi, allowance to, B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. on Res., 808 (ii).
 Lighthouse Keepers, in Com. of Sup., 1060 (ii).
 Locomotives, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 504 (i).
 Locomotive Tires, conc. in Ways and Means, 505 (i).
 Manhood Suffrage (remarks) 515 (i).
 Meteorological Service, Chatham, N.B., in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
 Midland Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Hudspeth*) on M. for 2°, 444 (i).
 Minudie Branch Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., (Mr. *Pope*) 1263 (ii).
 Moffat, Mr., M.P., decease of (remarks) 111 (i).
 Montreal Cotton Co.'s Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 957, 959 (ii).
 National Policy, in deb. on Ways and Means, 490 (i).
 Neguac Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
 New Brunswick and P.E.I. Mail Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986, 989, 997 (ii).
 N. W. T. Council B. 163 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 1076 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary reference, 998 (ii).
 Paper Hangings, in Com. on Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 Paper, News, in Com. on Ways and Means, 519, 521.
 "Parliamentary Companion," in Com. of Sup., 1189.
 Petroleum, conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 P.O. Irregularities in N.B., in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
 Prohibition, compensation to dealers (remarks) 951 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 178 (i).
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, 616, 622 (ii).
 Rebellion, N.W. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 Reciprocity Treaty with the U.S. (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 Senate Representation for N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 197 (i).
 Shipping, News and Telegraph Service (Ques.) 312 (i).
 Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 450, 452 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 463 (i).
 Solicitor Gen., appointment of, Provision B. 42 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 191 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. 1261 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (County Courts, N.B.) 655 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial Exhibition) 1169; (Experimental Farms) 723; (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).
Charges of Management (Financial Commissioner, Eng.) 594 (i).
Civil Govt. (Geological Survey) 1074; (High Commissioner's Taxes, &c) 652; (Interior) 1074 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs, steam launches) 1195; (Excise) 1195; (Railways) 1196 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 1197 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Steamers, &c.) 1087; (salaries, &c.) 1069.
Indians (N. W. T.) 1107 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, &c.) 1064; (salaries, &c.) 1060 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 991; (France and Quebec) 986; (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 989; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay, O.B.) 991 (ii).
Militia (Baird, Lieut. Col., gratuity) 1171 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1189; ("Parliamentary Companion") 1189; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 1248; (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs) 1186; (Savings Banks Funds) 1189 (ii).
Mounted Police (Gratuities) 1186.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1245; (Ont.) 976; (Experimental Farms) 982. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1245 (ii).
Railways—Capital: O. P. R., 1172. I. C. R. 1172, 1241; (Indiantown Branch) 1174; (Rolling Stock) 1177 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (1886-87) 1198.
Unprovided Items, 1198 (ii).
 Supplies to Str. *Lansdowne*, in Com. of Sup., 1064 (ii).
 Tenders for Supplies to Indians in N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 1107 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1075; in Com., 1231 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce, Dept. of, B. 7 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 193 (i); on M. for Com., 865 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance (personal explanation) 588 (i).
 Wall Paper, conc. in Ways and Means, 514 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 446, 452, 456, 463, 464, 488, 490, 502, 504, 505, 508 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.

- Queen's, N.B., Election, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 698 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., Haldimand.

- Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1217 (ii).
 Haldimand Election, Returning Officer's Ret., on M. for copies, 373 (i).
 York Village Public Works (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

- Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 3°, 1221 (ii).
 Can. Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 78, 1°*) 370 (i).
 C.P.R., B.C. Section, in Com. of Sup., 1172 (ii).
 Civil Servants extra salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1181 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery, in Com. of Sup., 1161 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 900 (ii).
 Electric Light in Montreal P.O., in Com. of Sup., 972 (ii).
 Exchange Bank, amts. owing Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 110.
 Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 454 (i).
 Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup., 1192 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1225 (ii).
 Freehold and Loan and Savings Co.'s B. 71 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 443 (i).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 House of Coms. Ventilation, on M. for Cor., 787 (ii).
 I. C. R., Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup., 770 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 770, 1174 (ii).
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of, Independence of Members, 1011 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 641 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1161 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 31, 1°) 142 (i).
 ——— B. 6 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 192 (i).
 ——— B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 362 (i).
 Ry. Commission, appointments (M. for Ret.*) 110 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1034 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 Schreiber, C., services, in Com. of Sup., 1181 (ii).
 Shirts, Cotton, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 452 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 1181; (*Williams*, barge, payment to Owners) 1182 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Interior, Geological Survey) 1162; (Privy Council Office) 1161 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Liquor License Act) 1197; (Post Office) 1196 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 1059 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties) 1192; (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs) 1187 (ii).
Pensions (Militia, &c.) 747 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1183; (Que.) 974 (ii).
Quarantine, 746 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R., 1172; I. C. R. (Halifax Extension) 770, 1174 (ii).
 Travis, J., Rep. of Judge Taylor respecting (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 452, 454 (ii).
 Williams, barge, payment to Owners, in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).
 York and Simcoe Battalion of Volunteers (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

- Chamberlin, B, extra pay, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Chippewa Indians, arrears due (M. for Ret.) 381 (i).
 Civil Service Promotion Examinations (Ques.) 1199 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—Continued.

- County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 656 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 885 (ii).
 Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 58-62 (i).
 Kit allowance to Volunteers (Ques.) 525 (i); (remarks) 716 (ii).
 Lavell, W. R., Relief B. 155 (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) on M. for 3°, 1137 (ii).
 Military Branch, &c., in Com. of Sup., 749 (ii).
 Monteith, John, Relief (B. 144, 1°) 876 (ii).
 Newspapers, partly Printed, conc. in Ways and Means, 447 (i).
 Paper Manufactures, in Com. on Ways and Means, 517 (i).
 Penetanguishene Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 1004.
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 695 (ii).
 Riparian Rights, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. *Skinner*) on M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 707 (ii).
 Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 436 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (County Courts) 656 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1196 (ii).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1070 (ii).
Indians (N.W.T.) 1110; (Ont. and Que.) 1186 (ii).
Militia (Drill Instruction) 753; (Military Branch and District Staff) 749 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Chamberlin, B., extra pay) 1195 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 975 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 436, 441, 447 (i).
 Woollen Fabrics, conc. in Ways and Means, 441 (i).
 York and Simcoe Battalion of Volunteers (remarks) 716 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

- Agricultural Machines, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 480, 497 (i).
 Boiler Tubes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
 Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1260 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 350 (i).
 ——— salary, in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1219 (ii).
 ——— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).
 ——— Detectives, in Com. of Sup., 1132 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 906 (i).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1227 (ii).
 Free List, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
 Fish Fry, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1886, on M. for Ret., 264.

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 132 (i).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 160 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1228 (ii).
 Indians, N.W.T., expenses of visit East, in Com. of Sup., 1110, (ii).
 Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1163.
 Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. Edgar) on M. for 2°, 285 (i).
 Iron, bar, rolled, &c. conc. in Ways and Means 500 (i).
 Iron Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1219 (ii).
 Malleable Iron Castings, conc. in Ways and Means, 503.
 Montreal Cotton Co. and Customs Dept. (Ques.) 102; (M. for Rep.) 222 (i).
 — Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 954-957, 959 (ii).
 Mowing Machines, conc. in Ways and Means, 479 (i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1136 (ii).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 184 (i).
 Six Nation Indians, Claim to Lands on Grand River (M. to ref. to Sp. Com.) 206; withdn., and Order for papers, &c., issued, 208 (i).
 Skates, conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
 Steel Ingots, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 502 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1260 (ii).
 Sugar, in deb. on Ways and Means, 465 (i).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 874 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Civil Govt. (Customs) 613 (i); (Inland Revenue) 1163 (ii); (Privy Council) 611 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1132; (Excise) 1195; (Post Office) 1136 (ii).
 Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1070 (ii).
 Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 737 (ii).
 Indians (N.W.T.) 1099 (ii).
 Miscellaneous (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Fish and Fish Oil, Refund of Duties) 1193 (ii).
 Quarantine, 743 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1154 (ii).
 Vote on M. to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel re Queen's Election, 624 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 465, 475, 497, 503 (i), 966 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.

- Canadian Workmen in the U. S. (Ques.) 1045 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 344 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. 1151; on M. for 3°, 1214 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 33 (i).
 Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1151, 1214.
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 111 (i).

Patterson, Mr. J. C.—Continued.

- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res., (Mr. Jamieson) 852-855 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 176 (i).
 — on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 690-692 (ii).

Perley Mr. W. D., East Assiniboia.

- C. P. R., Land Sales by Co. (M. for Ret.) 317; (Ques.) 527 (i).
 Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. (B. 34) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 479 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 894, 897 (ii).
 Judge of East Assiniboia, residence (Ques.) 102 (i).
 Liquor Permits in the N.W.T. (Ques.) 527 (i).
 National Policy and Free Trade, in deb. on Ways and Means, 484, 486 (i).
 Returns, enquiries for, re C.P.R. Land Sales, 1249.
 SUPPLY:
 Indians (N.W.T.) 1105 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 484-486 (i).

Perley, Mr. W. G., Ottawa City.

- Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 132, 1°*) 782 (ii).
 Elm Logs, Excise Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1152, 1203 (ii).
 Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 511 (i).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1229 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 511, 512 (i).
 White Fish River Indian Reserve, on M. for Ret., 803 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P.E.I.

- De Blois Postal Service (Ques.) 1004 (ii).
 Fifteen Point, P.E.I., Breakwater (Ques.) 312 (i).
 Fish Traps at Tignish (M. for Cor.) 788 (ii).
 — Licenses in P. E. I. (Ques.) 1001 (ii).
 Ice-boat Service, P.E.I. (M. for Ret.*) 210, 223 (i).
 Miminegash, P. E. I., Breakwater (Ques.) 371 (i).
 — Range Light, appointment of Keeper (Ques.) 372 (i), 1004 (ii).
 Neptune and Winter communication with P. E. I. (M. for Ret.*) 153 (i).
 Northern Light and Ice-boats between mainland and P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 210, 223 (i).
 — Winter communication with P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 150; on M. for Ret., 383 (i).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1124 (ii).
 Straits of Northumberland Subway, Surveys, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 Subway and Letter to Senator Howlan (Ques.) 527 (i).
 Subsidy (Money) to P. E. I. (Ques.) 206 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income* : Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 979 (ii).
 West Point, P.E.I., Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 21 (i).
 Winter Service and *Northern Light*, on M. for Ret.,
 150, 538 (i).

Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward, Ont.

- Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in
 Com., 245 (i).
 Bridge across St. Lawrence at Coteau Subsidy, in Com.
 on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1265 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers,
 on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges
 and Elections, 327 (ii).
 ——— salary, in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Customs and P. O. Building in Picton (Ques.) 321 (i).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk
 of Crown to produce papers, 41 (i).
 Fishing Licenses in East and West Lakes, Prince
 Edward Co. (Ques.) 322 (i).
 Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com.
 of Sup., 1247 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
 Lighthouse Keepers, in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1165 (ii).
 Main Ducks and Walpole Islands, Leases (M. for Ret.)
 369 (i).
 Murray Canal, Contracts for completion (Ques.) 322 (i).
 Postmaster at Milford, appointment (Ques.) 322 (i).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 1160 (ii).
 Riparian Rights, in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1265 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* (Inland Revenue) 1163 (ii) ; (Privy Council) 609 (i),
 1160 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance and Repairs) 1065 ;
 (salaries, &c.) 1061 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises)
 1247 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1243. Dredging, 980.
Superintendence of Insurance (expenses) 1073 (ii).
 Voters' Lists in P. E. County, Cost of Revision, &c. (M.
 for Ret.*) 369 (i).
 Wellbanks, Danl., charges against as Mail Carrier (M.
 for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 Wellington Harbor of Refuge (M. for Ret.) 369 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H., Compton.

- C.P.R., Extension to Quebec Harbor (Ans.) 44 (i).
 ——— in B.C., in Com. of Sup. 766 (ii).
 ——— Laurentides Branch Lines, Tariff Rates (Ans.)
 252 (i).
 ——— Rates in B.C. (Ans.) 321 (i).
 Cap St. Ignace Station house, on M. for Ret., 103 (i).
 Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
 Concurrence, 1269 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
 Govt. Officials in Northumberland, N.B. (Ans.) 321.
 House of Coms., salaries, in Com. of Sup., 661 (ii).
 I.C.R., Capital Account (Ans.) 102 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

- I. C. R., Complaint against Employés (Ans.) 20 (i).
 ——— Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup.,
 769 (ii).
 ——— Grain Shipments, on M. for Ret., 380 (i).
 ——— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 769 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1241, 1269 (ii).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 824 (ii).
 ——— Supplies furnished by Contract or otherwise, on
 M. for Ret., 211 (ii).
 L'Evêque, Arsène, dismissal (Ans.) 1200 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 165
 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) prop. Res., 1142; in Com. on
 Res., 1158 (ii).
 Murray Canal, Contracts for completion (Ans.) 322 (i).
 North Shore Ry., purchase of, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (B. 77) M. for Com. on
 Res., 302; in Com., 312; conc. in and 1^o* of B.,
 361 (i) ; 2^o m., 646 (ii).
 P.E.I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Public Works, Liabilities (Ans.) 14, 15 (i).
 Rys. (Govt.) Act Amt. (B. 6, 1^o*) 20; 2^o m., 192; in
 Com., 226; 3^o m., 364 (i).
 Ry. (General) Act Amt. (B. 47, 1^o*) 204; in Com.,
 361 (i) ; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1031 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 15 (i).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for
 Com. of Sup., 1043 (ii).
 Royal Commission on Canal Leases, in Com. of Sup.,
 1180 (ii).
 St. Charles and St. Joseph de Lévis Station-house
 (Ans.) 101 (i).
 St. Lawrence Canals, Enlargement (Ans.) 313 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 170) prop. Res., 1142;
 M. for Com. on Res., 1249; in Com., 1250, 1257,
 1259, 1266 (ii).
 Subsidies, Ry., Liabilities (Ans.) 14 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Royal Commission on Leases) 1180 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (I.C.R.) 1269 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 661 (ii).
Militia (contingencies, &c.) 754 (ii).
Railways—Capital : C.P.R. (B.C.) 766. I.C.R., 1241; (Halifax
 Extension) 769, 781; (Rolling Stock) 824 (ii).
Quarantine, 743 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111
 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 879 (ii).
 Trade and Commerce, Minister of (prop. Res.) 361 (i).
 Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of
 Sup., 754 (ii).
 Trent Valley Canal, construction works (Ans.) 669 (i).
 Valuators services, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
 Welland Canal Bridge, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).
 Western Counties Ry. Co.'s confirmation of Agreement
 (prop. Res.) 591 (i) ; 1^o* of B., 1031 (ii).
 Wharf in Richelieu River (Ans.) 321 (i).
 Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co. and Ry. Dept., on M.
 for Ret., 149 (i),
 Yarmouth and Annapolis Ry., in Com. on Res., 1031 (ii)

Porter, Mr. R., West Huron.

Address in ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).
 Goderich and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp.
 (B. 24, 1°*) 111; in Com., 533 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res.
 (Mr. Jamieson) 938 (ii).
 Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 459 (i).
 Salt, conc. in Ways and Means, 436 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 436, 459 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., Chambly.

Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure" (Ques.) 14 (i).
 Chambly Canal, appointment of Supt. (M. for Ret.*)
 19 (i).
 ——— widening of (Ques.) 142 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers,
 on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to M. to ref. Ret. to Com. on
 Privileges and Elections, 353 (i).
 Dumont, Gabriel, and recent Amnesty (Ques.) 525 (i).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for
 Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 42 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Thompson)
 on M. for 3°, 1223 (ii).
 Longueuil Wharves, construction (Ques.) 16, 142 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 168
 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1158 (ii).
 Sheppard, E. E., Warrant for Arrest (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Statutes, Revised, of Can., French Ed. (Ques.) 142 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Public Works—Income ; Buildings (Que.) 974 (ii).

Purcell, Mr. P., Glengarry.

Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services (M. for Ret.) 366.
 Scrip to Veterans of 1837 (Ques.) 320 (i).
 Vote on Disallowance (explanation) 616 (ii).

Putnam, Mr. A., Hants.

Joggins Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Pope)
 1260 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J., Cariboo.

Ashcroft and Barkerville Telegraph Service (Ques.)
 1005 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.

Boisvert, Louis, appointment as Lighthouse keeper (M.
 for O. C., &c.*) 803 (ii).
 C.P.R., Laurentides Branch Lines Tariff Rates (Ques.)
 525 (i).
 Commercial relations with France (remarks) on M. for
 Com. of Sup, 823 (ii).
 Customs and Excise Tariff, distribution (Ques.) 708 (ii).
 Dumont, Gabriel and recent Amnesty (Ques.) 525 (i).
 Electoral Lists for L'Assomption Co. (Ques.) 525 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act, Repeal (Ques.) 205 (i).
 Resignation of Lieut. Gov. of Que. (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 St. Esprit Postmaster, dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 153 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Floods, Engineers Reps., &c. (M.
 for Ret.*) 803 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I.—Continued.

Sheppard's case and Toronto Magistrates' conduct
 (Ques.) 1199 (ii).
 Stills, Illicit, Seizures, &c., 1878-1886 (M. for Stmt.*)
 153 (i).
 Tobacco, Illegal Sales and Seizures (M. for Stmt.*)
 153 (i).

Robertson, Mr. A., West Hastings.

Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°*) 359 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on
 Amt. (Mr. Davies) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges
 and Elections, 340 (i).
 Collars, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 446.
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for
 Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 26 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 446 (i).

Robertson, J. E., King's, P.E.I.

Dredging in Murray Harbor, P.E.I. (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 I. C. R., Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup.,
 781 (ii).
 P. E. I., Public Wharf, Reps. as to state (Ques.) 257 (i).
 St. Mary's Bay, Sturgeon Bay, &c., Wharves (Ques.)
 143 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Public Works—Income : Buildings (P.E.I.) 924 (ii).
 Railways—Capital : I.C.R. (Halifax Extension) 781 (ii).
 Winter Service, P.E.I., and Northern Light (M. for
 Ret.) 530 (i).

Robertson, Mr. T., Shelburne.

Barrack Land, Shelburne Harbor, N.S. (Ques.) 668.
 Barrington Harbor, Tenders for Lightship (Ques.) 383.
 Geological Survey in N.S. (Ques.) 383 (i).
 Lunenburg Public Building, amount paid for Site
 (Ques.) 1003 (ii).
 Port la Tour Harbor Light (Ques.) 785 (ii).
 Shelburne Harbor Islands (Ques.) 668 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance and Repairs) 1066 ;
 (completion and construction) 1068 (ii).
 West Head Harbor Light (Ques.) 786 (ii).

Robillard, Mr. H., Ottawa City.

Gov. Gen.'s residence in Ottawa (Ques.) 154 (i).
 Rideau River obstructions (M. for O. C., &c.*) 803 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.

Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1203 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
 Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1244 (ii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar.

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell)
 in Com., 902 (ii).

Royal, Mr. J., Provencher.

Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com.
 on Res., 583 (1).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.

- Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co's. (B. 44, 1°*) 204 (i).
 Can. Pac. Ry. Co's. Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°*) 204 (i).
 Niagara River Bridge Co's. incorp. (B. 43, 1°*) 204 (i).
 Ontario Pacific Co.'s (Bill 124, 1°*) 667 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. Thompson) on
 M. for 2°, 1229 (ii).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., Winnipeg.

- Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M.
 for 3°, 1220 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on Order for Com.,
 149 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. White, Cardwell)
 on M. for Com., 891; in Com., 915; on M. to conc.
 in Amts., 1007 (ii);
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Co.'s (B. 84, 1°*)
 413 (i).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 109, 1°*)
 524 (i).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Watson) Official Debates and
 newspaper report, 1156 (ii).
 — Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, *re* rep. of
 deb. in *Globe*, 615 (ii).
 Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 110, 1°*)
 524 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr.
 White, Cardwell) in Com. on Res., 1119 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Indians* (N.W.T.) 1106 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Refund of Duties, Fish and Fish Oil) 1193; (St.
 Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs) 1188 (ii).
Penitentiaries (salaries) 1237 (ii).

- Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s
 (B. 79, 1°*) 383 (i).

Scriven, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

- Coal Oil Importation in Bulk, in Com. on B. 107,
 1146 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1267, 1269, 1270 (ii).
 Prescott Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 300 (ii).
 Private Bills, Rules respecting, on M. to conc. in Rep.
 of Sp. Com., 1272 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 363 (i).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret.,
 366 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in
 Com., 1266 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Dominion Lands—Capital*: Surveys (Ont. and Que.) conc.,
 1270 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) conc., 1269 (ii).
Quarantine, conc., 1267 (ii).

- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, 502, 503 (i).

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

- Iron Industries, in Com. on B. 107, 1207 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 727 (ii).

Shakespeare, Mr. N., Victoria, B. C.

- Behring's Sea, protection of British subjects (Ques.)
 45 (i).
 Black Cod Banks, B. C., Rep. of Expedition (Ques.)
 527 (i).
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, and claim of McNamee &
 Co. (M. for Sp. Com.) 527 (i).
 Experimental Farm in B. C. (Ques.) 527 (i).
 Fortifications of B. C., Rep. of Col. O'Brien (Ques.)
 102 (i).
 Immigration into Dom. during 1886 (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Life-saving Station on Vancouver Island (Ques.) 45 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) on rumored adjmt. of Hse. for one
 week, 224 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Indians* (B. C.) 1097 (ii).
Militia (Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges) 764 (ii).

Shanly, Mr. W., South Grenville.

- Alberta and B. C. Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 56,
 1°*) 300 (i).
 Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1°*) 359 (i).
 Anticosti Island, in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).
 Canadian Society of Civil Engineers incorp. (B. 22, 1°*)
 111 (i).
 Canal Officers salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1169.
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. 168
 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1156 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*, 1169 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (salaries, &c.) 1114 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., St. John, N.B., City and County.

- C.P.R., Winter Port, on M. for Com. of Sup., 970 (ii).
 N. B. Ry. Co.'s (B. 120, 1°*) 638 (ii).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr.
 Thompson) in Com., 645 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election (M.) Clerk of Crown in Chancery
 to attend with papers, &c., 100 (i).
 — notice given of Res. to amend Ret., 111 (i).
 — prop. Res. to amend Ret. by inserting name of
 Mr. King instead of Mr. Baird, 155 (i).
 St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co. (M.) to suspend Rules,
 706; (B. 134, 1°*) 782 (ii).

Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.

- Ash Susan, Relief (B. 135) 1° on a div., 804; 2° m.,
 1017; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 42) 1028; 3° m.,
 1141; neg. (Y. 56, N. 61) 1142; M. to place on
 Order paper for 5°, 1155; in Com. and 3°, 1221 (ii).
 Brandon, Souris and Rock Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B.
 28, 1°*) 111 (i).
 British Canadian Loan and Investment Co.'s Acts Amt.
 (B. 61, 1°*) 300 (i).
 Canadian Horse Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 413 (i).
 Governor Gen., reception of (M. to adjn.) 543 (i).
 Manufacturers Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 125,
 1°*) 667 (ii).

Small, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Massawippi Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°) 318.
 Noel, Marie Louise, Relief (B. 108, 1°) 804; 2° agreed to (Y. 81, N. 49) 876 (ii).
 Primitive Methodist Colonisation Co.'s (B. 121, 1°*) 924 (ii).
 Standard Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. (B. 106, 1°*) 515 (i).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

- Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) in Com., 238 (i).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on Res., 581 (i).
 Harbors and Breakwaters, money voted by Parlt. since Confederation (Ques.) 1002 (ii).
 Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. Curran) 130 (i).
 Kingston General and St. Catharines Marine Hospital (Ques.) 668 (ii).
 Marine and Immigrant Hospital at Quebec, Expenditure (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 80, 1°*) 383 (i)
 Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 705 (ii).

Smith, Mr. W., South Ontario.

- Cattle, diseased, Importation of (Ques.) 204 (i).
 Oshawa Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82, 1°*), 413 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, 438 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 611 (ii).
 Creighton, Mr. J., Indian Agent at Saugeen (M. for Ret.) 314 (i).
 Elections of 1887, Returning Officers' Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 223 (i).
 Indian Affairs in the N.W., conduct of Govt. Officers (M. for Cor.*) 369 (i).
 "Jamaica" Pullman Car expenses (M. for Ret.) 313 (i).
 Rebellion of 1837, Volunteers services, on M. for Ret., 367 (i).
 Statutes, Revised, Commissioners (Ques.) 205 (i).
 SUPPLY :
 Civil Govt. (Privy Council Office) 611 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet) Laval.

- Address, His Ex.'s Reply (read) 153 (i).
 Address to Her Majesty on 50th anniversary of Reign, Mess. from Sen. (announcement) 680 (ii).
 Agriculture and Colonisation Com., notice must be given to change quorum, 154 (i).
 Ash Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. Small) on M. for 2°, 804 (ii).
 Beauce Controverted Election, Judge's Rep.(read) 3 (i)
 Civil Service Act Amt., on prop. introd. of B., ruled out of order, 413 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery, letter to Clerk (presented) 370 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Disallowance, Vote on, Member asked to explain, 583 (i)
 Election as Speaker (thanks returned) 3 (i).
 Election Retg., Gazetting of, personal explanation allowed by Members in deb., 32 (i).
 ——— personal attacks (ruling) 36 (i).
 ——— ref. to previous deb. checked, 40 (i).
 ——— papers produced by Clerk of Crown, 45 (i).
 Estimates, The, by Mess. (read) 318 (i); 1886-87 and 1887-88, 952, 1152 (ii).
 Evanturel, Lieut.-Col. A., on M. for Ret., 1199 (ii).
 Gov. Gen., reception of, on M. to adju., objection (Mr. Blake) sustained, 543 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland, Member requested to withdw. expression, 66 (i).
 ——— ruling: Mover cannot amend his own motion, &c., 140 (i).
 Hse. of Com., salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1164, 1239 (ii).
 Imperial, Naval and Military Officers employed by Colonial Govts., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 144 (i).
 Internal Economy Commissioners, appointment by Mess. (read) 13 (i).
 Judges, Reflections on, ruled unparliamentary, 373 (i).
 Library of Parlt., Librarians' Rep. (presented) 4 (i).
 ——— on M. to conc. in Repts., 1249 (ii).
 Members, new, notification of return of Members Elect: South Victoria, Ont., 277; Restigouche, 588 (i).
 Mess. from His Ex., 13, 144, 153, 318 (i); 952, 1152 (ii).
 Mortgages, payment of, prop. M. to introd. B. ruled out of order, 111 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of, decorum in debate (ruling) 1011 (ii).
 ——— expressions respecting Upper Chamber considered objectionable, 200 (i).
 ——— Independence of Members (ruling) 1010 (ii).
 ——— Indian Agent at Saugeen (ruling) 315, 316 (ii).
 ——— Member has right to ask questions, 615 (i).
 ——— Member misquoting, 1014 (ii).
 ——— Member being called on to withdw. stmt. 1012 (ii).
 ——— Prohibition (ruling) re B. on Order paper to repeal Can. Temp. Act, 858 (ii).
 ——— re Amt. (Mr. Cargill) to Res. on Prohibition (ruling) 852 (ii).
 ——— re Amt. (Mr. Girouard) to Res. on Prohibition, 846 (ii).
 ——— re personal explanation on Prohibition (ruling) 939 (ii).
 ——— re Amt. (Mr. Sproule) on Prohibition, relevancy of deb. (ruling) 949 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch Ry. B., on objection (Mr. Mills) to 2° (ruling) 649 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358; (ruling) 360 (i).
 Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B., on objection to M. to place on Orders, 1001 (ii).
 Previous deb., ref. to checked, 40, 474 (i).
 Privileges of Commons claimed from His Ex. and confirmed, 3 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Official Rep. and report in *Man. Sun* (remarks) 1156 (ii).
 Prorogation, communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1269 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, papers, &c., respecting, laid on Table, 100 (i).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 185 (i).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) to disagree in 2nd Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 640 (ii).
 — Sitting Member called on to explain, 640, 671.
 — John R. Dunn, announcement of presence, 524.
 — ordered to appear before Bar of House, 616 (ii).
 — examination, 627 (ii).
 — Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 703; (ruling) 704 (ii).
 Restigouche Electoral Dist., return of Member Elect announced, 588 (i).
 South Victoria, Ont., Electoral Dist., return of Member Elect announced, 277 (i).
 Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 3 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Legislation : House of Commons (salaries) 1164, 1239 (ii).
 Upper Columbia Ry., attention called to B. not being printed in French (remarks) 320 (i).
 Vacancy, notification of, in Restigouche, 277 (i).
 Vote on M. to allow J. R. Dunn Counsel, *re* Queen's Election (remarks) 624 (ii).
 Unparliamentary Language and Conduct (reproofs) 110, 180, 298, 333, 353, 374 (i), 619, 704 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance, Mr. Mitchell's name ordered to be inserted in Div. List, 558 (i).
 Writ for Restigouche, Issue of (Ans.) 361 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

- Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2^o, 197 (i).
 Civil Servants Office Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 345 (i).
 Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2^o, 286 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 720, 726 (ii).
 Prisoners, Release of (prop. Res.) exercise of Executive clemency, 793 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) Amt., 948 (ii).
 Scrip for services in Rebellion, outside Militia, on M. for Ret., 17 (i).
 Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 512 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 720, 726.
Civil Govt. (Interior Dept.) 1129 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 512 (i).

Stevenson, Mr. J., West Peterborough.

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 837 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

- Adjmt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 320 (i).
 Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 25, 1^o*) 111 (i).
 Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dom. Bank incorp. (B. 48, 1^o*) 223 (i).
 Niagara and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89, 1^o*) 441 (i).
 Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62, 1^o*) 300 (i).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 179 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

- Anglo-Canadian Bank (B. 98, 1^o*) 515 (i).
 Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) M. for Com., 1137; 3^o m., 1141; neg. (Y. 56, N. 61) 1142 (ii).
 Butter Imports from U.S., 1883-1887 (M. for Ret.) 211 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 334; (explanation) 341.
 Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 507, 515 (i).
 Home Rule for Ireland (personal explanation of Vote) 154 (i).
 Hoop Nets on River St. Lawrence (Ques.) 101 (i).
 Iron Manufacture, conc. on Ways and Means, 494 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary expressions, 1014 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
 Shovels and Spades, conc. in Ways and Means, 464 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Savings Banks Funds) 1189 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 464, 494, 507, 515 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income (Harbors and Rivers) 1184 (ii).
Railways—Capital : I. C. R. (Ladiantown Branch) 1174 (ii).

Thérien, Mr. O., Montcalm.

Tobacco, increased Duty on (Ques.) 320 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D., Antigonish.

- Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2^o, 1017-1021, 1027; in Com., 1140 (ii).
 Bremner, Charles, seizure of Furs from, in Com. of Sup., 12.8 (ii).
 Civil Service Officials and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 666.
 Copyright, British works, reprinting (Ans.) 15 (i).
 Counterfeit and Imitation Notes (B. 123, 1^o) 633; in Com., 808 (ii).
 County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
 Criminal Cases, Procedure in (B. 19, 1^o) 100 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—Continued.

- Criminals, release of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) to exercise Executive clemency, 799 (ii).
David J. Adams, case against (Ans.) 313 (i).
 Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 707; in Com., 809 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 541 (i).
 Dumont, Gabriel, and recent Amnesty (Ans.) 525 (i).
 Dunn, J. R. (remarks) on Counsel's argument, 626, 628, 630 (ii).
 Dunscombe, Mr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).
 East Assiniboia, residence for Judge (Ans.) 102 (i).
 Elgin, Jr. County Judge (Ans.) 143; applicants for position, on M. for Ret., 368 (i).
 Essex, Dep. Judge for County (Ans.) 786 (i).
 Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°) 862; (Crown compensation for Costs) prop. Res., 952; conc. in, 1033.
 Fisheries, Vessels boarded, &c., by Officers in Protection Service, on M. for Ret., 221 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 114, 1°) 589 (i); 2° m., 1222; in Com., 1227 (ii).
 Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1886, on M. for Ret., 269.
 Imperial Trusts Co.'s B. 15 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 637
 Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Order for 2°, 272; on M. for 2°, 285 (i).
 Interest, payment of by Crown (B. 137, 1°) 804; withdn., 1121 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1237 (ii).
 Lavolette, Godefroi, allowance (B. 138) prop. Res., 111 (i); in Com., 805; 1°* of B., 808; in Com., 889.
 Libel, Imprisonment for (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1234 (ii).
 North-West Ter. Act Amt. (B. 127, 1°) 708; M. for 2° and in Com., 809 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I. C. R., B. 77 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 648 (ii).
 Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 65) reorganisation of salaries of Officers (prop. Res.) 223; in Com., 274; Res. conc. in and 1° of B., 301 (i); 2° m., 641 (ii).
 Penitentiaries, Cloth, &c., supplied (Ans.) 14 (i).
 Public Morals and Public Convenience B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 278 (i).
 Public Debt and recent Elections, in deb. on Ways and Means, 477 (i).
 Public Stores (B. 20, 1°) 100; in Com., 273 (i).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. (B. 19) 2° m. and in Com., 644 (ii).
 Provincial Courts Judges (B. 166) prop. Res., 862; in Com. and 1°*, 1127 (ii).
 Quebec Ship Laborers (Ans.) in reference to B., 1006 (ii).
 Queen's, N.B., Election, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Skinner*) to amend Ret., 156; (Amt.) to refer to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 160; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 189 (i)

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—Continued.

- Queen's, N.B., Election, Dunn, J. R., before Bar of House (M. to allow Counsel) 616, 620; agreed to (Y. 154, N. 2) 624 (ii).
 — on M. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) to disagree in 2nd Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 675; (Amt.) 677; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 85) 706 (ii).
 Real Property in the Territories Act Amt. (B. 154, 1°*) 1028 (ii).
 Representation Act Amt. (B. 140, 1°) 839; 2° m., 839 (ii).
 Revising Officers' salaries (Ans.) 671 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B. C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1054 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs, in Com. of Sup., 1188 (ii).
 St. Charles Branch Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 830.
 Sheppard, E. E., Warrant for Arrest (Ans.) 45 (i).
 — Toronto Magistrates' conduct (Ans.) 1199 (ii).
 Solicitor Gen., appointment, Provision (B. 42) prop. Res. and 1°*, 191 (i).
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. (B. 146, 1°*) 924 (ii).
 Statutes, Consolidation, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 205 (i).
 — distribution to Justices (Ans.) 668 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (N.W.T.) 654; (payment to Judge Wood) 1164 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Justice) 1237 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 666; (Revised Statutes) 1247 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dunscombe, Mr., Claim) 1248; (St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co.'s Law Costs) 1188; (Statutes, consolidation) 1190 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.O.) 660; (Kingston) 657; (Man.) 659, 1237; (St. Vincent de Paul) 659 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. B. Ry. (construction) 830 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 111, 1°) 524; prop. Res., 590 (i); 2° m., 810; in Com., 873, 877, 890; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1222 (ii).
 Threats and Intimidations (B. 162, 1°) 1075; 2° m., 1152, 1154; in Com., 1229, 1232 (ii).
 Travis, Mr. Jeremiah, appointment as Judge in N. W. T., (Ans.) 143 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 477 (i).
 Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. 157 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) prop. Res., 591 (i); on M. for 2°, 1128.
 Wood, Judge, extra services, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., South Norfolk.

- Adjmt., Ascension Day, &c. (remarks) 320 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White*, *Cardwell*) in Com., 905 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 53, 1°) 277 (i).
 — B. 114 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 589 (i).
 Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 74, 1°*) 359 (i).
 South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 66, 1°*) 318 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.

- Banff National Park B. 16 (Mr. White, Cardwell) on M. for 2^o, 196; in Com., 232, 242 (i).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 339 (i).
 Colonial Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1168 (ii).
 Experimental Farm in Man. (Ques.) 101 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. Thompson) on M. to introd., 589 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
 Piers in P.E.I., condition (Ques.) 669 (ii).
 Prorogation (congratulatory remarks) 1274 (ii).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, payment of Costs and Expenses (Ques.) 205 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*, 1166 (ii).
Indians (N.W.T.) 1109 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Miscellaneous, 1185 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, distribution of, B. 159 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 1^o, 1033 (ii).
 Vote on Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters (remarks) on Member not voting, 588 (i).
 White Mud River, Man., Improvements (Ques.) 102 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.

- Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. Small) in Com., 1138; on M. for 3^o, 1221 (ii).
 Can. Atlantic Steamship Co.'s (B. 151, 1^{o*}) 1001 (ii).
 Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 622 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. Davies) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 336; (explanation) 341 (i).
 ——— increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 601 (i).
 County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 655 (ii).
 Dunn, J. R., examination, 633 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. Mills) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 26 (i).
 ——— of 1874 (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I.C.R., B. 77 (Mr. Pope) on M. for Com. on prop. Res., 303 (i); on M. for 2^o, 647 (ii).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 358 (i).
 Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Clerk of Crown in Chancery question, 360 (i).
 Pictou Bank, Winding-up (B. 85, 1^{o*}) 413 (i).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 601 (i).
 Riddell, Fanny Margaret, Relief (B. 145, 1^o) 884 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C. P. R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1051 (ii).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, on Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 161–167; (explanation) 173 (i).
 St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s (B. 134, 1^{o*}) 782 (ii).
 Senate Representation for N. W. T. B. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 251 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (County Courts, N.B.) 665 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 601 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 662 (ii).
Militia (contingencies, &c.) 764 (ii).

Tupper, Mr. C. H.—Continued.

- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 18, 1^o) 74.
 ——— B. 111 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 883 (ii).
 Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, G.C.M.G., Cumberland.

- Agent and contingencies, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 1114.
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
 Anticosti Island, in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).
 Asst. Receiver Gen., Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
 Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
 ——— Office, in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 Bank circulation, security for (Ans.) 205 (i).
 Bartlett's work on Coal and Iron, in Com. of Sup., 1247.
 Beauharnois Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
 British American Bank Note Co.'s Contract (Ans.) 142.
 Briton Medical and General Life Association, policy-holders Claims (Ans.) 786 (ii).
 Brokerage and Comn., in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 Budget, The (Ans.) 258; (annual statement) 384–407 (i). See "*Ways and Means*."
 Butter, Duty and Inspection (Ans.) 154 (i).
 C. P. R. in B. C., in Com. of Sup., 766, 1171, 1178 (ii).
 Canal Officers salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
 Carillon Canal Valuator's services, in Com. of Sup., 1179.
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 660, 664 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery, salary, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i), 1159, 1266 (ii).
 ——— Extra Clerks in Office, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Clothes-wringers, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 Cotton Clothing, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 523.
 Colonial Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
 ——— Cheese Exhibit, in Com. of Sup., 1167, 1240 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 ——— relations with France (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 822 (ii).
 ——— Treaties, papers, &c., respecting (Ans.) 143, 154 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1266–1269 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651, 653, 1154 (ii).
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
 Cornwall Floods, in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
 Cooper, R. W., extra services, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 107, in Com., 1144; 3^o m., 1200; (remarks) 1207, 1217 (ii).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
 Debt, Public, gross and net (Ans.) 14 (i).
 ——— Interest on, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 ——— National, of Canada, in Com. on B. 107, 1217 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, on M. for Com. on Res., 553–559 (i).
 ——— on M. to make First Order, 480 (i).
 Drain pipes, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles.—Continued.

- Duties on Iron, extension of time for entering goods, in Com. on B. 107, 1220 (ii).
 Elm Logs, Export Duty, in Com. on B. 107, 1150 (ii).
 Estimates, The, bringing down (Ans.) 100, 192; (presented) by Mess., 318 (i).
 ——— Supplementary, 1886–87, 1887–88 (presented). by Mess., 952 (ii).
 ——— further Supplementary 1887–88 (presented). by Mess., 1152 (ii).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 720 (ii).
 Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 594 (i).
 Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, in Com. of Sup., 1191 (ii).
 Franchise Act, Costs of Voters' Lists, on M. for Ret., 15, 16 (i).
 ——— expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s (B. 165) prop. Res., 862; in Com., 1029; conc. in and 1^o* of B., 1120 (ii).
 Free List, conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
 Garrison, Mr., appointment as Surveyor of Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1131 (ii).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 Gov. Gen's. Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
 Gov. Gen's Warrants, 1873 to 1886, on M. for Ret., 261, 266, 279 (i).
 ——— 1886–87, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 292 (i).
 Hardware, Builders, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 515 (i).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 719 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Commission, papers respecting (Ans.) 708 (ii).
 ——— Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).
 House of Coms., salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1239 (ii).
 Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 728 (ii).
 I.C.R., Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup. 771, 778 (ii).
 ——— Freight Earnings, in Com. of Sup., 778 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1113, 1173, 1196, 1241 (ii).
 ——— Indiantown Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1175 (ii).
 ——— Machinery, in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).
 ——— Moncton, accommodation at, in Com. of Sup. 781 (ii).
 ——— Passes to Members (remarks) 524 (i).
 ——— Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 823, 1177 (ii).
 ——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 ——— St. John, accommodation at, in Com. of Sup., 1174 (ii).
 ——— Servis Tie Plates, in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
 Interior Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1129, 1162 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612. (i).
 Iron Drawbacks (remarks) in deb. on Ways and Means, 467, 473 (i).
 Iron Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1080 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles.—Continued.

- Iron and Steel Industries, in Com. on Ways and Means, 488, 522 (i). See "Ways and Means."
 Jones, L. K., salary as Priv. Sec., in Com. of Sup., 766 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832, 838 (i).
 Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
 Locomotives, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 504 (i).
 Maccaroni, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 460 (i).
 Mail Subsidies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 986–991, 999 (ii).
 Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
 Mess. from His Ex., 318 (i), 952, 1152 (ii).
 Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 Millson, Col. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners further Loan (B. 168). Res. in Com., 1156; 1^o* of B., 1159 (ii).
 Mounted Police gratuities, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1186 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
 N.S. Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Pope) 1264 (ii).
 Oil Cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. Wilson, *Elgin*) latitude of deb. affirmed, 454 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Branch, I.C.R., B. 77 (Mr. Pope) on M. for Com. on prop. Res., 302, 304 (i) on M. for 2^o, 646 (ii).
 Paper Hangings, in Com. on Ways and Means, 516 (i).
 Paper, News, in Com. on Ways and Means, 520, 522 (i).
 Personal Explanation, re letter of Mr. Ross, 1077 (ii).
 Perley, H. F., services, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 Pianofortes, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 P. E. I. Railway, in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
 Printing Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
 Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i), 1159, 1266 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) paragraph in Toronto *Mail*, re interview at Washington, 781 (ii).
 Public Accounts (presented) 13 (i).
 Postmaster Gen.'s Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 653 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan (B. 158) prop. Res., 592 (i); in Com. and 1^o* of B., 1032; in Com., 1124 (ii).
 Railway, Street, bars or rails, conc. in Ways and Means 507 (i).
 Rapide Plat Locks, in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
 Reciprocity with the U.S. (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 Red Wood, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 Returning Officers' expenses (Ans.) 669 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, C.P.R. (B.C.) Valuation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1038, 1046 (ii). See "I.C.R."
 Royal Comn. on Canal Leases, in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 ——— on *Bys.*, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles.—Continued.

- St. Anne's Canal, residence, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- St. Charles Branch Ry. Land Claims, in Com. of Sup., 829, 830 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 832.
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832; conc., 1268 (ii).
- Savings Banks Funds, in Com. of Sup., 1189.
- Savings Banks, N. B., &c., in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
- Schreiber, C., services, in Com. of Sup., 1181 (ii).
- Screws, conc. in Ways and Means, 507 (i).
- Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 612 (i), 1162 (ii).
- Senate Representation for the N.W.T. B. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 257 (i).
- Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 513 (i).
- Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- Skates, conc. in Ways and Means, 507 (i).
- Steam Engines, conc. in Ways and Means, 505 (i).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1252, 1264 (ii).
- Subsidy to P. E. I. (Ans.) 206 (i).
- (Money) to P. E. I. (B. 139) prop. Res., 708; in Com., 814 (ii).
- Subway from P. E. I. to Mainland (Ans.) 142 (i).
- Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1183 (ii).
- SUPPLY: (Ms. for Com.) 13, 591 (i), 649, 708, 817, 916, 967, 1034, 1077, 1129, 1233 (ii).
- Administration of Justice* (N.W.T.) 654 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Agricultural Societies in N.W.T.) 1240; (Archives, care of) 745; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1166; (Criminal Statistics) 718; (Experimental Farms) 720; (Health Statistics) 719; (Imperial Institute) 728, 1267 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Carillon) 1179; (Cornwall) 832; (Culbute) 838; (Lachine) 832; (Murray) 832; (St. Lawrence River) 832; (Sault Ste. Marie, construction) 832, conc., 1268; (Tay) 838, 1179; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 836; (Welland) 835; (Williamsburg) 832. *Income* (Beauharnois) 838; (Lachine) 838; (Lake St. Francis) 1242; (payment to Owner of barge *Williams*) 1182; (Rideau) 838; (Royal Commission on Leases) 1180; (St. Anne's) 1180; (St. Peter's) 1180; (Williamsburg) 838 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Asst. Receiver Gen., Halifax) 591; (Auditor and Receiver Gen., Winnipeg) 591; (Brokerage and Commission) 593; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 594; (Debt, Interest on) 593; (Printing Dom. Notes) 596; (Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., &c) 592 (i).
- Civil Govt.* (Agriculture) 614; (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 612 (i); (Finance, contingencies) 653 (ii); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 596 (i); (Geological Survey) 1162; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 651, Taxes, 652 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 612 (i), 1267; (Interior) 1129, 1162 (ii); (Justice) 612; (Marine) 614; (Postmaster Gen.'s Dept.) 614 (i), contingencies, 653 (ii); (Privy Council) 597 (i); 1159, conc., 1266 (ii). (Public Printing, &c.) 612; (Public Works) 614; (Sec. of State) 612 (i), 1162 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Canals) 1113; (Customs) 1129; (Excise) 1195; (Post Office) 1196; (Public Works, Agents, &c., B.O.) 1114; (Railways, I.C.R.) 1113, 1196, conc., 1269 (ii).
- Immigration* (Agents salaries, &c.) 732 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Indians* (B.C.) 1098; (N.W.T.) 1099; (Ont., Que., and Mar. Provs.) 1093 (ii).
- Legislation*: Elections, 1165. Franchise Act (expenses) 1165. House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 660, 1239. Library (salaries, &c.) 667. Senate, 680, 1238; conc., 1267 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 1058 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Campbellton and Gaspé) 991; (France and Quebec) 986, 1057, 1269; (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P.E.I.) 999; (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 989; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B.) 991 (ii).
- Militia* (Baird, Lieut.-Col., gratuity) 1171; (Military Properties, care of) 764 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Bartlett's work on Coal, Iron, &c.) 1247; (Commercial Agencies) 1112; (Cornwall Floods) 1190; (Duncombe, Mr., Claim) 1248; (Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties) 1191; (Printing Bureau) 1113; (Rand's Micmac Dictionary) 1247; (Savings Banks Funds) 1189 (ii).
- Mounted Police* (Crozier, Major, gratuity) 1186 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 1159 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 919; (Ont.) 1183; (P.E.I.) 924. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 1269 (ii).
- Quarantine*, 743, 1267 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: C.P.R. (B.O.) 766; C.P.R., 1171, 1267; (L. K. Jones, salary as Private Sec.) 766. C. B. Ry. (construction) 829. I. C. R. (accommodation at Moncton) 781; (accommodation at St. John) 1174; (Halifax Extension) 771, 778; (Indiantown Branch) 1175; (Law Costs) 1178; (Machinery) 1177; (St. Charles Branch) 1176; (Rolling Stock) 823, 828, 1177; (Servis Tie Plates) 829. *Miscellaneous*, 1173, 1241. P. E. I. Ry., 1176. Short Line Ry., 1179. *Income* (Royal Commission on Rys.) 1179 (ii).
- Superannuation* (gratuity to C. S. Neville) 1170, 1182 (ii).
- Territorial Accounts* (1886-87) 1197 (ii).
- Supply (B. 169) Res. in Com., and 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 1273 (ii).
- Tacks, Brads, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (ii).
- Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838, 1179 (ii).
- Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 836 (ii).
- Tobacco, Increased Duty on (Ans.) 313 (i).
- Valuators, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- Ways and Means*,—Ms. for Com., 13 (i), 954 (ii).
- Budget Speech, 384-407 (ii).
- The Tariff, 413, 426, 444, 480, 515 (i), 963 (ii).
- TARIFF CHANGES: (advertising pictures) 426 (i), 965 (ii); (agricultural machines) 480; (axes) 461 (i), 965 (ii); (axles and springs) 462; (barrels, pork) 446; (blacking) 426; (blueing) 426; (boiler tubes) 506 (i), 965 (ii); (braces) 427; (British gum, dressing, &c.) 445; (buggies, carriages, &c.) 427; (buttons, ivory, &c.) 427; (carboys and demijohns) 433; (cigars and cigarettes) 439; (collars, cotton or linen) 445; (cotton fabrics) 428; (cotton sewing thread) 427; (cuffs) 428, 440, 446; (cutlery) 435; (earthenware, &c.) 432; (gas metres) 446; (glue, sheet, &c.) 446; (gold and silver leaf) 434; (grape vines) 479; (hammers) 462; (hardware, builders, &c.) 507, 515; (harness and leather dressing) 426; (hoes, rakes, &c.) 462 (i), 965 (ii); (ferro-manganese) 488; (fertilisers) 452; (flagstones) 433; (flasks and phials) 433; (free list) 508; (iron, pig, &c.) 498; (iron industry) 488, 498, 504, 507, 522 (i), 965 (ii); (jeans and coutilles) 428; (labels for fruit, &c.) 508; (leather, belting) 434; (liquorice root) 434; (locomotives, &c.) 504; (macaroni, &c.) 460; (mowing machines, &c.) 479; (newspapers, partly printed) 446; (oil cloth) 434; (oil cloth, floor) 516; (oranges and lemons) 460; (paper hangings) 434, 516; (paper manufactures) 520; (paper, all kinds) 435; (paper, tarred) 461; (photographic dry plates)

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles.—*Continued.*

449; (pickles) 435; (picks, mattocks, &c.) 462; (plumbago) 435; (potatoes) 440; (salt) 435; (sand paper) 439; (screws) 507; (sewing machines) 434; (shingle bolts) 513; (shirts) 450; (shoe and shoemakers' ink) 426; (shovels and spades) 463 (i), 965 (ii); (skates) 506; (slates) 439 (i), 965 (ii); (sledges, track tools, &c.) 507; (steam engines) 505; (steel ry. bars) 507; (tacks and brads) 516; (telegraph, &c., insulators) 433; (tomatoes) 440; (trunks, &c.) 445; (varnishes) 440; (vegetables) 440; (veneers of wood) 452; (watch actions, &c.) 440; (wire, iron and steel) 501 (i), 965 (ii); (woollen goods) 522 (i).

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 835.

Western Counties Ry. agreement B. 157 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1129 (ii).

West Indies, Rep. of Commsr. (Ans.) 74, 278 (i).

Williams, barge, payment to Owners, in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 832, 838 (ii).

Winter Port of C. P. R. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 970 (ii).

Woollen Goods, in Com. on Ways and Means, 522 (i).

Turcot, Mr. G., *Mégantic.*

Debates, Official, distribution to Municipalities (Ques.) 1005 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*

Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 91, 1°) 442 (i).

Kit Allowance to Volunteers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 717 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., *Yamaska.*

Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers (remarks) 36 (i).

Evanturel, Lieut. Col. A., indemnity (Ques.) 1199 (ii).

Waldie, Mr. J., *Halton.*

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1226 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 861 (ii).

Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1124 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 431 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 65 (i).

Military Drill at Ottawa College (Ques.) 1033 (ii).

Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1122 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 429, 433 (i).

Watson, Mr. R., *Maquette.*

Agricultural Machines, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 481, 487 (i).

C. P. R., Sale of Lands in Man. (M. for Ret.) 222 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 107 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 1220 (ii).

Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, Order for Com. on Res., 149, 258; (remarks) 369 (i).

— Ms. to make prop. Res. First Order of the Day, 383, 480 (i).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*

Disallowance of Man. Ry. Charters, M. for Com. on Res., 543–553; (reply) 587; Res. neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 587 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 888 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 893, 897; on M. to conc. in Amts., 1016 (ii)

Duties on Iron, extension of time for entering goods, in Com. on B. 107, 1220 (ii).

Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 40 (i).

Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 23, 1°*) 111 (i).

Experimental Farm in Man. (Ques.) 101 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 721 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1225 (ii).

I. C. R., Discriminating Freight Rates, in Com. of Sup., 781 (ii).

Newspapers, partly printed, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 449 (i).

Northern Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).

Paper, Tarred, conc. in *Ways and Means*, 461 (i).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *Debates*, Official Rep. and newspaper report of proceedings, 1156 (ii).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Red River Improvements (Ques.) 1004 (ii).

Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in *Ways and Means*, 513 (i).

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1119 (ii).

Supplies to Indians of N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 1108 (ii)

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 721 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1196 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 742 (ii).

Indians (N.W.T.) 1108 (ii).

Miscellaneous (preparation of Returns) 1112 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1111 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging, 981 (ii).

Quarantine, 743 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax Extension) 781 (ii).

Travis, Jeremiah, appointment as Judge in N.W.T. (Ques.) 143 (i).

Vote on Disallowance *re* Mr. Scarth's remarks on *Globe* newspaper report, 616 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 449, 481, 487 (i).

White Mud River, Man., Improvements (Ques.) 102.

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John N. B.*

Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2°, 1025 (ii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 814 (ii).

C.P.R., Winter Port (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 967 (ii).

Civil Servants and Elections, in Com. of Sup., 667 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 341 (i).
- increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
- County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 655 (ii).
- Customs Dept., in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
- David J. Adams*, case against (Ques.) 312 (i).
- Dipper Harbor Breakwater, construction (Ques.) 785
- Duffy, D. A., claims of, *re* Dorchester Penitentiary (M. for Ret.*) 803 (ii).
- Dunn, J. R., remarks on Counsel's argument, 626, 629. See "Queen's, N.B., Election."
- Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 29 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 114, on M. to introd. B. (Mr. *Thompson*) 589 (i).
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. 165 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1030 (ii).
- Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, 1873-1886 on M. for Ret., 272, 279 (i).
- Imperial Institute, in Com. of Sup., 729 (ii).
- Imperial Trusts Co.'s. B. 15 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 637 (ii).
- I. C. R., accommodation at Moncton, in Com. of Sup., 781 (ii).
- Casualties, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).
- Oil, lubricating, furnished (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i)
- Pullman and Parlor Cars (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).
- Rolling Stock, purchase of (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).
- Rolling Stock, in Com. of Sup., 824 (ii).
- Supplies furnished by Contract or otherwise, on M. for Ret., 211 (ii).
- Wire, &c., Fencing, Contracts, (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).
- McGrath, H. J., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 527 (i).
- Molasses, gauging of, at St. Stephen's, N.B. (M. for Ret.*) 44 (i).
- Paper Hangings, in Com. on Ways and Means, 516 (i).
- Private Bills, reception of Reps. from Coms., on M. to extend time, 515 (i).
- Privileges and Elections Com. (remarks) *re* Rep. of Queen's Co., N.B., Election, 319; (Ques.) 369 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kenny*) *re* Rep. of Official Debates, 785 (ii).
- Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
- Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 645 (ii).
- Queen's, N.B., Election, M. for Clerk of Crown to attend House with Rets., &c., 4 (i).
- M. to have papers read, 4 (i).
- M. that Returning Officer transmit papers, 5 (i).
- M. summoning John R. Dunn to Bar of House, 588 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to allow Counsel, 619 (ii).
- on Order for J. R. Dunn to appear before Bar of House, 616 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

- Queen's, N.B., Election, J. R. Dunn before Bar and questioned, 616-636 (ii).
- prop. M. to disagree in 2nd Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 638, 671 (ii).
- on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 697 (ii).
- St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. *Skinner*) on M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 707 (ii).
- Scrip for Services in Rebellion, outside Militia, on M. for Ret., 17 (i).
- Shingle Bolts, Cedar Logs, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 513 (i).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 811; in Com., 877 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (County Courts, N. B.) 655 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Imperial Institute) 729 (ii).
- Civil Govt.* (Customs) 614; (Privy Council) 604 (i).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 667 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance and Repairs) 1065; (completion and construction) 1067 (ii).
- Militia* (contingencies) 754 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Liverpool, &c., and St. John, &c.) 990 (ii)
- Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (additional Block, Ottawa) 916; *Income*: Buildings (N.B.) 971. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 980 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (accommodation at Moncton) 781; (Rolling Stock) 824 (ii).
- Transport of Volunteers to Rifle Matches, in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
- Writ for Restigouche, Issue of (Ques.) 361 (i).
- Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.**
- Address in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 8 (i).
- Ash, Susan, Relief B. 135 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2^o, 1026; in Com., 1139 (ii).
- Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 765 (ii).
- Queen's, N.B., on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 685 (ii).
- Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P. E. I.**
- Civil Servants Office Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
- Clerk of Crown in Chancery, increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
- Clothes-wringers, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
- Fertilisers, artificial, conc. in Ways and Means, 452-454 (i).
- Hoes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
- Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 72 (i).
- Lobster Fishery in N.S., on M. for copies of Cor., 316.
- Northern Light*, in Com. of Sup., 979 (ii).
- Personal Explanation *re* vote on Clerk of Crown in Chancery question, 360 (i).
- Pianofortes, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
- Piers in P. E. I., condition of (Ques.) 669 (ii).
- Pinette, P. E. I., Harbor, Dredging (M. for copies of Cor.) 146 (i).
- Private Bills, reception of Reps. from Coms., on M. to extend time, 515 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
 Red Point Wharf, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 786 (ii).
 Senate Representation for N. W. T. B. 17 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 256 (i).
 Shirts, Cotton or Linen, conc. in Ways and Means, 450.
 Subsidy to P. E. I. B. 139 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 817 (ii).
 Subway to P. E. I. (Ques.) 101, 142 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Interior) 1129 (ii) ; (Privy Council) 597 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (France and Quebec) 986 ; (Halifax and Murray Harbor, P.E.I.) 991 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging, 981. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 979 (ii).
 Tarpaulins, in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1231 (ii).
 Tracadie Harbor, P.E.I., Dredging of (M. for Cor.) 213 (i).
 Unparliamentary Language (remarks) 705 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 451, 452, 454, 463 (i).
 Winter Service, P.E.I., and *Northern Light*, on M. for Ret., 531 (i).

White, Hon. T., Cardwell.

- Banff National Park (B. 16, 1°) 74 ; 2° m., 194 ; M. for Com., 226 ; in Com., 227, 229, 243 (i) ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 640 (ii).
 Banff Springs reservation, in Com. of Sup., 1189, 1247 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Outrages, papers respecting (remarks) 455 (i).
 C. P. R., Land Sales by Co. (Ans.) 527 (i).
 Colonisation Co.'s, amts. paid (Ans.) 786, 1002 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 113, 1°) 589 ; 2° m., 817 ; M. for Com., 890 ; in Com., 892, 896, 908, 914 ; M. to recom., 1007 (ii).
 Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 37 (i).
 Geographical nomenclature in Reps., on M. for Ret., 802 (ii).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii)
 — in N.S. (Ans.) 383 (i).
 Gilchrist, W. C., compensation to relatives for loss of property during Rebellion (Ans.) 154 (i).
 Homesteads Cancelled (Ans.) 784 (ii).
 Homesteads in Ry. Belt (Ans.) 670 (ii).
 Indian and Colonial Exhibition and Geological Officers (Ans.) 526 (ii).
 Insane Asylum, Man., in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
 Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 13 (i).
 Land Sales in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 14 (i).
 McLean, T. A., indemnity, in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 N. W. Central Ry., construction (Ans.) 1198 (ii).
 N. W. Rebellion, payment of Claims (Ans.) 543 (i).
 N.W.T., expenses of Govt., in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 — Encouragement of settlement (Ans.) 1002 (ii).

White, Hon. T.—Continued.

- Paper, News, in Com. on Ways and Means, 519 (i).
 Shelburne Harbor Island (Ans.) 668 (ii).
 Stevenson, Mr. R., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 669 (ii)
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. (B. 161, 1°) 1074.
 — to Rys. in N.W.T. (B. 164) Res. in Com., 1117 ; M. for Com. on B., 1221 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Interior, Geological Survey) 1185 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1136, 1197 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 1197 (ii).
Indians (N.W.T.) 1106 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 1189, 1247 ; (Chamberlin, B., extra pay) 1195 ; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1112 ; (Man. Insane Asylum) 1247 ; (McLean, T. A., indemnity) 1187 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (1886–87) 1198 ; (1887–88) 1248 (ii).
 Writ for Restigouche, Issue of (Ans.) 361 (i).
 Yukon River Exploration (Ans.) 102 (i).

White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.

- Agricultural and Colonisation Com. (M.) to employ shorthand writer and to increase quorum, 153 (i).
 Campbell, Mr., late M. P., decease (remarks) 1006 (ii).
 Culbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
 Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 290 (i).
 Ottawa Ship Canal, in Com. of Sup., 831 (ii).
 Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Bryson*) on M. to place on Order paper (objection) 1001 ; in Com., 1088, 1091 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Culbute) 838 ; (Sault Ste. Marie, construction) 831 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. C., Argenteuil.

- Election Rets., Gazetting of, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) for Clerk of Crown to produce papers, 39 (i).
 Paper Manufactures, in Com. on Ways and Means, 517.
 Order (Ques. of) digression from deb., 454 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 454, 517 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.

- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1261 (ii).
 Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 331 (i).
 — salary, in Com. of Sup., 604 (i), 1160 (ii).
 County Court Judges, in Com. of Sup., 655 (ii).
 Elgin, Jr. County Court Judge (Ques.) 143 (i).
 — applicants for position (M. for Ret.) 368 (i).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1184, 1246 (ii).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 719 (ii).
 Life-boat Service, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 604, 1160 (ii).
 Short Line Ry., materials used in construction (Ques.) 383 (i).
 Statutes, publication of, B. 159 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1122 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 170 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1256, 1261 (ii).

Swisher, Joseph, application for remuneration, 365, 368 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (County Courts) 655 (ii).

Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) 719 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Interior, Geological Survey) 1163 (ii); (Privy Council) 804 (i), 1160 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 1099 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Rewards for Saving Life, &c.) 1057 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1184, 1246 (ii).

Threats and Intimidations B. 162 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1229; in Com., 1229, 1232 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 964 (ii).

Wood Mr. J. F., Brockville.

Clerk of Crown in Chancery and Returning Officers, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to ref. Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 349 (i).

Private Bills Petitions (Ms. to extend time) 74, 413 (i).

—— M. to reduce time for posting, 784 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—Continued.

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 931 (ii).

St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. *Skinner*) on M. to ref. back to Standing Com., 706 (ii).

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. in N.W.T. B. 164 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1119 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 120 (i).

Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa, County.

Financial Commissioner, Eng., in Com. of Sup., 594 (i).

Gowanlock, Mrs. (remarks) on conc., 1268 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Res. (Mr. *Curran*) 132 (i).

Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 99, 1°*) 515.

Prorogation (congratulatory remarks) 1274 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Charges of Management (Financial Commissioner, Eng.) 594 (i).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 732 (ii).

Pensions: conc., 1268 (ii).

Vote on Disallowance, on Mr. *Mitchell's* explanation, 588 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.

Brace Harbor, P.E.I., Dredging (Ques.) 321 (i).

INDEX.-PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH; moved (Mr. Porter) 7; seconded (Mr. Weldon) 8 (i).
—— His Ex.'s reply, 153 (i).
—— TO HER MAJESTY: Receipt of Mess. from Senate, 680; prop. M. to consider, 706; (M.) 782 (ii).
- ADJOURNMENT, ASCENSION DAY AND QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Remarks, 300, 319; M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 320 (i).
—— CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 839 (ii).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 654, 1164 (ii).
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°*, 3 (pro forma) (i).
- ADVERTISING PICTURES, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 426.
- AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c.:
- AGRICULTURAL MACHINES: conc. in Ways and Means, 480-488 (i).
 - SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
 - AND COLONIZATION COM.: Ms. (Mr. White, Renfrew) to employ shorthand writer and to increase quorum, 153 (i).
 - ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 - ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 717, 982, 1166, 1240, 1267 (ii).
 - CATTLE, DISEASED, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 204 (i).
 - CENSUS RETURNS OF MAN.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 44 (i).
 - COL. EXHIBITION, CHINESE EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 1167, 1240 (ii).
 - CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M for Ret.* (Mr. Gordon) 110 (i).
 - CHIPMAN, C. O., EXTRA SERVICES re COLONIAL EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
 - CHOLERA, PRECAUTIONS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 670 (ii).
 - CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 - DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Carling) 19 (i).
 - DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 614 (i), 1164 (ii).
 - DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 - EXPERIMENTAL FARM, B.O.: Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 527 (i).
 - N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 16 (i).
 - MAN.: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 101 (i).
 - Com. of Sup., 720, 982 (ii).
 - HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
 - IMMIGRATION INTO DOM. DURING 1886: Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 45 (i).
 - in Com. of Sup., 730 (ii).
 - IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 728, 1267 (ii).
 - INDIAN AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION AND GEOLOGICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 526 (i).
 - "PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
 - QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 743, 1170 (ii).
 - WEST INDIES, REP. OF COMM'RS.: Ques. (Mr. Jones) 74, 278 (i).
 - WHITE POPULATION OF MAN.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 14 (i).
- Agriculture (Dept.) Act Amt. B. No. 116** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°, 590 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1031 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 12.)
- Alberta and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 59** (Mr. Hall). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 320; in Com. and 3°*, 601 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 78.)
- Alberta and B. C. Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 56** (Mr. Shanly). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70** (Mr. Shanly) 1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- ALEXANDRE, COMPLAINT AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 526 (i).
- AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 751 (ii).
- Anglo-Canadian Bank B. No. 98** (Mr. Taylor). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 53.)
- ANNAPOLIS FORT, PURCHASE OF MILITARY LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Jones) 379 (i).
- ANTICOSTI ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1169 (ii).
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 717, 745 (ii).
- ARICAT P. O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. Flynn) 790 (ii).
- ARMS IN THE NORTH-WEST: Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 1199 (ii).
- ARTHABASKA AND WOLFE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res., 1142 (ii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 717, 982, 1166, 1240; conc., 1267 (ii).
- ASCENSION DAY, ADJNMT. FOR: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 320 (i).
- ASECROFT AND BARKERVILLE, TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 1005 (ii).
- ASH, SUSAN. See "DIVORCE."
- ASSINIBOIA, EAST, RESIDENCE OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia) 102 (i).
- ASSISTANT RECEIVER GENERAL, HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
- ASSURANCE. See "INSURANCE."
- Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44** (Mr. Rykert). 1°*, 204; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 69.)
- AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
—— REP.: Remarks (Mr. Blake) presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 13 (i).
- AXES, CHOPPING, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 461, 462 (i); 965 (ii).
- AXLES AND SPRINGS: conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
- BAGGAGE, CUSTOMS REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 101 (i).

- BAIRD, LIEUT. COL. W. T. GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
- BALLOT BOX PATENTS: M. (Mr. Brown) for Sel. Com. to examine, 786 (ii).
- Banff National Park B. No. 16** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1^o, 74; 2^o, 194; M. for Com., 226; in Com., 227, 239; 3^o*, 301 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 32.)
- Deb. on M. for 2^o (Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Edgar) 194, 197; (Messrs. Mitchell and Casey) 195; (Messrs. Mills and Trow) 196; (Mr. Sproule) 197 (i).
- Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 226; in Com., 227, 229, 243; (Mr. Mitchell) on M. for Com., 226; in Com., 230, 239; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 227, 230, 234, 238, 242, 245; (Mr. Casey) 227-229, 231, 237, 242, 245; (Mr. Ellis) 228; (Mr. Hesson) 228, 231; (Mr. Blake) 229-231, 234; (Mr. Kirk) 231; (Mr. Trow) 232, 242; (Mr. Jones) 232; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 233, 245; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 234; (Mr. Davin) 235; (Mr. McMullen) 236; (Mr. Cockburn) 237; (Mr. Mallory) 237; (Sir Donald A. Smith) 238; (Mr. Davies) 240; (Mr. Burdett) 240; (Mr. Ives) 242; (Mr. Platt) 243 (i).
- BANFF SPRINGS, CLAIMS TO, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 364 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1189, 1247 (ii).
- BANKS AND BANKING:**
- ANGLO-CANADIAN BANK. See B. 98.
- BANK CIRCULATION, SECURITY FOR: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 205 (i).
- BRITISH CANADIAN LOAN AND INVESTMENT CO. See B. 61.
- CANADIAN PERMANENT LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. See B. 143.
- EASTERN CANADA LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. See B. 55.
- EXCHANGE BANK, AMOUNTS OWING GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mulock) 110 (i).
- FREEHOLD LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. See Bs. 71 and 156.
- NOVA SCOTIA PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY AND SAVINGS FUND. See B. 131.
- PENSION FUND SOCIETIES, &c. See B.
- PENSION FUND SOCIETY OF DOMINION BANK. See B. 48.
- PICTOU BANK WINDING-UP. See B. 85.
- SAVINGS BANKS FUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
- WESTERN CANADA LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. See B. 123.
- [See also "FINANCE."]
- BANK CIRCULATION, SECURITY FOR: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 205 (i).
- BARGE "WILLIAMS," PAYMENT TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).
- BARRACK LANDS, SHELBURNE, N. S.: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 668 (ii).
- BARRACKS IN B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 766 (ii).
- BARRELS, CONTAINING MEATS: conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
- BARRINGTON HARBOR, N. S., TENDERS FOR LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 383 (i).
- BARTLET'S WORK ON COAL AND IRON PRODUCTION OF DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
- BATTERIES, ARTILLERY, &c., SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
- Bay of Quinté Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. Robertson, Hastings). 1^o*, 359; 2^o*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 753 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 97.)
- BEAUCO CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
- BEAUBARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
- JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1260 (ii).
- POST OFFICE INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 786 (ii).
- LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 669 (ii).
- BED COMFORTERS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 964 (ii).
- BEDSON, MR., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 659, 1237 (ii).
- BEHRING'S SEA, SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS IN: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 24 (i).
- PROTECTION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS: Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 45 (i).
- PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. and remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 455 (i).
- BÉLANGER, P., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1003 (ii).
- BELTING, LEATHER: conc. in Ways and Means, 434 (i).
- BELL-BUOY FOR ST. JOHN HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 257 (i).
- BERGIN, SURGEON GEN., POSITION: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 1003.
- in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
- Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35** (Mr. Bowman). 1^o*, 190; 2^o*, 312 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 680 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 89.)
- BETTER TERMS. See "NOVA SCOTIA."
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John A. Macdonald) 1^o*, 3, pro forma (i).
- BILL (No. 2) Respecting Local Government in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Davin.) 1^o, 13 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) To amend "The Dominion Lands Act."—(Mr. Davin.) 1^o, 19 (i).
- BILL (No. 4) To amend "An Act (49 Victoria, Chapter 52) to punish Seduction and like Offences, and to make further provision for the protection of Women and Girls."—(Mr. Charlton.) 1^o*, 20; Order for 2^o dschgd. and B. withdn., 312 (i).
- BILL (No. 5) To amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. McLelan) 1^o*, 20; 2^o, 192; in Com., 225; 3^o*, 274 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 9)
- BILL (No. 6) To amend "The Government Railways Act."—(Mr. Pope.) 1^o*, 20; 2^o, 192; in Com., 326; 3^o, 364 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Department of Trade and Commerce.—(Sir John A. Macdonald) 1^o, 20; Res. prop. 191; 2^o*, 192; M. for Com. on Res., 361 (i); M. for Com. on B., 862; in Com., 867; Res. in Com., 884; B. in Com., and 3^o*, 890 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 8) To amend the Territories Real Property Act.—(Mr. Davin.) 1^o, 20 (i).

- BILL (No. 9) For the discharge of Insolvent Debtors whose estates have been distributed rateably among their Creditors.—(Mr. *Edgar*.)
1° 44; Order for 2° read, 272; M. for 2°, 282; 2°, 291 (i).
- BILL (No. 10) Respecting the Ontario Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 11) To incorporate "The St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company."—(Mr. *Bergin*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 12) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 538 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Curran*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 14) To incorporate "The Collingwood General and Marine Hospital."—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 126)
- BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the "Imperial Trusts Company of Canada."—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
1°*, 74; 2°*, 153 (i); in Com., 637; 3° m., 638; 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 115.)
- BILL (No. 16) Respecting the Banff National Park.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)
1°, 74; 2°, 194; M. for Com., 226; in Com., 227, 239; 3°*, 301 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting the Representation of the North-West Territories in the Senate of Canada.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°, 74; 2°, 197; in Com., 246, 301; 3°*, 302 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 18) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*.)
1°, 74 (i).
- BILL (No. 19) To amend the Law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
1°, 100 (i); 2°* and in Com., 644; 3°*, 646 (ii). 50-51 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 20) Respecting Public Stores.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
1°, 100; 2° and in Com., 273; 3°*, 301 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 21) To amend the Act respecting Public Morals and Public Convenience.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1°, 100; 2°, 273; in Com., 278; 3°*, 312 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers.—(Mr. *Shanly*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). 50-51 *Vic.*, c. 124.)
- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Watson*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Porter*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com., 538; 3°, 539 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 690 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°*, 539 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 925; conc. in and 3°*, 926 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°*, 539 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the Brandon, Souris and Rock Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 272 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Manufacturers' Life and Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Brown*.)
1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°, 539 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 30) To amend "The Companies Act."—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°, 111; 2°*, 291 (i); in Com., 1143; 3°*, 1144 (ii) (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 31) To amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1°, 142 (i).
- BILL (No. 32) To amend "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act."—(Mr. *Amyot*.)
1°, 142 (i).
- BILL (No. 33) Respecting the payment of Mortgages.—(Mr. *McMullen*.)
1°, 142 (i).
- BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°, 153; 2°*, 312 (i); ref. back to Com. on Rys., 479 (i); withdn.
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bowman*.)
1°*, 190; 2°*, 312 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the New Westminster Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Chisholm*.)
1°*, 190; 2°*, 272 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Regina and Wood Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davin*.)
1°*, 190; 2°*, 312 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).

- BILL (No. 38) To amend the Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Hamilton Central Railway Company."—(Mr. *McKay*.)
1°*, 190; 2°*, 272 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 630 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 39) To authorise the Grange Trust (limited) to wind up its affairs.—(Mr. *Masson*.)
1°*, 190; 2°*, 312 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 630 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 116.)
- BILL (No. 40) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act."—(Mr. *Jamieson*.)
1°, 190 (i).
- BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°, 190 (i); 2°, 884; in Com. and 3°*, 1029 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 42) to make provision for the appointment of a Solicitor General.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
Res. prop. and 1°, 191 (i); 2° m., 889 (ii); 2°*, Res. and B. in Com., and 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Niagara River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Rykert*.)
1°*, 204; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rykert*.)
1°*, 204; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 735 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 45) Further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rykert*.)
1°*, 204; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 46) To amend "The Dominion Elections Act."—(Mr. *Edgar*.)
1°, 204; 2° m., 539 (i).
- BILL (No. 47) To amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. *Pope*.)
1°*, 204; 2°*, 301; in Com., 361; 3°, 363 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in 1031 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1°*, 223; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 49) To incorporate the Upper Columbia River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara*.)
1°*, 223; 2°, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 50) To amend the Representation Act as respects certain Constituencies in British Columbia.—(Mr. *Baker*.)
1°, 223 (i).
- BILL (No. 51) To amend the Act respecting defective Letters Patent and the discharge of Securities to the Crown.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°, 277 (i).
- BILL (No. 52) To empower the Employés of Incorporated Companies to establish Pension Fund Societies.—(Mr. *Hall*.)
1°*, 277; 2°*, 543 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1152 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 53) To amend "The Electoral Franchise Act."—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1°, 277 (i).
- BILL (No. 54) To amend "The Chinese Immigration Act."—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
1°, 277 (i); 2°* and in Com., 642; 3°*, 643 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Kenny*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 113.)
- BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Shanly*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Prescott County Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scriver*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680. (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 58) To terminate the Trust respecting the South-Eastern Railway, to authorise its sale, and to incorporate the South-Eastern Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hall*.)
1°*, 300; M. for 2°, 369; 2°*, 444 (i).
- BILL (No. 59) To amend the Act incorporating the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hall*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 320; in Com. and 3°*, 601 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 60) Further to amend the Act incorporating the Western Assurance Company, and other Acts affecting the same.—(Mr. *Cockburn*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 61) To amend the Acts incorporating and relating to the British Canadian Loan and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 62) To reduce the Stock of the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company (limited), and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 320; (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)
1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 64) To repeal the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Cargill*.)
1°, 300 (i).

- BILL (No. 65) To amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
Res. prop., 223; in Com., 274; 1° of B., 301 (i); 2° and in Com., 641; 3°*, 642 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1°, 318; 2°*, 444; in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Massawippi Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°, 318; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 68) To amend The Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°, 319 (i).
- BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the Equity Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Curran*.)
1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Shanly*.)
1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- BILL (No. 71) To enable the Freehold Loan and Savings Company to extend their business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Denison*.)
1°*, 359; M. for 2°, 443 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Halifax and West India Steamship Company (limited).—(Mr. *Kenny*.)
1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Bay of Quinté Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*.)
1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1°*, 359; 2°, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *Hudspeth*.)
1°*, 360; 2°, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 76) To amend the Act respecting Sick and Distressed Mariners.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 360 (i); 2°* and in Com., 643; 3°*, 644 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 77) Respecting the Oxford Junction and New Glasgow Branch of the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
Res. prop., 273; M. for Com., 302; in Com., 312; 1° of B., 361 (i); 2° m., 646; 2°, 649; in Com. and 3°*, 1028 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 78) to incorporate "The Canada Accident and Indemnity Assurance Company."—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1°*, 370; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 79) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company, and to change the name thereof.—(Mr. *Scarth*.)
1°*, 383; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Sir *Donald Smith*.)
1°*, 383; 2°*, 539 (i).
- BILL (No. 81) To confirm and amend the Charter of incorporation of the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *Grandbois*.)
1°*, 383; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Smith, Ontario*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Londonderry Iron Company.—(Mr. *Kenny*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 121.)
- BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Scarth*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- BILL (No. 85) To authorise and provide for the winding-up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 86) Further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*.)
1°*, 413; withdn., 601 (i).
- BILL (No. 87) To revive and amend the Charter of the Quebec and James' Bay Railway Company, and to extend the time for commencing and completing the Railway of the said Company.—(Mr. *Grandbois*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the Canadian Horse Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Niagara and Woodstock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1°* and 2°, 441 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 90) To revive the Charter of the Quebec Railway Bridge Company, and to amend the same by extending the delay for commencement and completion of its works, and in other respects.—(Mr. *Grandbois*.)
1°*, 441; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 91) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act."—(Mr. *Tyrohitt*.)
1°, 442 (i).

- BILL (No. 92) To amend the Acts relating to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Foster.)
1° 442 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1031 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 93) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°, 442 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 884 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 94) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. McNeill.)
M. to introd. B., 413; 1°, 442 (i).
- BILL (No. 95) To amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting interest."—(Mr. Landry.)
1°, 443 (i).
- BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Dominion Oil Pipe Line and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1°*, 479; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 875 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 122.)
- BILL (No. 97) To authorise certain extensions of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)
1°*, 479; withdn., 601 (i).
- BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Anglo-Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Taylor.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Wright.)
1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii) (50-51 Vic., c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 100) Respecting the Waterloo and Magog Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 101) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Labelle.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)
1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 876; M. to place on Orders of the Day, 1001; in Com., 1083; 3°, 1092 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 103) To incorporate the Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)
1°*, 515; 2°, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 120.)
- BILL (No. 105) To incorporate the Hereford Branch Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 106) To incorporate the Standard Printing and Publishing Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 123.)
- BILL (No. 107) To amend Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting Duties of Customs.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°*, 524 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1144; 3° m., 1152, 1200; 3°*, 1220 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 108) For the relief of Marie Louise Noel—(A) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 804; 2° agreed to (Y. 81, N. 49) 876; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 130.)
- BILL (No. 109) Respecting "The Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada."—(Mr. Scarth.)
1°*, 524 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Scarth.)
1°*, 524 (i); 2°, 680; withdn., 889 (ii).
- BILL (No. 111) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, and to make better provision for the Trial of Claims against the Crown.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 524; Res. prop., 530 (i); 2° of B. m., 810; 2°, 814; Res. in Com., 814; B. in Com., 873, 876; Res. conc. in, 834; B. in Com. and 3° on a div., 890; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1222 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 112) For the protection of Railway Employés.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°, 539 (i).
- BILL (No. 113) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°, 539 (i); 2°, 817; M. for Com., 890; in Com., 892; Order for consdn. of B., 1007; 3°*, 1017 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 114) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 539 (i); 2° m., 1222; 2° and in Com., 1227; 3°, 1228 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, and to remove doubts as to the right of certain persons to vote at elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°, 590 (i); 2° and in Com., 884; 3°, 1028 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 116) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Agriculture.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°, 590 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1031 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 117) Respecting the Western Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 758; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Innes.)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 59.)

- BILL (No. 119)** To confer certain powers upon the St. Johns and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Coursol.*)
1°*, 638; 2° m., 875; 2°, 876 (ii); withdn.
- BILL (No. 120)** Respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 638; 2°*, 758; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 121)** To amend the Act respecting Canned Goods.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 638; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 814 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 122)** Respecting the conveyance of Liquors on board Her Majesty's Ships in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 638; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 814 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 123)** Respecting the Defacing of Counterfeit Notes, and the use of Imitations of Notes.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 638; 2°* and in Com., 808; 3°*, 809 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 124)** Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rykert.*)
1°*, 667; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 125)** To incorporate the Manufacturers' Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 667; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 126)** To amend "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act."—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 707; 2°* and in Com., 809; 3°*, 810 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 127)** To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 708; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 809 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 128)** To enable the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company to extend their business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 782; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 129)** Respecting the Primitive Methodist Colonisation Company (limited)—(*F*) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Small*)
1°* and 2°*, 924; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- BILL (No. 130)** To incorporate the Teeswater and Inverhuron Railway Company—(*D*) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Cargill*)
1°*, 745; 2°*, 785; in Com., and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 131)** Respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building Society and Savings Fund.—(Mr. *Tupper, Pictou.*)
1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 114.)
- BILL (No. 132)** Further to amend the Act incorporating the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Perley, Ottawa.*)
1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 133)** Respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 134)** To enable the St. Martin's and Upham Railway Company to sell its railway and property.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 135)** For the relief of Susan Ash—(*B*) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1° on a div., 804; 2° m., 1017; 2° agreed to (Y. 50, N. 42). 10 28; in Com., 1137; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to recom., neg. (Y. 35, N. 85) 1141; M. for 3° neg. (Y. 56, N. 61) 1142; M. to place on Order paper for 3°, 1 55; 3° m., 1220; recom. and 3° on a div., 1 21 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- BILL (No. 136)** To confer certain powers on Boards of Trade as to the licensing of Weighers.—(Mr. *Costigan*)
1°, 804; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 137)** Respecting the payment of Interest by the Crown.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 804; withdn., 1121 (ii).
- BILL (No. 138)** To provide for the payment of a yearly allowance to Godefroi Laviolette, late Warden of the Penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 111 (i); in Com., 806; 1°* of B., 808; 2° and in Com., 88; 3°*, 890 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 139)** To provide for an additional Subsidy to the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Sir *Charles Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 708; in Com., 814; 1°* of B., 817; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1029 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 140)** In addition to the Revised Statutes, Chapter six, respecting Representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 839; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 141)** To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter thirty-nine, respecting the Expropriation of Lands.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 862; Res. prop., 952; conc. in, 1033; 2° and in Com., 1033; 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 142)** for the protection of Laborers on board Vessels.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°, 862 (ii).
- BILL (No. 143)** To enable the Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Company to extend their business, and for other purposes—(*I*) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 876; 2°*, 926; in Com., 1142; 3°*, 1221 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 108.)

- BILL (No. 144) For the relief of John Monteith—(*J*) from the Senate.—(Mr. O'Brien.)
1° 876; 2° on a div., 926; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 129.)
- BILL (No. 145) For the relief of Fanny Margaret Riddell.—(*J*) from the Senate.—(Mr. Tupper, Pictou.)
1° on a div., 884; 2° on a div., 926; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1017 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 131.)
- BILL (No. 146) to amend "The Speedy Trials Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-five of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 924; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1032 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 147) To amend the North-West Territories Act;—(Mr. MacDowall.)
1°, 924 (ii).
- BILL (No. 148) To provide for the improvement and management of the Harbor of Sorel.—(Mr. Labelle.)
1°*, 925 (ii).
- BILL (No. 149) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
1°, 2°* and 3°, 926 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Royal Victoria Hospital—(*M*) from the Senate.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°* and 2°*, 951; in Com. and 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 125.)
- BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the Canada Atlantic Steamship Company.—(Mr. Tupper, Pictou.)
1° and 2°*, 1001; in Com. and 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 152) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1° and 2°*, 1001; in Com., 1120, 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 153) To amend "The Immigration Act"—(*Q*) from the Senate.—(Mr. Bowell.)
1°*, 1028; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 154) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter fifty-one, respecting Real Property in the Territories—(*N*) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°*, 1028; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 155) For the relief of William Arthur Lavell—(*H*) from the Senate.—(Mr. Ferguson, Leeds.)
1° and 2° on a div., 1028; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1137 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 128.)
- BILL (No. 156) To enable the Freehold Loan and Savings Company to extend their business.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°, 2°* and 3°*, 1028 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 112.)
- BILL (No. 157) To confirm a certain agreement between Her Majesty and the Western Counties Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Pope.)
Res. prop., 591 (i); in Com. and 1°* of B., 1031; 2° m., 1127; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1129 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 158) To authorise the advance of certain sums of money to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, to complete the Graving Dock and other improvements in said harbor.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 592 (i); M. for Com., 1031; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1032; 2°*, 1124; in Com., 1125; 3°*, 1127 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 159) To amend Chapter two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting the publication of the Statutes."—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°, 1033; 2°*, 1121; in Com., 1122; 3° on a div., 1124 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 160) To amend The Indian Act—(*O*) from the Senate.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°*, 1033; 2°* and in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 161) To amend an Act to authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1074 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 162) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 173, respecting Threats, Intimidations and other Offences.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1075; 2° m., 1152; deb. adjd., 1155; deb. rsm'd, 2° and in Com., 1229; 3° on a div., 1233 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 163) Respecting the Council of the North-West Territories.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°, 1075; 2°*, in Com. and 3° on a div., 1233 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 164) To authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein named.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 1117; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1120; in Com. and 3°*, 1221 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 165) to provide for advances to be made by the Government of Canada to the Fredericton and Saint Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 862; in Com., 1029; conc. in and 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 1120 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 166) to amend Chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Thompson.)
Res. prop., 862; in Com., 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 1127 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 168) respecting the improvement of the River St. Lawrence.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1142; in Com., 1156; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°* of B., 1159 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 169) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1887, and the 30th June, 1888, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1273 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 1.)

- BILL (No. 170)** to authorise the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
 Res. prop., 1142; in Com., 1249; 1°* and 2°* of B. in Com. and 3°*, 1266 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 170.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 1274 (ii).
- BLACK COD BANKS, B.C., REP. ON EXPEDITION**: Ques (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 527 (i).
- BLACKING, &c.**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 426 (i).
- BLANCHE RIVER, COMPLETION OF WHARF**: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 205 (i).
- BLOUIN, LOUIS, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 543 (i).
- BLUE BOOKS AND DEPTL. REPS., DISTRIBUTION**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to change Rule, 295 (i).
- BLUEING, LAUNDRY**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 426 (i).
- BOILERS IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, INSPECTION, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 383 (i).
- BOILER TUBES, &c.**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 506 (i).
- BOISVERT, L., APPOINTMENT AS LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER**: M. for O. C.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 803 (ii).
- BOLDUC, CAPT. L., DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 525 (i).
- BOOKS, EDUCATIONAL**: in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 366 (ii).
- BOOT ISLAND BREAKWATER**: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).
- BOOMS AND PIERS IN TRENT RIVER**: Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 708 (ii).
- BOURINOT'S "PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE"**: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 14 (i).
- BRACES**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 427 (i).
- BRACKET BOARDS ON CHISHOLM'S DAM**: Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 786 (ii).
- BRAE HARBOR, P.E.I., DREDGING**: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 321 (i).
- Brandon, Souris and Rock Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp.**
 B. No. 28 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 272 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 25** (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
 ——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1260 (ii).
- BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &c.** See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- BRICK, FIRE**: in Com. on *Ways and Means*, 967 (ii).
- BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE Co.'s CONTRACT**: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 142 (i).
- VESSELS, SEIZURES. See "BEHRING'S SEA."
- British Canadian Loan and Investment Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 61** (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°* 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**:
 AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
 ASHROFT AND BARKERVILLE TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 1005 (ii).
 BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 766 (ii).
 BATTERIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA—Continued.**
 BLACK COD BANKS, B. C., REP. OF EXPEDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 527 (i).
 BEHRING'S SEA, PROTECTION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 45 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 21; Remarks, 455 (i).
 CLOTH SUPPLIED PENITENTIARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Baker*) 14 (i).
 "U" BATTERY, COMMAND OF: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1004 (ii).
 C. P. R. See general heading.
 CHINESE IMMIGRATION, AMOUNT COLLECTED: in Com. of Sup., 1134 (ii).
 ——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 110 (i).
 CUSTOMS TARIFF AND ENTERING GOODS: Remarks, 524 (i).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 527 (i).
 DRILL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
 ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. Co.'s LANDS ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 110 (i).
 ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, AND CLAIM OF McNAMEN & Co.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 527 (i).
 FISHERIES, DEEP SEA: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
 FORTIFICATIONS OF B. C., REP. OF COL. O'BRIEN: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 102 (i).
 INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (ii).
 JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, LIGHTHOUSE AT: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
 LIFE-SAVING STATION ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 45 (i).
 NEW WESTMINSTER SOUTHERN RY. Co. See B. 36.
 PORT SAN JUAN HARBOR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
 PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 977, 980 (ii).
 REPRESENTATION ACT AMT. See B. 50.
 TELEGRAPHIC SIGNAL SERVICE IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
 YUKON RIVER EXPLORATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
- BRITISH COPYRIGHT WORKS, REPRINTS**: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 15 (i).
 ——— M. for Stmt. of Sums collected (Mr. *Edgar*) 22 (i).
- BRITISH GUM, DRESSING, &c.**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 445 (i).
- BRITON MEDICAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSOCIATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 786 (ii).
- BROKERAGE, &c., 4 PER CENT. LOANS**, in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
- BROKOVSKI, E., COR. RESPECTING**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 803 (ii).
- BUDGET, THE**: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 192, 258.
 ——— Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 300 (i).
 ——— Annual Statement (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 384 (i).
 See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- BUGGIES, FARM WAGGONS, &c.**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 427 (i).
- BUOYS IN RICHELIEU RIVER, CONTRACTS AWARDED**: Ques. (Mr. *Clayes*) 321 (i).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald* and others) 100, 110 (i).
 ——— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 479
 ——— M. to take in Wednesdays, 952 (ii).
 ——— M. to take in Mondays, 1116 (ii).
 ——— Ms. to take in Saturdays, 804, 1076 (ii).
- BUTTER, DUTY AND INSPECTION**: Ques. (Mr. *Hickey*) 154.
 ——— IMPORTS FROM THE U. S., 1883 TO 1887: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 211 (i).
 ——— SUBSTITUTES, IMPORTATION OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 205 (i).
 ——— SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 101 (i).
- BUTTONS, VEGETABLE IVORY, &c.**: conc. in *Ways and Means*, 427 (i).

- CABLE TO PELEE ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Brien) 786 (ii).
- CAMPBELL, C., PRÉCIS ON DEFENCES OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
- CAMPBELL, MR., LATE M. P. FOR DIGBY: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) on decease, 543 (i).
- CAMPBELL, MR., LATE M. P. FOR RENFREW: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) on decease, 1006 (ii).
- CAMPBELL, SIR ALEXANDER, COMMISSION TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 150 (i).
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- Can. Accident and Indemnity Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. Mulock). 1°*, 370; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 106.)
- Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 132 (Mr. Perley, Ottawa). 1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 67.)
- Can. Atlantic Steamship Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. Tupper, Pictou). 1° and 2°*, 1001; in Com. and 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 99.)
- Can. Permanent Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. Cockburn). 1°*, 876; 2°*, 926; in Com., 1142; 3°*, 1221 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 108.)
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 68 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 319 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 40 (Mr. Jamieson). 1°, 190 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. Tyrwhitt). 1°, 442 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act Repeal B. No. 64 (Mr. Cargill). 1°, 300 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT, VIOLATIONS OF: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) on M. for Adjmt., 1115 (ii).
- See "Prohibition."
- Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s further Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. Rykert). 1°*, 204; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 56.)
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
- EXTENSION TO QUEBEC HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 44 (i).
- IN COM. OF SUP., 766, 1171; conc., 1267 (ii).
- LAND SALES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia) 317 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia) 527 (i).
- IN MAN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 222 (i).
- LAURENTIDES BRANCH LINES, TARIFF RATES: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 525
- ONDERDONK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1003 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 1034 (ii).
- RATES IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 320 (i).
- REGINA TOWN SITE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN CO. AND GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 803 (ii).
- ROLLING STOCK. See "ROLLING STOCK."
- WINTER PORT: on M. for Com. of Sup., 967 (ii).
- CAN. HORSES IN THE U.S., PROHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 1044 (ii).
- Can. Horse Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. Small). 1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 107.)
- Can. Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. Taylor). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 120.)
- Can. Society of Civil Engineers incorp. B. No. 22 (Mr. Shanly). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 124.)
- CAN. WORKINGMEN IN THE U.S., PROHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1046 (ii).
- CANALS:
- BEAUHARNOIS: in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
- CANAL OFFICERS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
- CARILLON: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- CHAMBLEY, APPOINTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Préfontaine) 19 (i).
- WIDENING: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 142 (i).
- CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
- COOPER, R. W., EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- CULBUTE: in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
- LACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 832, 838, 1182 (ii).
- LAKE ST. FRANCIS: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
- MURRAY, CONTRACTS FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 322 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
- PERLEY, H. F., EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- RIDEAU: in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON LEASES: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS ENLARGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 313 (i).
- ST. ANNE'S: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 832 (ii).
- ST. PETER'S: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 830; conc., 1268 (ii).
- TAX: in Com. of Sup., 838, 1179 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 669; in Com. of Sup., 836 (ii).
- TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 835 (ii).
- VALUATORS SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- WELLAND CANAL BRIDGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 835 (ii).
- "WILLIAMS" BARGE, PAYMENT TO OWNERS: in Com. of Sup., 1182 (ii).
- WILLIAMSBURG: in Com. of Sup., 832, 838 (ii).
- Canned Goods Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. Costigan). 1°, 638; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 814 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 38.)
- CAPE BRETON RY.: in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
- CAP À LA CORNEILLE BOOMS: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 1001 (ii).
- CAP ST. IGNACE STATION HOUSE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Dessaint) 103 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 918 (ii)
- CARAQUETTE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1262 (ii).
- CARILLON AND GRENVILLE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1263 (ii).
- CARRIAGES: conc. in Ways and Means, 427 (i).
- CARON, G., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1003 (ii).
- CATTLE, DISEASED, IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Ont.) 204 (i).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS See "INDIANS."
- "C" BATTERY, COMMAND OF: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1004 (ii).
- CENSUS RETS. OF MAN.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 44.
- CENTRAL RY., N.S., SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 214 (i).
- CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. See "DEPUTY SPEAKER."

CHAMBLAY CANAL, APPOINTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 19 (i).
 ——— **WIDENING:** Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 142 (i).
CHAMBERLIN, B., EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 591–597 (ii).
CHICOOUTIMI AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1262 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 277 (i); 2°* and in Com., 642; 3°*, 643 (ii). (50–51 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 110 (i).
Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°, 153; 2°*, 312; ref. back to Com. on Rys., 479 (i) withdn.
CHIPPEWA INDIANS. See "INDIANS."
CHIPMAN, C. C., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES re COLONIAL EX.: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
CHISHOLM'S DAM, RIVER TRENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 669 (ii).
 ——— **BRACKET BOARDS:** Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 786 (ii).
CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS. See "INDIANS."
CHOLERA, PRECAUTIONS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 670 (ii).
CHOUNARD, D., CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1005 (ii).
CHROMOS, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
CIGARS AND CIGARETTES: conc. in Ways and Means, 439 (i).
CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 596–612 (i), 651, 1129, 1162 1237; conc., 1366 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. *McNeill*). M. to introd. B., 412; 1°, 442 (i).
 ——— **EXAMINERS REP.:** presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 44 (i).
 ——— **EXAMINATIONS, 1881:** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 143 (i).
 ——— **PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 383 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1199 (ii).
 ——— **STAFF, NAMES AND ADDRESSES, &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 383 (i).
 ——— **VACANCIES, SUPERANNUATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 44 (i).
 ——— See "SECRETARY OF STATE."
CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY:
 ——— List of Members presented to Clerk of House, 1 (i).
 ——— ordered to attend House with books, papers, &c., re Queen's, N.B., Election, 4 (i).
 ——— M. (Mr. *Mills*) ordering Clerk to attend with papers, &c., re Returns made to Writs, 25 (i).
 ——— M. (Mr. *Mills*) to ref. Return of Clerk to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 322 (i).
 ——— Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) requiring Clerk to address a letter to Clerk of House, 325 (i).
 Deb. (Mr. *Blake*) 325; (Mr. *Platt*) 327; (Mr. *Burdett*) 328; (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) 328; (Mr. *Mallory*) 329; (Mr. *Campbell*, *Kent*) 330; (Mr. *Boyle*) 330; (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) 331; (Mr. *McMullen*) 331; (Mr. *Bowman*) 334; (Mr. *Taylor*) 334; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 335; agreed to (Y. 104, N. 74) 359 (i).
 Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 333; Deb. (Mr. *Tupper*, *Pictou*) 338; (Mr. *Lister*) 338; (Mr. *Trow*) 339; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 339; (Mr. *Robertson*, *Hastings*) 340; (Mr. *Weldon*, *St John*) 341; (Mr. *Bowell*) 341; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 342; (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) 344; (Mr. *Laurier*) 344; (Mr. *Sproule*) 345; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 346; (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 346; (Mr. *Charlton*) 347; (Mr. *Wood*, *Brockville*) 349; (Mr. *Peterson*, *Brant*) 350; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 352; (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 358; neg. (Y. 74, N. 104) 358 (i).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY.—Continued.
 ——— Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 597, 601 (i).
 Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 597, 600; (Mr. *Welsh*) 597; (Mr. *Mills*) 597; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 599; (Mr. *Davis*) 601; (Mr. *McMullen*) 603; (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 604; (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) 604; (Mr. *Ferguson*, *Leeds*) 605; (Mr. *Madill*) 605, 608; (Messrs. *Edgar and Mills*) 606; (Mr. *Mallory*) 607; (Mr. *Campbell*, *Kent*) 608; (Mr. *Platt*) 609; (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 610; (Mr. *Somer ville*) 611; (Mr. *Peterson*, *Brant*) 611 (i).
 ——— Letter to Clerk: presented to House (Mr. *Speaker*) 370 (i).
 ——— **EXTRA CLERKS IN OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
CLEMENCY OF THE CROWN: See "PRISONERS."
CLOTH, &c., SUPPLIED TO PENITENTIARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Baker*) 14 (i).
CLOTHING, COTTON, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 523.
 ——— **READY-MADE, &c.:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 965.
CLOTHES WRINGERS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
COAL: deb. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).
Cobourg, Blairton and Marmora Railway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Guillet*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50–51 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
COLBY, CHAS. C. See "DEPUTY SPEAKER."
COLLARS, COTTON OR LINEN: conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1113, 1129, 1135, 1196; conc. 1269 (ii).
Collingwood General and Marine Hospital incorp. B. No. 14 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 72; 2°*, 153 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50–51 *Vic.*, c. 126.)
COLLINS, JAS., M.D. See "INDIANS."
COLONIAL CONFERENCE, INSTRUCTIONS TO CAN. REPRESENTATIVES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 219 (i).
 ——— M. for copy of Com., &c. (Mr. *Casey*) 150 (i).
COLONIAL EXHIBITION AND GEOLOGICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 526 (i).
COLONIZATION Co.'s IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 786 (ii).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1002 (ii).
COMBS, DRESS AND TOILET: in Com. on Ways and Means, 964 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 ——— **TREATIES, PAPERS, &c., RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 143, 154 (i).
 ——— **RELATIONS WITH FRANCE:** Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) 1006 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (ii).
COMMITTEES, CHAIRMAN OF. See "DEPUTY SPEAKER."
COMMITTEES:
BALLOT BOX PATENTS: M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sel. Com. to examine, 786 (ii).
 "DEBATES": M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sp. Com. to supervise, 4 (i).
 ——— on M. to conc. in names, Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to change, 5 (i).
McNAMÉ & Co., CLAIM re ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: M. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) for Sel. Com., 527 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, RULES RESPECTING: M. (Mr. *Hall*) for Sel. Com. to define practice, 688 (ii).
SELECT STANDING: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Com. to prepare Lists, 4 (i).

COMMITTEES—*Continued.*

SELECT STANDING: substitution of Mr. Mills' name for Mr. Blake's to prepare Lists, 6 (i).

— Incorrect Lists reported, 13 (i).

— Corrected Lists presented, 18 (i).

— M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to add names, 154 (i), 668 (ii).

SIX NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS TO LAND ON GRAND RIVER: M. (Mr.

Paterson, Brant) to ref. to Sel. Com., 206 (i).

Companies, Act Amt. B. No. 30 (Mr. McCarthy).
1°, 111; 2°*, 291; in Com., 1143; 3°*, 1144 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 20.)

COMPANIES. *See*

BAY OF QUINTE BRIDGE CO.

BRITISH CANADIAN LOAN AND INVESTMENT CO.

CANADA ACCIDENT AND INDEMNITY ASSURANCE CO.

— ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP CO.

— PERMANENT LOAN AND SAVINGS CO.

CANADIAN POWER CO.

— HORSE INS. CO.

— SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS.

COMPANIES' ACT AMT.

DOM. OIL PIPE LINE AND MANUFACTURING CO.

EASTERN CAN. SAVINGS AND LOAN CO.

EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.

"EMPIRE" PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.

EQUITY INS. CO.

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO.

FREEHOLD LOAN AND SAVINGS CO.

GRANGE TRUST CO.

GUARANTEE AND PENSION FUND SOCIETY OF DOM. BANK.

HALIFAX AND WEST INDIES STEAMSHIP CO.

IMPERIAL TRUSTS CO. OF CAN.

LONDONDERRY IRON CO.

MANUFACTURERS' LIFE AND ACCIDENT INS. CO.

— ACCIDENT INS. CO.

NIAGARA RIVER BRIDGE CO.

NOVA SCOTIA PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY, & C.

ONTARIO AND QU'APPELLE LAND CO.

PENSION FUND SOCIETIES, & C.

PRIMITIVE METHODIST COLONISATION CO.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION CO.

"STANDARD" PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.

ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE HYDRAULIC AND MANUFACTURING CO.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP CO.

WESTERN ASSURANCE CO.

— CAN. LOAN AND SAVINGS CO.

[*See also "RAILWAYS" and "SUBSIDIES."*]

COMPENSATION TO RELATIVES OF W. C. GILCHRIST FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 154.

CONCURRENCE, 1266-1269 (ii).

CONTINGENCIES, MILITIA, INCLUDING GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 15 (i).

CONVERTED ELECTIONS. *See* "ELECTIONS."

COOPER, R. W., SERVICES *re* TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).

COPYRIGHT WORKS, BRITISH REPRINTS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 15 (i).

— SUMS COLLECTED: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Edgar) 22 (i).

CORINTH POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 320 (i).

CORN-MEAL: deb. in Ways and Means, 509 (i).

CORNWALL FLOODS RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 1190, 1238 (ii).

CORNWALL'S VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1263 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1265 (ii).

COTTON FABRICS, PRINTED OR DYED: conc. in Ways and Means, 428-432 (i).

Council of the N. W. T. B. No. 163 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°, 1075; 2°*, in Com. and 3° on a div., 1233 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 29.)

Counterfeit Notes. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

CREIGHTON, MR. J., INDIAN AGENT AT SAUGEEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Somerville) 314 (i).

Criminal Law (procedure in criminal cases) B. No. 19 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 100; 2°* and in Com., 644; 3°*, 646 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 50.)

Criminal Law (public morals, &c.) B. No. 21 (Mr. Charlton). 1°, 100; 2°, 273; in Com., 278; 3°*, 312 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 48.)

Criminal Law (counterfeit and imitation notes) B. No. 123 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 638; 2°* and in Com., 808; 3°*, 809 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 47.)

Criminal Law (ship laborers' protection) B. No. 142 (Mr. Amyot). 1°, 862 (ii).

Criminal Law (seduction, &c.) B. No. 4 (Mr. Charlton). 1°*, 20; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 312 (i).

Criminal Law (speedy trials Act, Chap. 175 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 924; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1032 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 51.)

Criminal Law (threats, intimidations, &c., Chap. 173 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 162 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1075; 2° m., 1152; deb. adjd., 1155; deb. rsmtd., 2° and in Com., 1229; 3° on a div., 1233 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 49.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).

CROWN, EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY: prop. Res (Mr. Sproule) 798 (ii).

Crown Securities. *See* "LETTERS PATENT."

COUNTY COURT OF ELGIN, JR. JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 143 (i).

— ESSEX, DEP. JUDGE FOR COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Brien) 786 (ii).

COUNTY COURTS, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).

CUFFS, COTTON OR LINEN: conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:

ANIMALS, & C., EXPORTED, VALUES: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 15 (i).

APPRAISERS: in Com. of Sup., 1131 (ii).

BUTTER, DUTY AND INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. Hickey) 154 (i).

— IMPORTATION FROM THE U. S.: M. for Ret (Mr. Taylor). 211 (i).

— SUBSTITUTES, SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. Fisher) 101 (i).

— IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. Fisher) 205 (i).

CANADIAN WORKINGMEN IN THE U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Patterson) Essex) 1045 (ii).

COAL OIL IMPORTATION IN BULK: in Com. on B. 107, 1144-1149 (ii).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE TARIFF, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 708 (ii).

DETECTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1132 (ii).

CUSTOMS LAWS AMT.: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 277 (i); (Mr. Curran) 953 (ii).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.

- ELM LOGS, EXPORT DUTY : in Com. on B. 107, 1150, 1201, 1214 (ii).
 EXPORT OF SPIRITS AND IMPORTED CORN : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 143 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS : M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 15 (i).
 FINES AND SEIZURES : in Com. of Sup., 1135 (ii).
 FLOUR INSPECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 143 (i).
 GARRISON, MR., APPOINTMENT AS SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS, HALIFAX : in Com. of Sup., 1130 (ii).
 GRAIN EXPORTS, VALUES : M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 15 (i).
 IMPORTS OF TEA, CHINA AND JAPAN : M. for Ret. (Mr. Bowman) 23 (i).
 IN COM. OF SUP., 613 (i), 1129, 1195, 1237 (ii).
 IRON BOUNTIES, AMOUNTS PAID ON MANUFACTURES : Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 371 (i).
 IRON DRAWBACKS : in deb. on Ways and Means, 467 (i).
 IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRIES : in Com. on Ways and Means, 468, 488, 504 (i); 522, 965, 1207 (ii).
 IRON DUTIES : REMARKS (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1079 (ii).
 ——— EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENTERING GOODS : in Com. on B. 107, 1220 (ii).
 MONTREAL COTTON CO. : COR. WITH DEPT. Ques. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 102 (i).
 ——— IRREGULARITIES : Ques., (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 102; M. for Ret., 222 (i).
 ——— REMARKS (Mr. Paterson, Brant) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 954-957 (ii).
 PREVENTIVE OFFICERS APPOINTED ON FRONTIER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 223 (i).
 REGULATIONS RESPECTING BAGGAGE : Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 101 (i).
 "ST. ANNE," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 803 (ii).
 SEIZURES BY DETECTIVES : in Com. of Sup., 1133 (ii).
 SPIRITS, SEIZURES AND CONFISCATION : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 803 (ii).
 STILLS, ILLICIT, SEIZURES BY INLAND REVENUE DEPT. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
 TEA, IMPORTS, CHINA AND JAPAN : M. for Ret. (Mr. Bowman) 23 (i).
 TOBACCO, INCREASED DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 320 (i).
 ——— SEIZURES, ILLEGAL SALES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
 TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS : presented (Mr. Bowell) 13 (i).
 WHISKEY PASSED AS VINEGAR : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 102 (i).
 ——— UNLAWFUL MANUFACTURE OF : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 20 (i).

Customs Duties (Chap. 33 Rev. Statutes) Act Amt.

B. No. 107 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°*, 524 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1144; 3° m., 1152, 1200; 3°*, 1220 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 39.)

Deb. on M. for 3° (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1200; (Mr. Hesson) 1201; (Mr. Roome) 1203; (Messrs. Edwards and Armstrong) 1204; (Mr. Masson) 1205; (Sir Charles Tupper) 1207, 1217; (Mr. Jones) 1207; (Mr. McDougald, Pictou) 1209; (Messrs. McMillan [Huron] and Ellis) 1212; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1214; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 1214; (Mr. Montague) 1217; (Mr. Mills) 1217; (Mr. Mitchell) 1218; (Mr. Laurier) 1219; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1219; (Mr. Bowell) 220; (Mr. Watson) 1229; (Mr. Scarth) 1220 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. reorganisation B. No. 41 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°, 190 (i); 2°, 884; in Com. and 3°*, 1029 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 11.)

CUTLERY, PLATED : CONC. in Ways and Means, 435 (i).

DALTON, WM., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1200; remarks, 1249 (i).

"DAVID J. ADAMS," CASE AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 312 (i).

DAWSON, DR., EXTRA SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).

- "DEBATES," OFFICIAL, PUBLICATION : in Com. of Sup., 667.
 ——— DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 1005 (ii).
 ——— AND NEWSPAPER REP. : Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Scarth) 615, 1156 (ii).
 ——— SUPPOSED ERROR IN REP. : Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kenny) 784 (ii).
 ——— Remarks on Rep. of Com., 1155 (ii).
 DEBT, PUBLIC, GROSS AND NET : Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 14.
 ——— OF CAN. : deb. on conc. in Ways and Means, 467, 472-484, 593 (i).
 ——— in Com. on B. 107, 1217 (ii).
 DE BLOIS MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1004 (ii).
 DEEP-SEA FISHERIES OF B.C. : Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 102 (i).
 DEFENCES OF CANADA : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1171 (ii).
 DELEHANTY, PATRICK, CLAIM FOR INJURIES : Ques. (Mr. Campbell, Kent) 668 (ii).
 DEPTL. REPS., DISTRIBUTION : prop. M. (Mr. Charlton) to change Rule, 144 (i).
 DEP. SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS. : prop. M. (Mr. Fisher) to rescind Order of Standing Com., 296; neg. (Y. 66, N. 109) 299; remarks (Mr. Blake) 320 (i).
 ——— M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to appoint Mr. C. C. Colby, 370 (i).
 DIGBY, N.S., REPRESENTATION : M. (Mr. Jones) to issue Writ, 1074 (ii).
 DIONNE, J., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 321 (i).
 DIPPER HARBOR BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 785 (ii).
 DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS Ms. for Com., read, 149, 258 (i); Remarks (Mr. Watson) 369 (i).
 ——— Ms. (Mr. Watson) to make first Order of the Day, 383, 480 (i).
 ——— prop. Res. (Mr. Watson) 543 (i).
 Deb. (Mr. Watson) 543-553; (Sir Charles Tupper) 553; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 559; (Mr. Daly) 564; (Mr. Dawson) 567; (Mr. Blake) 568; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 576; (Mr. Davies) 579; (Sir Donald Smith) 581; (Mr. Landry) 582; (Mr. Royal) 583; (Mr. Armstrong) 584; (Mr. Watson) 587; neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 587 (i).
 ——— VOTE ON DIVISION : Explanation, 588 (i).

DIVISIONS :

- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY AND RETURNING OFFICERS : Res. (Mr. Mills) to ref. Ret. of Clerk to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 322; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 325; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Davies) 336; neg. (Y. 74, N. 104) 358; Amt. agreed to (Y. 104; N. 74) 359 (i).
 DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS : Res. (Mr. Watson) 543; neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 587 (i).
 DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS. : Res. (Mr. Fisher) to rescind Order of Standing Com., 296; neg. (Y. 66, N. 109) 299 (i).
 DIVORCE, ASH, SUSAN, RELIEF B. 135 (Mr. Small) : 2° agreed to (Y. 81, N. 49) 876; on 3°, Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 1140; neg. (Y. 35, N. 85) 1141; 3° neg. (Y. 56, N. 61) 1142 (ii).
 ——— NOLAN, MARIE LOUISE, RELIEF B. 108 (Mr. Small) : 2° agreed to (Y. 81, N. 49) 876 (ii).
 DUNN, J. R. : M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow Counsel re Examination before Bar of House, 616; Amt. (Mr. Davies) 618; neg. (Y. 43, N. 119) 623; M. agreed to (Y. 154, N. 2) 624 (ii).
 HOME RULE FOR IRELAND : Res. (Mr. Curran) 46; Amt. (Mr. McNeill) 54; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 98; neg. (Y. 49, N. 133) Amt. (Mr. Davin) 126; neg. (Y. 60, N. 128) 137; Amt. (Mr. McNeill) neg. (Y. 56, N. 132) 137; amended Res., 140; agreed to (Y. 135, N. 47) 141 (i).

DIVISIONS - *Continued.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: M. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) to disagree in 2nd Rep. of Com. re Queen's, N.B., Election, 671; Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) 677; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) 683; neg. (Y. 85, N. 104) 702; Amt. agreed to (Y. 105, N. 85) 706; main Motion agreed to on same div., 706 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 842; Amt. (Mr. *Girouard*) 846; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) 851; neg. (Y. 38, N. 145) 947; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 136) 948; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 948; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) agreed to (Y. 91, N. 86) 950; Res. neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 950 (ii).

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION: Res. (Mr. *Skinner*) to amend Ret., 154; Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to ref. Ret. of Returning Officer to Com. on Privileges and Elections, agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 189 (i).

Divorce, Ash, Susan, Relief B. No. 135 (Mr. *Small*). 1° on a div., 804; 2° m., 1017; 2° agreed to (Y. 50, N. 42) 1028; in Com., 1137; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to recom., neg. (Y. 35, N. 85) 1141; M. for 3° neg. (Y. 53, N. 61) 1142; M. to place on Order paper for 3°, 1155; 3° m., 1220; recom. and 3° on a div., 1221 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 127.)

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Thompson*) 1017, 1027; (Mr. *Davies*) 1021; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1026; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 1026; (Mr. *Mills*) 1027; in Com. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1137; (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*) 1138; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1138; (Mr. *Hills, Bothwell*) 1139; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 1139; (Mr. *Thompson*) 1140 (ii).

Divorce, Lavell, William Arthur, Relief B. No. 155 (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*). 1° and 2° on a div., 1028; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1137. (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 128.)

Divorce, Monteith, John, Relief B. No. 144 (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°, 876; 2° on a div., 926; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 129.)

Divorce, Noel, Marie Louise, Relief B. No. 108 (Mr. *Small*). 1° on a div., 804; 2° agreed to (Y. 81, N. 49) 876; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 130.)

Divorce, Riddell, Fanny Margaret, Relief B. No. 145 (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*). 1° on a div., 884; 2° on a div., 926; in Com. and 3°* on a div., 1017 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 131.)

DODD, DR. See "INDIANS."

Dom. Bank. See "GUARANTEE."

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 142 (i).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 707; 2°* and in Com., 809; 3°*, 810 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 204; 2° m., 539 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Sir *Jhn A. Macdonald*). 1° 590 (i); 2° and in Com., 884; 3°, 1028 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

DOM. EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 19 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 589 (i); 2°, 817; M. for Com., 890; in Com., 892; Order for consdn. of B., 1007; 3°*, 1017 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 31.)

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1136, 1197 (ii).

— SALES AND RECEIPTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 14 (i).

DOM. LIME RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*). 1143; in Com., 1261 (ii).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).

Dom. Oil Pipe Line and Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 479; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 875 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 122.)

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CLAIM OF CONTRACTOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 803 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).

DRAWBACKS ON IRON: deb. on conc. in Ways and Means, 473, 499 (i).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 980 (ii).

— IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, King's*) 669 (ii).

— BRAE HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 321 (i).

DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).

— OF 9TH BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 670 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 708, 1234 (ii).

DRILL SHEDS AND RIFLE RANGES: in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1142; in Com., 1259 (ii).

DUFFY, D.A., CLAIM FOR EXTRAS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 803 (ii).

DUMONT, GABRIEL, AND RECENT AMNESTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 525 (i).

DUNDAS, PUBLIC OFFICES OR BUILDINGS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 110 (i).

DUNN, JOHN R. See "QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION."

DUNSCOMBE, MR., SERVICES, re SEIZURE OF "ATALAYA": in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).

DURANTAYE SENATORSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 708 (ii).

DUTIES, COMMUTATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).

Duties of Customs. See "CUSTOMS."

EARTHENWARE AND STONWARE: conc. in Ways and Means, 432 (i).

Eastern Canada Savings and Loan Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Kenny*). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 113.)

Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Scarth*). 1°*, 413; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 117.)

Electoral Franchise Act. See "FRANCHISE."

ELECTIONS:

BEAUCHE, CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS: in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY. See general heading.

DIGBY, N.S., REPRESENTATION OF: M. to issue Writ (Mr. *Jones*) 1074.

DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT. See Bs. 32 and 126.

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. See Bs. 46 and 115.

ELECTIONS, GENERAL, 1874: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*) 209 (i).

— 1887, RETURNING OFFICERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 223.

— VOTES POLLED: M. for Stimt.* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 110 (i).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT AMT. See Bs. 53 and 114.

HALDIMAND ELECTION, 1887, RETURNING OFFICER'S RET: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 372 (i).

HEBERT, H., REVISING OFFICER, MONTMAGNY; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 803 (ii).

ELECTIONS—Continued.

- HERBERT, H., BALANCE DUE AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 258 (i).
- KAMOURASKA ELECTORAL DISTRICT, COSTS *re* ELECTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 318 (i).
- LIST, ELECTORAL, FOR L'ASSOMPTION CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 525 (i).
- QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION. *See* general heading.
- RESTIGOUCHE, ISSUE OF WRIT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 361 (i).
- RETURNS, PAPERS PRODUCED BY CLERK OF CROWN: (Mr. *Speaker*) 45 (i).
- REVISING BARRISTERS CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 803 (ii).
- REVISING OFFICER, MONTMAGNY ELECTORAL DISTRICT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 803 (ii).
- RETURNING OFFICERS AT ELECTIONS OF 1887: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 223 (i).
- VOTERS LISTS UNDER FRANCHISE ACT, COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 15 (i).
- [*See also* "SECRETARY OF STATE."]
- ELECTRIC LIGHT IN MONTREAL P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 973.
- ELGIN, JUNIOR CO. JUDGE, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 368 (i).
- Emerson and N. Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 204 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
- "Empire" Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c.* 123.)
- EMPLOYÉS OF INCORPORATED CO.'S. *See* "PENSION FUND SOCIETIES."
- Equity Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c.* 103.)
- ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.'S LANDS ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 110 (i).
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK AND McNAMEE & CO.'S CLAIM: M. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) for Sel. Com., 527 (i).
- ESSEX, DEP. JUDGE FOR COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 736 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE, BRINGING DOWN: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 100, 192 (i).
- presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 318 (i).
- SUPPL. 1886-87 AND 1887-88: presented, 952 (ii).
- FURTHER SUPPL., 1886-87: presented, 1152 (ii).
- EVANTUREL, LIEUT. COL., INDEMNITY: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1199 (ii).
- EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Edwards*) 45 (i).
- EXCHANGE BANK, AMOUNTS OWING GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 110 (i).
- EXCHEQUER COURT. *See* "SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS."
- EXCISE: in Com. of Sup. 1115, 1195 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 720, 982 (ii).
- B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 527 (i).
- MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 101 (i).
- N.W.P.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 16 (i).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 15 (i).
- EXPORT OF SPIRITS AND IMPORTED CORN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 143 (i).

Expropriation of Lands (Chap. 39 *Rev. Statutes*)
Amt. B. No. 141 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 862; Res. prop., 952; conc. in, 1033; 2° and in Com., 1033; 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c.* 17.)

- EXPROPRIATION. *See* "ST. CHARLES BRANCH."
- EXTRA CLERKS, PREPARING RETS.: in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
- FABRICS, COLORED: conc. in Ways and Means, 452 (i).
- FATHER POINT HARBOR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 144.
- FERGUSON, MR., COUNSEL FOR J. R. DUNN, *re* QUEEN'S, N. B., ELECTION: Stmt. before Bar of House, 627 (ii).
- FERRO-MANGANESE, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 488 (i).
- FERRY-BOATS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND LEVIS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 258 (i).
- FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL: conc. in Ways and Means, 452-460 (i).
- FIFTEEN POINT, P. E. I., BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 312 (i).
- FILE HILL RESERVE, VACCINATION OF INDIANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

FINANCE:

- AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 13 (i).
- BANK CIRCULATION, SECURITY FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 205 (i).
- BRITISH CANADIAN LOAN AND INVESTMENT CO. *See* B. 61.
- CANADIAN PERMANENT LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* B. 143.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 15 (i).
- DEBT, PUBLIC, GROSS AND NET: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 14 (i).
- in deb. on Ways and Means, 467, 472-484, 593 (i).
- in Com. on B. 107, 1217 (ii).
- EASTERN CANADA SAVINGS AND LOAN CO. *See* B. 53.
- ESTIMATES. *See* general heading.
- EXCHANGE BANK, AMOUNTS OWING GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 110 (i).
- FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD. *See* B. 93.
- FINANCES OF NOVA SCOTIA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones*) 215 (i).
- FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup. 594 (i).
- FRENCH LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* Bs. 71 and 156.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, DETAILS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 150, 258, 279, 291 (i).
- "JAMAICA" PULLMAN CAR, EXPENSES. Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 313 (i).
- N.S. PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY AND SAVINGS FUND. *See* B. 131.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 13 (i).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, ESTIMATES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 110, 223 (i).
- SAVINGS BANKS FUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS, N. B., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 313 (i).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 312 (i).
- WESTERN CANADA LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* B. 128.
- [*See also* "BANKS AND BANKING."]
- Finance and Treasury Board Acts Amt. B. No. 93 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*).** 1°, 442 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 884 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c.* 13.)
- FISCAL POLICY OF DOM.: deb. in Ways and Means, 491 (i).
- FISHERIES:**
- COD LIVER OIL BOUNTY: in Com. of Sup., 1071 (ii).
- "DAVID J. ADAMS," CASE AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 312 (i).
- DEEP SEA, B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1188 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP.: presented 707; Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 805 (ii).
- DISTRIBUTION: Remarks, 805 (ii).

FISHERIES—Continued.

- FISHING BOUNTIES, APPLICANTS FOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barron) 803 (ii).
 ——— DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Flynn) 257 (i).
 ——— IN VICTORIA, N. S., APPLICANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 371 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1072 (ii).
 FISH AND FISH OIL, REFUND OF DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (ii).
 FISH FRY DEPOSITS IN RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 FISH TRAP AT TIGNISH, P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Perry) 788 (ii).
 ——— APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1001 (ii).
 HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1069 (ii).
 HOOP-NETS ON RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 101 (i).
 IN COM. OF SUP., 1069, 1081, 1186, 1237 (ii).
 LAKE ERIE, CLAIMS FOR REBATE OF LICENSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. Casey) 379 (i).
 LEASES IN RIVER MATANE: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 526 (i).
 LICENSES IN EAST AND WEST LAKES, P.E. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 322 (i).
 ——— LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 379 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Brien) 1199 (ii).
 "LIZZIE LINDSAY," SCHOONER, AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. Joncas) 526 (i).
 LOBSTER AND OYSTER FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 ——— FISHERY AND CLOSE SEASON: M. for Ret. (Mr. Flynn) 316 (i).
 McDougall, Michael, Fishery Warden: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 803 (ii).
 PAPERS, &c., re NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 19; Remarks, 21, 73, 99, 112, 141, 238 (i).
 PROTECTION, ADDITIONAL CRUISERS: Ques. (Mr. Jones) 382 (i); in Com. of Sup., 1084 (ii).
 ——— INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS: M. for copies (Mr. Ellis) 221 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 21 (i); (Mr. Landerkin) 1002 (ii).
 ——— STEAMERS AND VESSELS: in Com. of Sup., 1081 (ii).
 REPORT re NEGOTIATIONS: Stmt. in Newspaper (Sir Charles Tupper) 781 (ii).
 RIPARIAN RIGHTS: in Com. of Sup., 1070 (ii).
 ROGERS' FISH LADDER: in Com. of Sup., 1069 (ii).
 SCHOONER OWNED BY R. LINDSAY AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 527 (i).
 VESSELS BOARDED, &c., BY OFFICERS IN PROTECTION SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ellis) 220 (i).
 FRANCE AND QUEBEC STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 986, 1057; conc., 1269 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. No. 53 (Mr. Tisdale). 1°, 277 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 589 (i); 2° m., 1222; 2° and in Com., 1227; 3°, 1228 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 5.)
 FRANCHISE ACT, COST OF VOTERS' LISTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 15, 16 (i).
 ——— EXPENSES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 677, 1165, 1240, conc., 1269 (ii).
 ——— RES. TO REPEAL: Order called (Mr. Laurier) 364 (i).
 ——— REPEAL: Ques. (Mr. De St. Georges) 205 (i).
 ——— REVISING OFFICERS' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 21 (i).
 ——— See "SECRETARY OF STATE."
 FRAUDS ON THE CUSTOMS, WHISKEY PASSED AS VINEGAR: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 102 (i).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. No. 166 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 862; in Com., 1029; conc. in and 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1120 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 26.)
- Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 156** (Mr. Hall). 1°, 2°* and 3°*, 1028 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 112.)
Freehold, Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. Denison). 1°*, 359; M. for 2°, 443 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 111.)
 FREE LIST: conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
 FLAG-STONES: conc. in Ways and Means, 433 (i).
 FLASKS AND PHIALS: conc. in Ways and Means, 433 (i).
 FLOODS AT CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 1190, 1238 (ii).
 ——— AT MONTREAL AND VICINITY: Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 101 (i).
 ——— ENGINEERS' REP.: M. for copies* (Mr. Rinfret) 803.
 ——— ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 277 (i).
 ——— RIDEAU RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 14 (i).
 FLOUR INSPECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 143 (i).
 FOG ALARM AND LIGHTHOUSE, MURR LEDGES: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 205 (i).
 FOREIGN REPRINTS. See "COPYRIGHT."
 FORTIFICATIONS OF B.C., REP. OF COL. O'BRIEN: Ques. (Mr. Shakespeare) 102 (i).
 FRANCE. See "COMMERCIAL RELATIONS."
 GASPÉ BASIN, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 526 (i).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND COL. EXHIB.: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 526 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1162, 1185 (ii).
 ——— IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 383 (i).
 ——— WEST OF PORT ARTHUR: M. for Ret. (Mr. Dawson) 213 (i).
 GEOGRAPHICAL NOMENCLATURE IN OFFICIAL REPS.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Dawson) 801 (ii).
 GIASSON, N., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 364, 377 (i).
 GILCHRIST, W. C., COMPENSATION TO RELATIVES FOR LOSS DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 154 (i).
 GLASS CARBOYS, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 433 (i).
 GLASS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 966 (ii).
 GLUE, SHEET, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 446 (i).
Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. Porter). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com., 538; 3°, 539 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 91).
 GOLD AND SILVER LEAF: conc. in Ways and Means, 434 (i).
 GOVT. BUSINESS. See "BUSINESS."
 ——— IN KEEWATIN, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 ——— IN N.W.T., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1112 (ii).
 ——— OFFICIALS IN NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B., REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 321 (i).
Govt. Railways. See "RAILWAYS."
 GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 1057, 1185, 1247 (ii).
 GOV., DEPUTY: Mess. summoning Commons to Senate, 1 (i).
 GOV., GENERAL: Mess. summoning Commons to Senate, 3 (i), 1275 (ii).
 ——— RECEPTION: M. to adjn. (Mr. Small) 543 (i).
 ——— RESIDENCE IN OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. Robillard) 154.
 ——— SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).

- GOVERNOR GENERAL: SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: 3 (i); 1275 (ii).
- SECRETARY: Letter from *re* Prorogation, 1269 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS: Order called for M. for Ret., 150 (i).
- WARRANTS, 1873 TO 1886: M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 258, 279 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. Mitchell) 262; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 265; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 266; (Mr. Davies) 267, 282; (Mr. Blake) 268; (Mr. Thompson) 269; (Mr. Weidon, St. John) 272, 279; (Sir Charles Tupper) 279; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 280; (Mr. Foster) 291; (Mr. McMullen) 282 (i).
- M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com., 291; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 291; (Sir Charles Tupper) 292; (Mr. Mitchell) 293; (Mr. Blake) 294; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 294 (i).
- GOWANLOCK, MRS.: Remarks on conc., 1268 (ii).
- GRAIN, &C., EXPORTED FROM DOM: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 15 (i).
- Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. Tisdale). 1°*, 359; 2°, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 66.)
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 13 (Mr. Curran). 1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 57.)
- See "NORTH SHORE RY."
- Grange Trust (limited) winding-up B. No. 39 (Mr. Masson). 1°*, 190; 2°*, 312 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 116.)
- GRAVING DOCKS. See "ESQUIMALT" and B. 158.
- GRAY, PETER, AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barron) 803 (ii).
- GREY, LIEUT. COL. AND "C." BATTERY: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 190 (ii).
- GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 114; in Com., 1262 (ii).
- GRONDIN'S LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPOINTMENT: M. for O. C.* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
- Guarantee and Pension Fund Society of Dom. Bank incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. Sutherland). 1°*, 223; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 55.)
- Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. Innes). 1°*, 638; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 59.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).
- GUINANE, MRS. E. M., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 1186.
- GUYSBORO' CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 321 (i).
- HALDIMAND ELECTION, RETURNING OFFICER'S RETURN: M. for copies (Mr. Casey) 372 (i).
- HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).
- Halifax and West India Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. Kenny). 1°*, 359; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 100.)
- SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- HALIFAX EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 767 (ii).
- HALIFAX TO MURRAY HARBOR AND CHARLOTTETOWN SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. McKay). 1°*, 190; 2°*, 272 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 63.)
- Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Brown). 1°*, 479; withdn., 601 (i).
- "HANSARD." See "DEBATES."
- HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See "MONTREAL," "QUEBEC," AND "SOREL."
- HARBORS AND BREAKWATERS, MONEY VOTED BY PARLT. Ques. (Sir Donald Smith) 1008 (ii).
- HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 916, 971, 1183, 1242; conc., 1269 (ii).
- HARDWARE, BUILDERS, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 507, 515 (i).
- HARNES AND LEATHER DRESSING: conc. in Ways and Means, 426 (i).
- HARNES AND SADDLERY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
- HARVEY BRANCH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1260 (ii).
- HARVEY, JOHN, CONTRACT FOR SLIDES ON MATTAWA RIVER: M. for copies* (Mr. Lister) 803 (ii).
- HAY KNIVES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
- HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 718 (ii).
- HÉBERT, HUBERT, BALANCE DUE AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 258 (i).
- EMPLOYMENT AS REVISING OFFICER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Choquette) 803 (ii).
- Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 105 (Mr. Hall). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 93.)
- HIGH COMMISSIONER:
- ACTING: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 45 (i).
- COMMISSION, PAPERS RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 708 (ii).
- RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 376 (i); Remarks, 815, 805 (ii).
- TAXES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 651 (ii).
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Somerville) 313 (i).
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES AND GOVT., COR. BETWEEN, WHILE HIGH COMMISSIONER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 376 (i).
- HISTOIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DES FAMILLES FRANÇAISES: in Com. of Sup. 1247 (ii).
- HOBBS, GARDEN RAKES, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 462.
- HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Order for Res. (Mr. Curran) called, 15 (i).
- M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to make Res. first Order of the day, 15 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Curran) 46; (Mr. McNeill) 52 (i).
- Amt. (McNeill) 55; deb. (Mr. Kenny) 55; (Mr. Flynn) 56; (Mr. O'Brien) 58; (Mr. Ossey) 61; (Mr. Wallace) 65; (Mr. Mills) 66; (Mr. Burns) 67; (Mr. Bergin) 68; (Mr. Jones) 71; (Mr. Welsh) 72; (Mr. Laurier) 74; (Mr. Landerkin) 77; (Mr. Blake) 79; (Mr. Costigan) 86; (Mr. McMullen) 89; (Mr. Coursool) 91; (Mr. McCarthy) 92; neg. (Y. 58, N. 133) 137 (i).
- Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) 98; deb. (Mr. Olayse) 98; (Mr. Davin) 99, 103; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 108; (Mr. Freeman) 112; (Mr. Mills) 114; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 120; (Mr. Gigault) 121; (Mr. Curran) 122; neg. (Y. 49, N. 133) 136 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—Continued.

Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 126; deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 126; (Mr. *Ives*) 128; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 129; (Sir *Donald A. Smith*) 130; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 130; (Mr. *Wright*) 132; (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 132; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 133; (Mr. *Mills*) 135; neg. (Y. 60, N. 128) 137 (i).
On main Motion (Mr. *McCarthy*) 137; (Mr. *Blake*) 138; (Mr. *Gigault*) 138; (Mr. *Mills*) 139; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 140; Res. agreed to (Y. 135, N.47) 141 (i).

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* VOTE (Mr. *Taylor*) 154

HOUSTEADS CANCELLED: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) *re* Return, 784.

— WITHIN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 670 (ii).

HOOP-NETS ON RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 101.

HORTON LANDING, N. S., BREAKWATER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).

HOT SPRINGS. See "BANFF."

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESSES IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: M. (Mr. *Porter*) 7; sec. (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 8; agreed to, 13; His Ex.'s reply, 153 (i).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY ON FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF REIGN: Mess. from the Senate, 680 (ii).

— prop. M. to consider, 706; M., 782; conc. in, 784 (ii).

BALLOT BOX PATENTS: M. for Sel. Com. to examine, 786 (ii).

BEAUCÉ ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

BOURINOT'S PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 14.

CAMPBELL, MR., LATE M. P. FOR DIGBY: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on decease, 543 (i).

CAMPBELL, MR., LATE M. P. FOR RENFREW: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1036 (ii).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Declaration of Election of Speaker, 3 (i).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Lists of Members presented to Clerk, 1 (i).

— Ordered to attend House with books, papers, &c., *re* Queen's, N.B., Election, 4 (i). See general heading.

COMMISSIONERS FOR ADMINISTERING OATH, 1 (i).

DEBATES COM. See "COMMITTEES" and "DEBATES."

DIGBY ELECTORAL DISTRICT: M. (Mr. *Jones*) to issue Writ, 1074 (ii).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S RECEPTION: prop. M. to adjn. objected to and sustained, 313 (i).

INTERNAL COMMISSION: Appointment by Mess., 13 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT. See general heading.

MEETING, 1 (i).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 277 (i).

OPENING, SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 3 (i); Closing, 1276 (ii).

PRIVILEGES, CONFIRMED BY HIS EX.: Stmt. by Mr. *Speaker*, 3 (i).

PROROGATION, COM. FROM THE GOV. GEN.'S SEC., 1269 (ii).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 3, 1276 (ii).

QUEEN'S (N.B.) ELECTION: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Weldon, St John*) 4; papers read, 4 (i). See general heading.

RESTIGOUCHE ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Issue of Writ, 361 (i).

— Return of member elect announced (Mr. *Speaker*) 588 (i).

REPRESENTATION ACT AMT. See B. 140.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1275 (ii).

RULES RESPECTING RY. ACTS: M. for Sel. Com., 668 (ii).

— M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1270 (ii).

SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1164, 1239 (ii).

SELECT STANDING COMS. See "COMMITTEES."

SENATE, SUMMONED TO BY MESS., 1, 3, 1275 (i).

SITTINGS, SUGGESTED CHANGE: Remarks on Prorogation, 1270 (ii).

SOUTH VICTORIA ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Return of member elect announced (Mr. *Speaker*) 277 (i).

SPEAKER, ELECTION OF: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1 (i).

— Declaration of Election by Clerk, 3 (i).

VENTILATION OF CHAMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 786 (ii).

[See also "ELECTIONS," "SECRETARY OF STATE.]

HOWE, MESSRS., AMOUNTS PAID PAINTING DEPTL. BUILDINGS:

M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Holton*) 144 (i).

HUDSON'S BAY EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).

HUDSPETH, A., ESQ., M. P., INTRODUCED AND TOOK SEAT: 277 (i).

— ELECTION OF: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on adjmnt. 44 (i).

ICE-BOAT SERVICE, P.E.I.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 223 (i).

IMMIGRATION ACT AMT. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°*, 1028; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

IMMIGRATION. See "AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION."

IMPERIAL FEDERATION. See "COLONIAL CONFERENCE."

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CONTRIBUTION TO: in Com. of Sup., 728; conc. 1267 (ii).

IMPERIAL, NAVAL AND MILITARY OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY COL. GOVTS., PAY AND PENSION: Mess. from His Ex., 144 (i).

Imperial Trusts Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 74; 2°*, 153 (i); in Com., 637; 3° m., 638; 3°*, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 115.)

Incorporated Co.'s Employés. See "PENSION FUND SOCIETIES."

Indian Act Amt. B. No. 160 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1033; 2°* and in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

INDIANS:

ANNUITIES UNDER ROBINSON TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).

B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1186 (ii).

CAUGHNAWAGAS, COMPENSATION BY C.P.R. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1199 (ii).

— SURVEY OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1006 (ii).

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, ARREARS DUE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 381 (i).

— ANNUITY: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1005 (ii).

CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, PENITANGUISHENE PURCHASE, COMPENSATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1005 (ii).

— TIMBER CUT ON LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1005 (ii).

COLLINS, JAS., M.D., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

OREIGHTON, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT SAUGEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 314 (i).

•DODD, DR., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 379.

FILE HILL RESERVE, VACCINATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN N.W., CONDUCT OF GOVT. OFFICERS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 369 (i).

— DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 13 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1237 (ii).

INDIAN SCHOOL AT QU'APPELLE, MEDICAL ATTENDANT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (ii).

N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 1084, 1186 (ii).

N.W.T., EXPENSES OF VISIT EAST: in Com. of Sup., 1110 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1099, 1186 (ii).

ONT., QUE. AND MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).

SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM TO LANDS ON GRAND RIVER: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 206 (i).

— withdn. and Order for Papers, &c., issued, 208 (i).

SURVEY OF RESERVES, ONT. AND QUE.: conc., 1270 (ii).

TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES TO INDIANS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup. 1107 (ii).

VANKOUGHNET, MR., AND REV. J. ROBINSON, COR. BETWEEN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 369 (i).

INLAND REVENUE. See "CUSTOMS AND EXCISE."

— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i), 1163; conc. 1267.

— REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 13 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

- CAPITAL ACCOUNT : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 102 (i).
 BRANCH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).
 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE, 1873 to 1886 : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Jones*) 110 (i).
 CASUALTIES, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44 (i).
 COMPLAINT AGAINST EMPLOYÉS : (Mr. *Choquette*) 20 (i).
 DISCRIMINATING FREIGHT RATES : in Com. of Sup., 768 (ii).
 DISMISSAL OF OFFICIALS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 21 (i).
 FREIGHT EARNINGS : in Com. of Sup., 778 (ii).
 GRAIN SHIPMENTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ellis*) 390 (i).
 HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION AT : in Com. of Sup., 1241 (ii).
 ——— EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 767 (ii).
 IN COM. OF SUP., 767, 833, 1113, 1173, 1198, 1241 ; conc., 1269 (ii).
 INDIANTOWN BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 1174 (ii).
 LÉVEQUE, ABBÉ, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1200 (ii).
 OIL, LUBRICATING, &c., FURNISHED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44 (i).
 MACHINERY : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (ii).
 MONCTON, ACCOMMODATION AT : in Com. of Sup., 767 (ii).
 PASSES TO MEMBERS : Remarks, 524 (i).
 PROPOSALS TO PURCHASE : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1034 (ii).
 PULLMAN AND PARLOR CARS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44.
 ROLLING STOCK, PURCHASE OF : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 823, 1177 (ii).
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 ——— EXPROPRIATION OF LAND, CLAIMS : M. for copies* (Mr. *Guay*) 803 (ii).
 ——— BELLECHASSE, RY. CROSSING : M. for Cop. (Mr. *Amyot*) 152 (i).
 SERVIS TIE PLATES : in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
 STATION AT ST. IGNACE, TENDERS FOR : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Choquette*) 377 (i).
 ——— M. for copies of Tenders (Mr. *Dessaint*) 103 (i).
 SUPPLIES FURNISHED BY CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones*) 210 (i).
 WIRE, &c., FENCING, CONTRACTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44 (i).

[See also "N.B." AND "N.S."]

- INSANE ASYLUM, MAN., GRANT TO : in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
 Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. No. 9 (Mr. *Edgar*).
 1°, 44 ; Order for 2° read, 272 ; M. for 2°, 282 ; 2°, 291 (i).
 INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS re FISHERY PROTECTION : M. for copies (Mr. *Ellis*) 221 (i).
 Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1° and 2°, 1001 ; in Com., 1120 ; 3°, 1121 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 36.)
 INSPECTOR, P. O., FOR QUEBEC, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 383 (i).
 INSURANCE :
 CANADA ACCIDENT AND INDEMNITY ASSURANCE CO. See B. 78.
 CANADIAN HORSE INS. CO. See B. 88.
 EQUITY INS. CO. See B. 69.
 MANUFACTURERS' ACCIDENT. See B. 125.
 ——— LIFE AND ACCIDENT CO. See B. 29.
 SALARY, &c., OF SUPERINTENDENT : in Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).
 WESTERN ASSURANCE CO.'S ACT AMT. See B. 60.

INTERIOR :

- BANFF NATIONAL PARK. See general heading.
 BROVOSKI, ED., COR. RESPECTING : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 803 (ii).
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE, SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1006.
 COLONISATION CO.'S AMOUNTS PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 786 (ii).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1002 (ii).

INTERIOR—Continued.

- DOMINION LANDS ACT. See B. 3.
 DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
 DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 13 (i).
 MOUNTED POLICE. See general heading.
 STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 669 (ii).
 ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK. See "BANFF."
 [See also "INDIANS," "DOM. LANDS," "ONTARIO."]
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Mess. from His Ex. presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 13 (i).
 Interest (Chap. 127 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Landry*). 1°, 443 (i).
 INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT : in Com. of Sup., 593 (i).
 Interest, payment by Crown, B. No. 137 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 804 ; withdn., 1121 (ii).
 INTOXICATING LIQUORS. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," "LIQUOR," "PROHIBITION."
 IRELAND. See "HOME RULE."
 IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRIES : deb. in Ways and Means, 468, 478-498, 504 522, (i), 965, 1207 (ii).
 ——— BOUNTIES, AMOUNTS PAID ON MANUFACTURES : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 371 (i).
 ——— DRAWBACKS : deb. in Ways and Means, 473, 499 (i).
 ——— DUTIES, EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENTERING GOODS : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1079 (ii).
 IVORY AND HORN : in Com. on Ways and Means, 966 (ii).
 JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 ; in Com., 1261 (ii).
 "JAMAICA" PULLMAN CAR EXPENSES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 313 (i).
 JEANS AND COUTILLES : conc. in Ways and Means, 428 (i).
 JOGGINS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1142 ; in Com., 1259 (ii).
 JONES, L. K., SALARY AS PRIV. SEC. : in Com. of Sup., 766.
 JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
 JUBILEE, HER MAJESTY'S, GOVT. GRANT TOWARDS CELEBRATING : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 20 (i). See "ADDRESS."
 JUDGE OF ASSINIBOIA, RESIDENCE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 102 (i).
 Judges of Provincial Courts (Chap. 138 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 862 ; in Com., 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3° of B., 1127 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 15.)
 JUSTICE :
 ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 855 (ii).
 CLEMENCY OF CROWN. See "PRISONERS."
 CLOTH, &c., SUPPLIED PENITENTIARIES : Ques. (Mr. *Baker*) 14 (i).
 COUNTY COURT JUDGES : in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
 DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 812 (i), 1162, 1237 (ii).
 DUMONT, GABRIEL, AND RECENT AMNESTY : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 525 (i).
 ELGIN, JUNIOR COUNTY JUDGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 368 (i).
 ESSEX, DEP. JUDGE FOR COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 786 (ii).
 JUDGES, REFLECTIONS ON : Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) unparliamentary, 373 (i).
 PENITENTIARY ACT AMT. See B. 65.
 PROVINCIAL COURTS JUDGES. See "JUDGES."

JUSTICE—Continued.

- PUBLIC STORES. See B. 20.
- SHEPPARD, EDMUND E., WARRANT FOR ARREST OF: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 45 (i).
- TORONTO MAGISTRATES' CONDUCT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 1199 (ii).
- SOLICITOR GENERAL'S APPOINTMENT. See B. 42.
- SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Thompson*) 862 (ii).
- SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS. See Bs. 18 and 111.
- TAYLOR, JUDGE, REP. *re* ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE BY MR. J. TRAVIS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Muloak*) 803 (ii).
- TRAVIS, MR. J., APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 143 (i).
- WOOD, JUDGE, J.P., EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).
- [See also "CRIMINAL LAW."]
- KAMOURASKA ELECTION, REVISING OFFICERS' ACCOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 318 (i).
- WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 101, 526 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dessaint*) 110 (i).
- KENNEBEC SENATORSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 708 (ii).
- KENTVILLE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 101 (i).
- Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°*, 539 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts, 925; conc. in and 3°*, 926 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 83.*)
- Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 149** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°, 2°* and 3°, 926 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 84.*)
- KINGSPORT RY., SURVEYS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).
- KINGSTON GENERAL AND ST. CATHARINES MARINE HOSPITAL: Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 663 (ii).
- Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 88.*)
- KIT ALLOWANCES TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 371; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 525 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (ii).
- LABELS FOR FRUIT, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
- LABERGE, MR., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1003 (ii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fiset*) 376 (i).
- LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 832, 838 (ii).
- LAKE ERIE, ESSEX AND DETROIT RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1266 (ii).
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 (ii).
- RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 (ii); in Com., 1263 (ii).
- LAKE ST. FRANCIS ROAD DYKE: in Com., of Sup., 1242 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER: M. for copies of Surveys (Mr. *Flynn*) 789 (ii).
- L'ASSOMPTION, REVISING OFFICER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 1004 (ii).
- LANDS, EXPROPRIATION. See "EXPROPRIATION."
- SALES BY C.P.R. Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 527 (i).
- INDIAN, IN ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1005 (ii).
- LANDS IN THE N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 14.
- See "DOMINION LANDS."
- LAVELL, WM. A. See "DIVORCE."
- Laviolette, Godefroi (allowance) provision B. No. 138** (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 111 (i); in Com., 803; 1°* of B., 808; 2° and in Com., 889; 3°*, 890 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 44.*)
- LEAMINGTON AND ST. CLAIR RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 (ii).
- LEATHER AND RAW HIDES INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 253 (i).
- SOLE: conc. in Ways and Means, 434 (i), 965 (ii).
- LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 660, 1164, 1238; conc., 1267 (ii).
- LEMONS, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).
- Letters Patent (defective) and Securities to Crown B. No. 51** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 277 (i).
- LIBEL, IMPRISONMENT FOR: Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
- LIBRARY OF PARLT., CLAIMS OF FARQUHAR & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
- M. to conc. in Repts. (Mr. *Colby*) 1249 (ii).
- Rep. presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
- Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
- Purchase of Books, 1165 (ii).
- Licensed Weighers B. No. 136** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 804; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 37.*)
- LIEUT. GOV. OF QUEBEC, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 669 (ii).
- LIFE SAVING STATION ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 45 (i).
- LIGHTS, FOG-WHISTLES, &C., MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (ii).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1053, 1238; conc., 1267 (ii).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND FOG-ALARMS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (ii).
- LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS: in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1165 (ii);
- LINDSAY, R., AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 527 (i).
- LINSEED OR FLAXSEED OIL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 964 (ii).
- LIQUORICE ROOT: conc. in Ways and Means, 434 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
- PERMITS IN THE N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*), 527 (i).
- Liquors, Conveyance on board H. M.'s Ships, B. No. 122** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 638; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 814 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 46.*)
- LIVERPOOL AND LONDON AND ST. JOHN, N.B., AND HALIFAX, N.S., SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 989 (ii).
- "LIZZIE LINDSAY," SCHOONER, AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*), 526 (i).
- LOBSTER FISHERY. See "FISHERIES."
- Local Govt. for the N. W. T. B. No. 2** (Mr. *Davis*). 1°, 13 (i).

LOCOMOTIVES, STEAM ENGINES, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 504 (i).

LONGUEUIL, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARVES: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 16, 142 (i).

Londonderry Iron Co.'s incorp. B. No. 83. (Mr. Kenny). 1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 857 (ii). (50-51 Vic, c. 121.)

LUNENBURG, SITE FOR PUBLIC BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 154 (i), 1003, 1004 (ii).

LYONS, MR., COUNSEL FOR J. R. DUNN *re* QUEEN'S, N. B., ELECTION: Stmt. before Bar of House, 624 (ii).

MACUIRE, MR., RELEASE: Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup, 1234 (ii).

McDOUGALL, MICHAEL, CLAIM FOR FISHING BOUNTY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barron) 803 (ii).

McGRATH, H. J., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 527 (i).

McKAY, W., AMOUNTS PAID FOR PAINTING DEPTL. BUILDINGS: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Bryson) 359 (i).

McLEAN, J. A., INDEMNITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).

McNAMEE & Co. See "ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK."

MACCARONI AND VERMICELLI: conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).

MAIL CONTRACTS IN LÉVIS Co.: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 45 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 986, 1057, 1185; conc., 1269 (ii).

MAIN DUCKS AND WALPOLE ISLANDS, LEASE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Platt) 369 (i).

MANHOOD SUFFRAGE: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 515 (i).

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co. of Can. B. No. 109 (Mr. Scarth). 1°*, 524 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 79.)

Man. South-Western Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. No. 133 (Mr. Haggart). 1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 80.)

MANITOBA:

 C.P.R., SALE OF LANDS BY Co.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 222 (i).

 DISALLOWANCE. See general heading.

 EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 101 (i).

 O'DONOGHUE, LATE W. B., PROPERTY OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 384 (i).

 ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, RED RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1004 (ii).

 SUBSIDIES (LAND) TO RYS See "SUBSIDIES."

 WHITE MUD RIVER, MAN., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 102.

 WHITE POPULATION: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 14 (i).

Manufacturers' Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. Small). 1°*, 667; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 105.)

Manufacturers' Life and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. Brown). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°, 539 (i). (51-51 Vic., c. 104.)

MARBLE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 934 (ii).

MARINE:

 BARRINGTON HARBOR LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 383 (i).

 BOLDUC, CAPT. L., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 525 (i).

 BELL-BUOY FOR ST. JOHN HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 287 (i).

MARINE—Continued.

COLLINGWOOD MARINE HOSPITAL. See B. 14.

DALTON, WM., SERVICES ON LIGHTSHIP: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1300; Remarks, 1249.

DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

DEPTL. RMP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 13 (i).

DIPPER HARBOR LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 785 (ii).

FERRY-BOATS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 236 (i).

GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).

JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 102 (i).

KINGSTON GENERAL AND ST. CATHARINES MARINE HOSPITAL: Ques. (Sir Donald Smith) 688 (ii).

LIFE-SAVING STATION, VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Shaikapeere) 45 (i).

LIGHTHOUSES AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1058, 1233; conc., 1267 (ii).

MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUE., EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Ret. (Sir Donald Smith) 803 (ii).

 — in Com. of Sup., 1088 (ii).

MURR LEDGES FOG ALARM, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 205 (ii).

MIMINIGASH RANGE LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 374 (i), 1004.

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 92.

"M. A. STARN": in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).

"NEPTUNE" AND WINTER COM. WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perry) 153 (i).

"NAPOLEON III," REFUND TO MCPHERSON: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).

"NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.

PORT SAN JUAN HARBOR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 102 (i).

PORT LA TOUR HARBOR LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 785 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 158.

RICHIEUX RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Claves) 311 (i).

RIVER POLICE: Ques. (Mr. Longsher, Montmorency) 543 (i).

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS. See B. 76.

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).

SOREL HARBOR. See B. 148.

SUPPLIES TO STR. "LANSDOWNE": in Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).

SAWDUST IN RIVERS AND STREAMS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 257 (i).

SHIPPING NEWS AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 312.

WEST HEAD HARBOR LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 786 (ii).

[See also "FISHERIES," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Massawippi Junction Railway Co.'s incorp B. No. 67 (Mr. Small). 1°, 315; 2°*, 441 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 785 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 94.)

 — SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).

MATANE RIVER, FISHING LEASES IN: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 528 (i).

 — WHARF REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 205 (i).

MATTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. Lister) 803 (ii).

MEMBERS OF THE GOVT., LIST OF, iii.

 — OF HOUSE OF COMMONS, LIST OF, v.

 — INTRODUCED: Hudspeth, A., Esq., 277 (i); Moffat, G., Esq., 639 (ii).

 — NEW, NOTIFICATION OF RETURN OF MEMBER-ELECT FOR SOUTH VICTORIA, ONT., 277 (i).

 — RESTIGOUCHE, 588 (i).

MERCIER, FRANÇOIS, PAYMENT FOR COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).

MERRITT, LIEUT. W. H., PROMOTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 788 (ii).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

 ADDRESS, REPLY TO, 153 (i).

 ESTIMATES, THE, 318 (i), 932, 1152 (ii).

 IMPERIAL, NAVAL AND MILITARY OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY COL. GOVTS.; PAY AND SENIOR, 144 (i).

 INTERNAL ECONOMY (HOUSE OF COMMONS) COMMISSION, 13 (i).

- METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORIES**: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
 — **SERVICE, CHATHAM, N.B.**: in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY, DR. RAND'S: in Com. of Sup., 1247 (i)
Midland Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 75 (Mr. *Hudspeth*). 1°*, 360; 2°, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 65.*)
MILFORD POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 322 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE:
AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 751 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS FORT, SALE OF MILITARY LANDS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones*) 379 (i).
ARMS IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 1199 (ii).
BAIRD, COL. W. T., GRATUITY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1171 (ii).
BARRACKS IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 769 (ii).
BATTERIES, SCHOOLS OF ARTILLERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 759 (ii).
BEDSON, MR., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 659, 1237 (ii).
BERGIN, FURGEON GENERAL, SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1033 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
DEFENCES OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
DEPT. REP.: presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 13 (i).
DRILL AT OTTAWA COLLEGE: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1033 (ii).
 — **INSTRUCTION**: in Com. of Sup., 753 (ii).
 — **FRENDS AND RIFLE RANGERS**: in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).
 — See "QUEBEC 9TH BATTALION."
EVANTUREL, LIEUT.-COL. A., INDEMNITY: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1199 (ii).
GILCHRIST, W. C., COMPENSATION TO RELATIVES FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 154 (i).
FORTIFICATIONS OF B.C., REP. OF COL. O'BRIEN: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 102 (i).
GREY, LIEUT.-COL., AND COMMAND OF "C" BATTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1004 (ii).
IN COM. OF SUP., 748, 1170, 1240 (ii).
JUBILEE, HER MAJESTY'S, GRANT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 20 (i).
KIT ALLOWANCE TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Elgar*) 371 (i).
 — (Mr. *O'Brien*) 525 (i); Remarks, 716 (ii).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (ii).
MERRITT, LIEUT. W. H., PROMOTION OF: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Baron*) 788 (ii).
MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 748 (ii).
MILITARY PROPERTIES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 764 (ii).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 748, 1267 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 769 (ii).
MILSON, COL.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1171.
QUEBEC 9TH BATTALION DRILL: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 670 (ii).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 708, 712 (ii).
 — **EXPENSES IN THE N.W.**: Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1234 (ii).
QUEEN'S OWN AND ROYAL GRENADIERS, KIT MONEY: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 371 (i).
REBELLION OF 1837, VOLUNTEERS SERVICES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Purcell*) 366 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 755, 1268 (ii).
SCRIP TO VETERANS OF 1837: Ques. (Mr. *Purcell*) 320 (i).
STRANGE, GEN., REPORT OF THE 9TH, AND 65TH BATTALIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 670 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE (84TH) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. *Bécharé*) 1005 (ii).
TRANSPORT OF VOLUNTEERS TO RIFLE MATCHES: in Com. of Sup., 754 (ii).
YORK AND SIMCOE BATTALION OF VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mellock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (ii).
WAR CLAIMS PAID AND REJECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1003 (ii).
MUMINGASH RANGE LIGHT, APPOINTMENT OF KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 372 (i).
 — **BREAKWATER, REPAIRS**: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 371 (i).
- MINUDIE BRANCH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1263 (ii).
MIRAMICHI LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1200 (ii).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1112, 1187, 1247 (ii).
MODEL BILL. See "PRIVATE BILLS."
MOFFAT, MR., M.P., DEATH OF: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald* and others) 111 (i).
MOFFAT, G., ESQ., M.P.: Introduced and took seat, 638 (ii).
MOLASSES, GAUGING AT ST. STEPHEN'S: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 44 (i).
MONCTON, ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 781 (ii).
MONCTON AND BUCTOCHE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1142; in Com., 1260 (ii).
MONTETH, JOHN. See "DIVORCE."
MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 45 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 151 (i).
MONTMORENCY, REVISING OFFICER FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 45 (i).
 — **VOTERS' LISTS FOR COUNTY**: M. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) to lay on Table, 628 (ii).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1263 (ii).
MONTREAL COTTON CO. See "CUSTOMS."
MONTREAL FLOODS. See "FLOODS."
Montreal Harbor Commissioners Acts Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 442 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1031 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 42.*)
MORIN, DR., CLAIM OF: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1004 (ii).
Mortgages, payment of, B. No. 33 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 142 (i).
 — prop. M. (Mr. *McMullen*) to introd. B., 111 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1112, 1186 (ii).
 — **PENSIONS**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 16 (i).
 — **REP.**: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 784 (ii).
MOWING MACHINES, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 479 (i).
MURRAY CANAL, CONTRACTS FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 322 (i).
NAIL PLATE, IRON OR STEEL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 964 (ii).
NAILS, SPIKES, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 (ii).
"NAPOLEON III," REFUND TO MCPHERSON: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).
NATIONAL POLICY AND FREE TRADE: deb. in Ways and Means, 484, 490, 495 (i).
 — in Com. on B. 107, 1205, 1212, 1214, 1217 (ii).
"NEPTUNE" AND WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 153 (i).
NEVILLE, C.S., GRATUITY ON RETIRING FROM C. S.: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Skinner*) 1°*, 638; 2°*, 758; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 76.*)

NEW BRUNSWICK :

BELL-BUOY FOR ST. JOHN HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 257 (i).
 CARLETON BRANCH RAILWAY : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (ii).
 DALTON, WM., SERVICES ON LIGHTSHIP : Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1200 ;
 Remarks, 1249 (ii).
 DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CLAIMS OF CONTRACTOR : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 803 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 FOG-ALARM, &c., MURR LEDGER : Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 205 (i).
 GOVT. OFFICIALS IN NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B., REMOVAL OF : Ques.
 (Mr. *Mitchell*) 321 (i).
 McGRATH, H. J., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Weldon,*
St. John) 527 (i).
 MOFFATT, MR., LATE M.P. FOR RESTIGOUCHE, DECEASE OF : Remarks
 (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).
 MOLASSES, GAUGING AT ST. STEPHEN'S, N.B. : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
Weldon, St. John) 44 (i).
 WINTER PORT OF O.P.R. : Remarks, 967 (ii).
 [See also "FISHERIES," "I. C. R." "MARINE," "PUBLIC
 WORKS," &c.]

NEWBORO' P.O., SAVINGS BANK FUNDS : in Com. of Sup.,
 1189 (ii).

NEWSPAPERS, PARTLY PRINTED : conc. in Ways and Means,
 446-449 (i).

New Westminster Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp.
 B. No. 36 (Mr. *Chisholm*). 1°*, 190 ; 2°*, 273 (i),
 withdn., 707 (ii).

Niagara and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. B.
 No. 59 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°* and 2°, 441 (i) ; in Com.
 and 3°* 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 85.*)

Niagara River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 43
 (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 204, 2°*, 320 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*,
 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 96.*)

"NORTHERN LIGHT" AND ICE-BOATS BETWEEN P.E.I.
 AND MAINLAND : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 210 (i).

— WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I. : M. for Ret.
 (Mr. *Perry*) 150 (i).

— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Robertson, King's*) 530 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 206 (i).

— REPAIRS, NEW BOILER, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1247.

— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 979, 1112 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY. PURCHASE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gigault*) 209.

NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B., GOVT. OFFICIALS IN : Ques. (Mr.
Mitchell) 321 (i).

— STRAITS, SURVEYS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 803 (ii).

N.W. T. Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°,
 708 ; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 809 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 28.*)

N.W. T. Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. *MacDowall*).
 1°, 924 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :

BANFF NATIONAL PARK. See general heading.

BROKOVSKI, E. D., CONDUCT OF : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 803 (ii).

C.P.R. See general heading.

COLLINS, J., M.D., MEDICAL OFFICER AT QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL :
 M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

COLONIZATION COMPANIES, AMOUNTS PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 786.
 — Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1002 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 16 (i).

FLEM HILL RESERVE INDIANS, VACCINATION OF INDIANS : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Charlton*) 379 (i).

GRAY, PETER, COR. re E. BROKOVSKI : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*)
 808 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—Continued.

HOMESTEADS CANCELLED : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 794 (ii).

— IN RY. BELT : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 670 (ii).

INDIANS. See general heading.

JUDGE OF EAST ASSINIBOIA, RESIDENCE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Perley,*
Assiniboia) 102 (i).

LIQUOR PERMITS IN THE N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*)
 527 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE : See "Mounted Police."

NATIONAL POLICY AND FREE TRADE : in deb. on Ways and Means,
 484, (ii).

N.W. CENTRAL RY., CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *MacDowall*) 1193 (ii).

N. W. REBELLION LOSSES, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Fisct*)
 543 (ii).

COUNCIL, EXTENSION OF LIFE OF. See B. 163.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT. See Bs. 2.

REAL PROPERTY ACTS AMT. See Bs. 8 and 154.

PEARCE, W., REP. ON CLAIMANT'S POSSESSION TO BANFF SPRINGS :
 M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 364 (i).

QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL MEDICAL OFFICER : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
Charlton) 379 (i).

REBELLION, N. W. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).

REGINA TOWN SITE, SALE OF LOTS AND RECEIPTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
Davin) 803 (ii).

ROBERTSON, J., AND MR. VANKOUGHNET, COR. BETWEEN : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Somerville*) 369 (i).

SCRIP FOR SERVICES IN REBELLION OUTSIDE MILITIA : M. for Ret. (Mr.
Davin) 16 (i).

SENATE REPRESENTATION. See B. 17.

SETTLEMENT OF N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*)
 1002 (ii).

SWISHER, J., SERVICES DURING REBELLION OF 1837 : M. for Ret. (Mr.
Wilson, Elgin) 365 (i).

TAYLOR, JUDGE, REP. re HON. J. TRAVIS IN N. W. T. : M. for Ret.*
 (Mr. *Mulock*) 803 (ii).

TRAVIS, JEREMIAH, APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE IN N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr.
Watson) 143 (ii).

[See also "INDIANS," "PUBLIC WORKS, &c.]

NOEL, MARIE LOUISE. See "DIVORCE."

Notes, Counterfeit, &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

NOTRE DAME DU SACRE CŒUR STATION : Ques. (Mr. *Fisct*)
 1002 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr.
Pope) 1143 ; in Com., 1263 (ii).

Nova Scotia Permanent Benefit Building
 Society and Savings Fund B. No. 131 (Mr.
Tupper, Pictou). 1°*, 782 ; 2°*, 876 ; in Com. and
 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 114.*)

NOVA SCOTIA :

BARRACK LANDS, SHELBURNE HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shel-*
burne) 668 (ii).

BARRINGTON HARBOR, TENDERS FOR LIGHTSHIP : Ques. (Mr. *Robert-*
son, Shelburne) 383 (i).

BETTER TERMS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones*) 216 (i).

BOOT ISLAND BREAKWATER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).

CAMPBELL, MR., LATE M.P. FOR DIGBY, DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir
John A. Macdonald) 543 (i).

CAPR BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION, SURVEYS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr.
Flynn) 790 (ii).

CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Eisenhour*) 214 (i).

— prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143 ; in Com., 1263 (ii).

CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT GUYSBORO, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*)
 321 (i).

FINANCES OF N.S. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones*) 215 (i).

FORT ANAPOLIS, SALE OF MILITARY LANDS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones*)
 879 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.

- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 383 (i).
 KINGSPORT (BASIN OF MINAS) RY. SURVEYS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).
 LOBSTER, CLOSE SEASON : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flynn*) 316 (i).
 ——— FISHERY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 316 (i).
 L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flynn*) 789 (ii).
 LUNenburg, SITE FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 154 (i).
 ——— AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1003.
 ——— GRANT FOR SAME : Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1004 (ii).
 PORT LA TOUR HARBOR LIGHT : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 785 (ii).
 POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE AT ARICHAH : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 790 (ii).
 SCOTT'S BAY BREAKWATER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).
 SEIZURES OF VESSELS IN N.S., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Jones*) 110 (i).
 SHELBURNE HARBOR ISLANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 668.
 SUPPLIES FURNISHED I.C.R. AT HALIFAX AND TRURO : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Jones*) 210 (i).
 SURVEYS, &c., CAPE BRETON RYS. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flynn*) 790 (ii).
 ——— L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flynn*) 789 (ii).
 WEST HEAD HARBOR LIGHT : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 786.
 WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH GOVT. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones*) 147 (ii).
 [See also "FISHERIES," "I. C. R.," "MARINE," "PUBLIC WORKS, &c."]
- NUTS AND WASHERS : in Com. Ways and Means, 523 (i).
Oaths of Office. See "ADMINISTRATION."
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1057, 1185, 1247 (ii).
 O'DONOHUGHE, M. F., EMPLOYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 143 (i).
 O'DONOHUGHE, W. B., CLAIM OF HEIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1077, 1080 (ii).
 ——— DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 364 (i).
 OFFICIAL BLUE-BOOKS AND CHANGE OF NAMES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 801 (ii).
 OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE, iii.
 OFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE HOUSE. See "COMMITTEES" and "DEBATES."
Officers. See "PUBLIC OFFICERS."
 OIL CLOTH, FLOOR : conc. in Ways and Means, 434, 516 (i).
 OLEOMARGARINE. See "BUTTER SUBSTITUTES."
 ONDERDONK, A. See "C. P. R." "AND" "ROLLING STOCK."
Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 667; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
 ——— SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1202 (ii).
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s reduction of Stock B. No. 62 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 300; 2°*, 320 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
Ont. and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 111; 2°*, 272; in Com. and 3°*, 539 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
Ont. Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 10 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

ONTARIO :

- BRIDGE ACROSS THE WELLAND CANAL : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 295 (i).
 CABLE BETWEEN PELEE ISLAND AND MAINLAND : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 786 (ii).
 CORNWALL FLOODS : in Com. of Sup., 1190, 1239 (ii).
 ——— personal explanation (Mr. *Bergin*), in Com. of Sup., 1238 (ii).
 DELHANTY, PATRICK, CLAIM FOR INJURIES : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Kent*) 668 (ii).
 ELGIN, JR. COUNTY COURT JUDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 143 (i).
 ——— APPLICANTS FOR POSITION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 368 (i).
 ESSEX, DEP. JUDGE FOR COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 786 (ii).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS AROUND THUNDER BAY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 213 (i).
 GOVERNOR GENERAL'S RESIDENCE IN OTTAWA : Ques. (Mr. *Robillard*) 154 (i).
 KINGSTON GENERAL AND ST. CATHARINES MARINE HOSPITAL : Ques. (Sir *Donald Smith*) 668 (ii).
 LICENSES AND CROWN TITLES, AND SETTLERS CLAIMS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 803 (ii).
 MAIN DUCKS AND WALPOLE ISLANDS, LEASE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Platt*) 369 (i).
 PENETANGUISHENE HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1004 (ii).
 PORT ROWAN (ONT.) HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 318 (i).
 PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL COUNTY COURT : Remarks, 1077 (ii).
 RIDEAU RIVER FLOODS : Ques. (Mr. *Edwards*) 14 (i).
 ——— OBSTRUCTIONS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Robillard*) 803 (ii).
 SAUGEEN INDIAN AGENT : M. for R. t. (Mr. *Somerville*) 314 (i).
 SETTLER'S CLAIMS IN DISPUTED TERRITORY : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dawson*) 803 (i).
 SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM OF : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 206 (i).
 TIMBER AND MINING LICENSES IN DISPUTED TERRITORY : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Dawson*) 803 (ii).
 TRENT RIVER, BOOMS AND PIERS, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 708 (ii).
 WELLBANKS, D., COMPLAINTS AGAINST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 803 (ii).
 WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Platt*) 369 (i).
 WHITE FISH RIVER INDIAN RESERVE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 802 (ii).
 YORKSHIRE ISLAND AND MAIN DUCKS, LEASE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 369 (i).
 [See also "CANALS," "FISHERIES," "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS" &c.]
- ORANGES AND LEMONS : conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).
ORDER, PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURE :
 ORDER :
 DEBATE ON WAYS AND MEANS : Objection taken by Mr. *McMullen* to members discussing other subjects than the items before the Chair, 486 (i).
 DIGNITY AND DECORUM IN DEBATE : Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) deb. need not be allowed on point of order, same not being consistent with the dignity of the House; deb. allowed only on a question of procedure, where opinions on parliamentary practice may be given, 1011 (ii).
 DIGRESSION FROM DEBATE : Member requested to confine himself to question before the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 316 (i).
 HOME RULE FOR IRELAND : Objection taken by Mr. *Wallace* to certain unparliamentary expressions; Mr. *Speaker* called upon member to withdraw same, 68 (i).
 IMPUTATION OF MOTIVES : Objection (Mr. *Somerville*); Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 315 (i).
 INDEPENDENCE OF MEMBERS : Member's remarks in deb. on Dom-lands Act challenged and ruled out of order by the Acting *Speaker*, 1010 (ii).
 LATITUDE OF DEBATE : Questioned by Mr. *Wilson (Argenteuil)* and affirmed by Sir *Charles Tupper*, 454 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

- MISQUOTING NEWSPAPER EXTRACT:** Objection taken and Member's attention arrested by Mr. *Speaker* to subject before the House, 1014 (ii).
- MISREPRESENTATION:** Member called on to withdraw statement or substantiate same by records; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) assertion may not be sustained in point of fact by argument or public records, therefore no question of Order, 1012 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS:** If a point in a Member's speech has been misunderstood, an explanation is allowed (Mr. *Speaker*) 32 (i).
- PREVIOUS DEBATE:** Reference to objected to; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not allowed according to Rules of House, 40, 474 (i).
- PROHIBITION:** Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) compensation to those engaged in liquor trade, objected to by Mr. *Mills (Bothwell)* as irrelevant to question before the House; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) in order, Amt., although vague, bearing on subject-matter before the House, 949 (ii).
- Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) to add compensation to dealers to Main Motion questioned by Mr. *Moncrieff*; declared pertinent to Res. by *Deputy Speaker*, 950 (ii).
- QUESTIONS:** Members have a right to ask questions (Mr. *Speaker*) 615 (ii).
- RELEVANCY OF DEBATE:** Questioned by Mr. *Denison* and remarks declared pertinent to question before the Chair, 997 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) on closing of debate on Home Rule, 140 (i).
- RETURNING OFFICERS:** Personal allusions ruled not in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 36 (i).
- SENATE, MEMBERS OF THE:** Expressions respecting Upper Chamber challenged by Mr. *McNeill*; considered objectionable by Mr. *Speaker*, and should not be used towards that body as forming part of Parliament, 200 (i).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY EXPRESSION:** Challenged by Mr. *Mitchell*, and declared by the Chairman an interjection and not addressed to any Member of the House, 998 (ii).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY EXPRESSIONS AND CONDUCT:** Reproofs (Mr. *Speaker*) 66, 110, 150, 298, 333, 353, 374 (i), 619, 704 (ii).
- UNSEEMLY NOISES:** Mr. *Speaker* declares he will have to name certain members if they do not desist, 949 (ii).
- VOTE ON DISALLOWANCE:** Unparliamentary expression; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) no member has a right to qualify a vote as an infamy, 703; ruling, 704 (ii).

PRIVILEGE:

- ADJOURNMENT:** Remarks (Mr. *Shakespeare*) on paragraph in *Citizen* respecting rumored adjournment for one week, 224 (i).
- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY AND GAZETTING RETURNS:** Attention of House drawn to by Mr. *Mills (Bothwell)* 23. See general heading.
- COMERCION AND CANAL LABORERS:** Personal explanation (Mr. *Curran*) and denial of statement in *Free Press*, 360 (i).
- CORNWALL FLOODS:** Personal explanation (Mr. *Bergin*) re distribution of Govt. grant for relief, 1238 (ii).
- "DEBATES," OFFICIAL REP.:** Supposed error and comparison with newspaper report (Mr. *Kenny*) 784 (ii).
- Proceedings before Committee, and paragraph in *Man. Sun* re speech of Mr. *Watson* on Disallowance; Member asked by Mr. *Speaker* to state question of privilege, and deb. on same not allowed, 1156 (ii).
- DIVISION LIST:** Attention of House called to omission of Mr. *Purcell's* name (Mr. *Bergin*) 615 (ii).
- DIVISION OR DISALLOWANCE:** Omission of Mr. *Mitchell's* name from List in Votes and Proceedings; Clerk ordered by Mr. *Speaker* to amend same by an erratum, 588 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE:** Personal explanation (Mr. *Scarth*) re Rep. of speech in *Globe*, 615 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.:** Personal explanation (Mr. *Davin*) on newspaper extract read by Mr. *Landerkin*, 1015 (ii).
- FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS:** Explanation (Sir *Charles Tupper*) re report in *Toronto Mail* of interview with Secretary Bayard at Washington, 781 (ii).
- PAIRING OF MEMBERS:** Personal explanations, Messrs. *Wolsh, Tupper (Pictou), Bowman and Carling*, 360 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

PROCEDURE:

- CAN. TEMP. ACT:** Amt. (Mr. *Girouard*) to Res. on Prohibition questioned by Mr. *Armstrong* as being not in Order, as it recommended an Amt. to the above Act, exempting beer, porter, &c, and light wines; Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) that the Amt. is relevant to the proposition contained in the Res. before the House, 846 (ii).
- Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) to Res. on Prohibition objected to by Mr. *Jamieson*, the same being not relevant to the subject-matter of the Res. before the House, 851; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) in Order and May quoted, 852 (i).
- Attention of Mr. *Speaker* called by Mr. *Hills (Bothwell)* to B. on Order Paper to repeal the Can. Temp. Act and the Amt. of Mr. *Cargill*, of the same effect, to Res. on Prohibition; previous ruling sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 858 (ii).
- CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT.:** Prop. M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to introduce B.; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) notice must be given, 413 (i).
- DIVORCE—ASH, SUSAN, RELIEF B.:** Ques. asked by Mr. *Davies* respecting the printing of the evidence; Mr. *Speaker* stated that it was not the usual practice to have same printed, 804 (ii).
- GOV. GEN.'S RECEPTION:** M. to adjn. objected to by Mr. *Blake* and sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 543 (i).
- HOME RULE FOR IRELAND:** Prop. Amt. as a substitute for main motion; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) Member cannot amend his own motion; but cases having arisen in England, where the original motion was withdrawn, with unanimous consent of the House it may be presented in a new form, 140 (i).
- JUDGES, REFLECTIONS ON:** Member called to Order by Mr. *Speaker* for speaking disrespectfully of Judges, and ruled unparliamentary, 373 (i).
- MORTGAGES:** Prop. M. (Mr. *McMullen*) to introd. B.; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) notice must be given, 111 (i).
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW BRANCH RAILWAY:** 2° objected to by Mr. *Mills (Bothwell)*; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that the expenditure provided for in the B. is covered by Res., 649 (ii).
- PAIRING OF MEMBERS:** Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) Members pairing outside of the cognisance of the Whips will not be recognised by the House, and personal explanations in future will not be allowed on that ground, 360 (ii).
- PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE:** Deb. allowed on a question of Procedure, and *Speaker's* duty to call for the opinions of those experienced in same, 1011 (ii).
- PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.:** M. to place on Orders of the Day for a certain day objected to by Mr. *White (Renfrew)* and sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 1001 (ii).
- RETURNS:** Ques. asked and converted into a motion for a Return can only be put by unanimous consent of the House; objected to by Mr. *Amyot* and sustained (Mr. *Speaker*) 1199 (ii).
- UPPER COLUMBIA RY. CO.:** On M. for 2°, attention of Mr. *Speaker* called to B. not being printed in French; B. cannot be read without unanimous consent of the House, 320 (i).
- OPIUM, DRUG. in Com. on Ways and Means,** 964 (ii).
- OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1143; in Com., 1261 (ii).
- Oshawa Ry. and Navigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. *Smith, Ontario*). 1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 92.*)
- OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL BLOCK:** in Com. of Sup., 916 (ii).
- Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 99** (Mr. *Wright*). 1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 74.*)
- OTTAWA COLLEGE MILITARY DRILL:** Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1033 (ii).
- Oxford Junction and New Glasgow Branch of the I.C.R. B. No. 77** (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 273; M. for Com., 302; in Com., 312; 1° of B., 361 (i); 2°m., 646; 2°, 649; in Com. and 3°*, 1028 (ii). (50-51 *Vic., c. 27.*)

- PACIFIC MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 278 (i).
- PAINTING, &c., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, AMOUNTS PAID**:
 M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Holton*) 144; (Mr. *Bryson*) 369 (i).
- PAIRING OF MEMBERS**: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*, and others) 358; (Mr. *Speaker*) 358; Ruling, 360 (i).
- PAIRS DURING SESSION**, viii.
- PAPER, ALL KINDS**: conc. in Ways and Means, 435 (i).
 ——— HANGINGS: conc. in Ways and Means, 434, 516 (i).
 ——— MANUFACTURES OF: in Com. on Ways and Means, 517-522 (i).
 ——— TARRED: conc. in Ways and Means, 461 (i).
- "PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION"**: in Com. of Sup., 1189 (ii).
- "PATENT RECORD"**: in Com. of Sup., 717 (ii).
- PEARCE, WM., D.L.S.** See "BANFF SPRINGS."
- PELEE ISLAND AND MAINLAND CABLE**: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 786 (ii).
- PENETANGUISHENE HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS**: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1004 (ii).
- Penitentiary Act Amt. (reorganisation of salaries) B. No. 65** (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 223; in Com., 274; 1° of B., 301 (i); 2° and in Com., 641; 3°, 642 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- PENITENTIARIES**:
 B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 660 (ii).
 CLOTH AND FLANNEL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Baker*) 14 (i).
 DORCHESTER: in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. *Thompson*) 14 (i).
 DUFFY, D. A., CLAIMS OF, re DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 803 (ii).
 KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 657 (ii).
 MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 659 (ii).
 REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 15 (i).
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 659, 1159 (ii).
 ——— prop. Res. to compensate G. W. Laviolette (Mr. *Thompson*) 111 (i). See B. 138.
- Pension Fund Societies, B. No. 52** (Mr. *Hall*).
 1°, 277; 2°, 543 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1152 (ii) (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- PENSIONS, MILITIA, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 746; conc., 1267 (ii).
 ——— MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 16 (i).
 ——— REBELLION OF 1855, ON ACCOUNT OF: in Com. of Sup., 746; conc., 1267 (ii).
- PERMITS**. See "LIQUOR."
- PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS**. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
- PETROLEUM OIL**: conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (i).
- PHOTOGRAPHIC DRY PLATES**: conc. in Ways and Means, 449 (i).
- PIANOFORTES**: in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
- PICKLES IN BOTTLES**: conc. in Ways and Means, 435 (i).
- PICKS, MATTOCKS, &c.**: conc. in Ways and Means, 462 (i).
- PICTON AND MILFORD MAIL CARRIER, CHARGES AGAINST**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 803 (ii).
- PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS**: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 321 (i).
- Pictou Bank, winding-up authorisation B. No. 85** (Mr. *Tupper*, *Pictou*). 1°, 413; 2°, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°, 550 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- PICTURES, SHOW CARDS, &c.**: conc. in Ways and Means, 426 (i).
- PIERS IN P.E.I.**: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 669 (ii).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*, *King's*) 257 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
- PINETTE, P.E.I., HARBOR, DREDGING**: M. Cor. (Mr. *Welsh*) 146 (i).
- PIPES, CLAY TOBACCO**: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
- PLEURO-PNEUMONIA AND SLAUGHTER OF CATTLE**: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
- PLUMBAGO**: conc. in Ways and Means, 435 (i).
- POCKET-BOOKS AND PURSES**: conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
- POINT DU PÈRE BREAKWATER**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fiset*) 803 (ii).
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 102** (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°, 515 (i); 2°, 876; M. to place on Orders of the Day, 1001; in Com., 1088; 3°, 1092 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- PORT ARTHUR HARBOR, &c., CONSTRUCTION**: in Com. of Sup., 916 (ii).
- PORT LA TOUR HARBOR LIGHT**: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*, *Shelburne*) 785 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE TO EAST BAY STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY**: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- PORT ROWAN HARBOR OF REFUGE, ENGINEER'S REP., &c.**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 318 (i).
- PORT SAN JUAN HARBOR OF REFUGE**: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 102 (i).
- POST OFFICE**:
 ALEXANDRE, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 526 (i).
 BEAUHARNOIS P. O. INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 669, 786 (ii).
 C.P.R., AMOUNTS PAID FOR POSTAL SERVICE (Mr. *McLellan*) 1273 (ii).
 CORNTH P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 320 (i).
 DEBLOIS POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1004 (ii).
 DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 614, 653 (ii).
 GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*, *Montmorency*) 526 (i).
 ICE-BOAT MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 210 (i).
 IN COM. OF SUP., 1135, 1196 (ii).
 INSPECTOR FOR QUE., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 393 (i).
 IRREGULARITIES IN NEW BRUNSWICK: in Com. of Sup., 1190 (i).
 LABERGE, A., POSTMASTER ST. LUON STATION, ENQUIRY AGAINST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fiset*) 376 (i).
 MAIL CONTRACTS IN COUNTY OF LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 45 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE, WINTER (P.E.I.): M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 210 (i).
 MILFORD POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 322 (i).
 MONTMAGNY P. O. BUILDING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 151 (i).
 MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 45; M. for Ret., 151 (i).
 NEW BRUNSWICK AND P.E.I. MAIL SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Com. of Sup., 996, 997 (ii).
 PACIFIC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 278 (i).
 PAQUET, J., APPOINTMENT AS POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Einfret*) 153 (i).
 PICTON AND MILFORD MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 803 (ii).
 PICKERING, ONT., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 277 (i).
 POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REP.: presented (Mr. *McLellan*) 13 (i).
 ——— DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 668 (ii).
 REGISTERED LETTERS, LOSS OF AT BEAUHARNOIS POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 669 (ii).
 UPHILL AND VICTORIA ROAD SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 364 (i).
 [See also "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]
- POTATOES**: conc. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).
- PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL COUNTY COURT JUDGE**: Remarks (Mr. *Labrosse*) 1077 (ii).

- Prescott County Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57** (Mr. *Scriven*). 1°, 300; 2°, 369 (i); in Com. and 3°, 680 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- PREVENTIVE OFFICERS ON FRONTIER, APPOINTMENTS:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
- Primitive Methodist Colonisation Co.'s B. No. 129** (Mr. *Small*). 1° and 2°, 924; in Com. and 3° 1016 (ii). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.** See "ELECTIONS."
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:**
- DE BLOIS POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1004 (ii).
- DREDGING BRAN HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 321 (i).
- MURRAY HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, King's*) 669 (ii).
- PINETTE HARBOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 146 (i).
- TRACADIE HARBOR: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Welsh*) 213 (i).
- FIFTEEN POINT BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 312 (i).
- FISH TRAPS AT TIGNISH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 788 (ii).
- LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1001 (ii).
- ICE-BOATS, OWNED BY GOVERNMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 223 (i).
- SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 223 (i).
- MIMINGASH RANGE LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 153 (i).
- "M. A. STARN": in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 153 (i).
- "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
- PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, King's*) 257 (i); (Mr. *Welsh*) 669 (ii).
- P. E. I. AND PICTOU, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 150 (i).
- SUBWAY AND LETTER TO SENATOR HOWLAN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 527.
- Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 101, 142 (ii).
- STRAITS OF NORTHUMBRELAND SUBVEY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 803.
- SUBSIDY (MONEY) TO P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206. See B. 139.
- WINTER SERVICE. See "NORTHERN LIGHT."
- [See also "PUBLIC WORKS."]
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.:** in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
- BUREAU, COST OF ORGANISATION AND PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1113 (ii).
- COMMITTEE'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 804 (ii).
- MS. TO CONC. in (Mr. *Bergin*) 839, 951, 1156, 1198 (ii).
- PRESSES: conc. in Ways and Means, 508 (i).
- PRISONERS:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) to exercise Executive Clemency, 798 (ii).
- PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS:** M. to extend time (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 74 (i).
- reception of Reports from Com. (M. to extend time) (Mr. *Hall*) 515 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) to reduce time, 784 (ii).
- POSTING: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to suspend Rule 862 (ii).
- RULES RESPECTING: M. for Sp. Com. to revise, 633 (ii).
- Rep. of Sel. Com., 1115 (ii).
- M. to adja. deb. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1116 (ii).
- M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 1270 (ii).
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM.'S REP:** Remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 361 (i).
- See "QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION."
- PRIVILEGES OF COMMONS CLAIMED FROM HIS EX. AND CONFIRMED** (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
- PRIVILEGE.** See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 597, 601 (i), 1159; conc., 1266 (ii).
- Procedure in Criminal Cases.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- PROCEDURE.** See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS:** M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to postpone Order, 788 (ii).
- Prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 840; (Mr. *Fisher*) 842; neg. (Y. 70, N. 112) 950 (ii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Girouard*) 846; (Mr. *Freeman*) 846; (Mr. *Cargill*) 849; neg. (Y. 47, N. 136) 948 (ii).
- Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cargill*) 851; deb. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 852; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 855; (Mr. *Curran*) 857; (Mr. *Foster*) 858; (Mr. *Waldie*) 861; (Mr. *Casey*) 927; (Mr. *Lister*) 930; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 931; (Mr. *Mason*) 932; (Mr. *McMullen*) 932; (Mr. *McNeill*) 935; (Mr. *MacMillan, Huron*) 936; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 937; (Mr. *Porter*) 938; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 939; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 940; (Mr. *Bergin*) 941; (Mr. *Freeman*) 944; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 946; neg. (Y. 38; N. 145) 947 (ii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) compensation to Dealers, 948.
- Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) agreed to (Y. 91, N. 86) 950 (ii).
- COMPENSATION TO DEALERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 951 (ii).
- GOVT. POLICY: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 951 (ii).
- PROROGATION, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.,** 1269 (ii).
- COMMONS SUMMONED TO SENATE, 1, 3 (i), 1275 (ii).
- Congratulatory Remarks, 1274 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 804 (ii).
- Provincial Courts.** See "JUDGES."
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:** presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 13 (i).
- PUBLIC BILLS, RULES RESPECTING:** M. (Mr. *Hall*) to define practice, 568 (ii).
- Public Morals, &c.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- Public Officers Act Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *McLelan*). 1°, 20; 2°, 192; in Com., 225; 3°, 274 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- Public Stores B. No. 20** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 100; 2° and in Com., 273; 3°, 301 (i). (50-51 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- PUBLIC WORKS:**
- AMBICAT P. O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE SITE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flynn*) 790.
- BLANCHE RIVER, COMPLETION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 205 (i).
- BOILERS IN PARLT. BUILDINGS, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 383 (i).
- BRACKET BOARDS ON CRISHOLM'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Mallory*) 669, 786 (ii).
- BRAN HARBOR, P.E.I., DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 321 (i).
- BREAKWATER IN KING'S CO., N.E., REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Borden*) 803 (ii).
- CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDING IN PICTOU: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 321 (i).
- CAP À LA CORNELLE BOOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1001 (i).
- CHAMBLEY CANAL, APPOINTMENT OF SUPT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 19 (i).
- WIDENING: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 142 (i).
- DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 13 (i).
- DIPPER HARBOR BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 785 (ii).
- DUNDAS, PUBLIC OFFICES OR BUILDINGS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bain, Westworth*) 110 (i).
- ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 72 (ii).
- EXAMINING WAREHOUSE IN OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Edwards*) 45 (i).
- FATHER POINT HARBOR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 144 (i).
- FIFTEEN POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 312 (i).
- HARBORS AND BREAKWATERS, MONIES VOTED BY PARLT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1002 (ii).
- HARVEY, JOHN, CONTRACTS FOR SLIDES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 803 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

- HORTON LANDING, N.S., BREAKWATER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Borden) 803 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS, VENTILATION OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. Charlton) 788 (ii).
- HOWE, WM. & G., AMOUNTS PAID FOR PAINTING, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Holton) 144 (i).
- IN COM. OF SUP., 916, 971, 1183, 1242 (ii).
- KENTVILLE, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. Borden) 101 (i).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Flynn) 789 (ii).
- LIABILITIES : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 14, 15 (i).
- LUNenburg PUBLIC BUILDING, SITE FOR : Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 154.
- AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 1003 (ii).
- GRANT FOR : Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 1004 (ii).
- McKAY, WILLIAM, AMOUNTS PAID FOR PAINTING DEPTL. BUILDINGS : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Bryson) 369 (i).
- MIMINGASH, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 371 (i).
- RANGE LIGHT-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 163 (i).
- MURRAY HARBOR, P.E.I., DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Robertson, King's) 689 (ii).
- NEGUAC WHARF : Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) in Com. of Sup., 1242 (ii).
- PAINTING PARLIAMENTARY AND DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Holton) 144; (Mr. Bryson) 369 (i).
- PERLEY, H. F., SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- PIERS IN P.E.I., CONDITION OF : Ques. (Mr. Robertson, King's) 257 (i); (Mr. Welsh) 669; in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
- PINETTE HARBOR, P.E.I., DREDGING : M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 146 (i).
- PORT ROWAN HARBOR OF REFUGE, ENGINEER'S REP., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. Charlton) 318 (i).
- PUBLIC WHARF AT P.E.I., REPS. AS TO STATE : Ques. (Mr. Robertson, King's) 257 (i).
- RED POINT WHARF, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 786 (ii).
- RICHELIEU RIVER WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Béchard) 321 (i).
- RIDEAU HALL, EXPENDITURE ON : in Com. of Sup., 978 (ii).
- RIMOUSKI RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 205 (i).
- SAWDUST IN RIVERS AND STREAMS : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 257 (i).
- SLIDES ON THE MATTAWA RIVER, CONTRACTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lister) 803 (ii).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, RED RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1004 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DE LA POCAITIÈRE, WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1003 (ii).
- STE. CÉCILE DU BIC WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 526 (i).
- ST. FRANCIS AND STE. FAMILLE WHARVES : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 526 (i).
- ST. JÉRÔME DE MATANE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Fiset) 783 (ii).
- ST. MARY'S BAY, STURGEON BAY, &c., WHARVES AT : Ques. (Mr. Robertson, King's) 143 (i).
- ST. MICHAEL'S WHARF, REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. Amyot) in Com. of Sup., 982 (ii).
- ST. ROCH AND STE. LOUISE WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1003 (ii).
- TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 797 (ii).
- TRACADIE HARBOR : M. for Cor. (Mr. Welsh) 213 (i).
- VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS : M. for Cor. (Mr. Charlton) 788 (ii).
- WATER SUPPLY TO GOVT. BUILDINGS, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 973 (ii).
- WEST POINT WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 21 (i).
- WHITE MUD RIVER, MAN., IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Watson) 102 (i).
- YORK VILLAGE PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Montague) 1005 (ii).
- [See also "MARINE" and "PROVINCES."]
- QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 743, 1170; conc., 1267 (ii).
- PRECAUTIONS AGAINST CHOLERA : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 670 (ii).
- Québec and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. Grandbois). 1°*, 413; 2°*, 539 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 70.)

- QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).
- QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 257 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan B. No. 158 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 592 (i); M. for Com., 1031; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1032; 2°*, 1124; in Com., 1125; 3°*, 1127 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 41.)
- Quebec Ry. Bridge Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. Grandbois). 1°*, 441; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 98.)
- QUEBEC RIVER POLICE : Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 543 (i).
- SHIP LABORERS : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1006 (ii). See Bs. 142 and 162.
- QUEBEC :
- BÉLANGER, P., AND CARON, G., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1003 (ii).
- BOISVERT, L., APPOINTMENT AS LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
- BOLDUC, CAPT. L., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 525 (i).
- C.P.R. LAURENTIDES BRANCH LINES, TARIFF RATES : Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 525 (i).
- EXTENSION TO QUEBEC HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 44 (i).
- CAP ST. IGNACE, I.C.R. STATION, TENDERS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Choquette) 377 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. Dessaint) 103 (i).
- CARBONNEAU, O., DISMISSAL : M. for Ret. (Mr. Choquette) 21 (i).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN LANDS, INDEMNITY BY C.P.R. CO. : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 1199 (ii).
- CHOUINARD, D., PAYMENT OF AWARD OF ARBITRATORS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1006 (ii).
- CUSTOMS OFFICER AT ST. GERMAIN DE RIMOUSKI : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 278, 321 (i).
- DIONNE, JOSEPH, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 321 (i).
- DURANTAYE SENATORSHIP, APPLICANTS FOR : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 708 (i).
- ELECTORAL LISTS FOR L'ASSOMPTION : Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 525 (i).
- FERRY-BOATS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND LÉVIS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 258 (i).
- FLOODS AT MONTREAL AND VICINITY : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 101 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 277 (i).
- ENGINEER'S REPS., &c. : (M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rykert) 803 (ii).
- GAUMONT, E., DISMISSAL : M. for Ret. (Mr. Choquette) 21 (i).
- GIASSON, N., DISMISSAL : M. for Ret. (Mr. Doyon) 377 (i).
- GRONDINES LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
- GROS ISLE MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 975 (ii).
- HÉBERT, HUBERT, BALANCE DUE AS REVISING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 258 (i).
- REVISING OFFICER FOR MONTMAGNY, ACCOUNTS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Choquette) 803 (ii).
- I. U. R. See general heading.
- KENNEDY SENATORSHIP, APPLICANTS FOR : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 708 (ii).
- LABERGE, A., ENQUIRY AGAINST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fiset) 376 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1003 (ii).
- LANDS EXPROPRIATED FOR ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Guay) 803 (ii).
- L'ÉVÉQUE, ARSÈNE, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1200 (ii).
- MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC : M. for Ret.* (Sir Donald Smith) 803 (ii).
- MARINE SCHOOL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 757 (ii).
- MORIN, DR. J., CLAIM FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1004 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE RAILROAD, PURCHASE OF : M. for Ret. (Mr. Gigault) 209 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- OLIVIER, E., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
 PELLETIER, F., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. Choquette) 21 (i).
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 257 (i).
 QUEBEC 9TH BATTALION DRILL: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 670 (ii).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 708, 712 (ii).
 — EXPENSES IN THE N.-W.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 1234 (ii).
 QUEBEC RIVER POLICE, APPOINTMENT OF CONSTABLES: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 543 (i).
 QUEBEC SHIP LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1006 (ii).
 RAILWAY CROSSING AT ST. CHARLES DE BELLECHASSE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Amyot) 152 (i).
 RESIGNATION OF LIQUOR GOV., QUE.: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 669 (ii).
 REVISING OFFICER'S ACCOUNT re KANOURASKA ELECTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Desautel) 318 (i).
 — L'ASSOMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 1004 (ii).
 — MONTMAGNY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Choquette) 803 (ii).
 — MONTMORENCY: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 45 (i).
 RICHELIEU RIVER, &C., BUOYS, CONTRACTS AWARDED: Ques. (Mr. Claves) 321 (i).
 ROY, HONORÉ, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 143 (i).
 "STE. ANNE," SHOONER, SEIZURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 803 (ii).
 ST. CHARLES AND ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS STATION-HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 101 (i).
 ST. CHARLES, BELLECHASSE, RY. CROSSING: M. for Cor. (Mr. Amyot) 152 (i).
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY. EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Guay) 803 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 ST. ESPRIT, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153.
 ST. HYACINTHE (84TH) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. Bechard) 1006 (ii).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS, ENGINEERS REPORTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
 SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 757 (ii).
- QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION:
- M. for Clerk of Crown to attend House with Rets., &c. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 4 (i).
 - M. for Clerk of Crown to attend with papers, &c., 5.
 - M. that Returning Officer transmit papers, &c., (Mr. Skinner) 100 (i).
 - Res. to amend Ret. by substituting name of Mr. King instead of Mr. Baird (Mr. Skinner) 155; (Mr. Thompson) 156 (i).
- Amt. to refer Ret. to Com. on Privileges and Elections (Mr. Thompson) 160; deb. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 160; (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) 161; (Mr. Edgar) 167; (Mr. Landry) 170; (Mr. Ellis) 173; (Mr. Davin) 174; (Mr. Barron) 175; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 176; (Mr. Choquette) 177; (Mr. Mitchell) 178; (Mr. Sutherland) 179; (Mr. Lister) 180; (Mr. Foster) 181; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 182; (Mr. Macdonald, Victoria) 183; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 184; (Mr. Sproule) 185; (Mr. Amyot) 186; (Mr. Girouard) 187; (Mr. Fisher) 188; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 189 (i).
- REP. OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 369 (i).
 - Res. (Mr. Girouard) summoning J. R. Dunn to Bar of House, 383, 588 (i).
 - Announcement of attendance of John R. Dunn (Mr. Speaker) 524 (i).
 - JOHN R. DUNN, BEFORE BAR OF HOUSE, 616; M. (Mr. Thompson) to allow Counsel, 616; Examination, 627-636.
 - M. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) to disagree in 2nd Rep. of Com. on Privileges and Elections, 638, 671 (ii).

QUEEN'S, N.B., ELECTION—Continued.

- Explanation of Sitting Member (Mr. Baird) 671; (Mr. Thompson) 675 (i).
 Amt. (Mr. Thompson) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 677; (Mr. Davies) 677; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 85) 806 (ii).
 Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Davies) summoning Ret. Officer to bar of House to amend Ret., 683; deb. (Mr. Weldon, Albert) 684; (Mr. Amyot) 686; (Mr. Ellis) 686; (Mr. Girouard) 688; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 690; (Messrs. Cockburn and Casey) 692; (Mr. O'Brien) 695; (Mr. Freeman) 696; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 697; (Mr. Monrieff) 698; (Mr. Lister) 700; (Messrs. Gillmor and Hudspeth) 701; neg. (Y. 85, N. 104) 702; (Mr. Mitchell) 702 (ii).
- PAYMENT OF COSTS AND EXPENSES OF CONTEST: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 205 (i).
- QUEEN'S COUNTY, N.B., REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1002 (ii).
- QUEEN'S OWN AND ROYAL GRENADIERS' KIT ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 37 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (ii).
- Railway Act Amt. B. No. 31 (Mr. Mulock). 1°, 142 (i).
 Railway Act Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. Pope). 1°, 204; 2°, 301; in Com., 361; 3°, 363 (i); Sen. Amts conc. in, 1031 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 19.)
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Pope) 15 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 614 (i), 766, 823, 1173, 1241; conc., 12 7 (ii).
- RAILWAY CHARTERS. See "DISALLOWANCE."
- RAILWAY COMMISSION, APPOINTMENTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mulock) 110 (i).
- Railway Employés Protection B. No. 112 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 589 (i).
- Railways (Govt.) Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. Pope). 1°, 20; 2°, 192; in Com., 226; 3°, 364 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 18.)
- RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, LIABILITIES FOR: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 14, 15 (i).
- RAILWAYS. See
- ALBERTA AND ARTHABASKA RAILWAY CO.
 - ALBERTA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 - ALBERTA RAILWAY CO.
 - ATLANTIC AND NORTH-WEST RAILWAY CO.
 - BERLIN AND CANADIAN PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 - BRANDON, SOUTH CITY AND ROCK LAKE RAILWAY CO.
 - BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY CO.
 - CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY CO.
 - CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.
 - CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.
 - CHINOOK BELT AND PEACE RIVER RAILWAY CO.
 - EMERSON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO.
 - COBourg, BLAIRTON AND MARMORA RAILWAY CO.
 - GODERICH AND CANADIAN PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 - GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY CO.
 - GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY CO.
 - GUELPH JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 - HALIFAX EXTENSION RAILWAY.
 - HAMILTON, GUELPH AND BUFFALO RAILWAY CO.
 - HAMILTON NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO.
 - HERRFORD BRANCH RAILWAY CO.
 - INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
 - KINCARDINE AND TRESWATER RAILWAY CO.
 - KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RAILWAY CO.
 - KINGSFORD, PROP. LINE.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

- MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO.
 MANITOBA AND SOUTH-WESTERN COLONISATION RAILWAY CO.
 MASSAWIPPI JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 MIDLAND RAILWAY CO.
 NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY CO.
 NEW WESTMINSTER SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO.
 NIAGARA AND WOODSTOCK RAILWAY CO.
 NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.
 NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.
 ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY CO.
 ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.
 ONTARIO SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY CO.
 OSHAWA RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION CO.
 OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RAILWAY CO.
 OXFORD JUNCTION AND NEW GLASGOW BRANCH.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
 PRESBOTT COUNTY RAILWAY CO.
 PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY.
 QUEBEC AND JAMES' BAY RAILWAY CO.
 REGINA AND WOOD MOUNTAIN RAILWAY CO.
 SASKATCHEWAN AND WESTERN RAILWAY CO.
 SAINT MARTIN'S AND UPHAM RAILWAY CO.
 SAINT GABRIEL LEVEE AND RAILWAY CO.
 SHORT LINE RY.
 SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY CO.
 SOUTH NORFOLK RAILWAY CO.
 SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RAILWAY CO.
 SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY CO.
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RAILWAY CO.
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RAILWAY.
 TEEBOWATER AND INVERHURON RAILWAY CO.
 TÉMISCOUATA RAILWAY CO.
 UPPER COLUMBIA RAILWAY CO.
 WATERLOO AND MAGOG RAILWAY CO.
 WESTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY CO.
 WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CO.
 WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY CO.
- [See also "SUBSIDIES."]
- RAKES, GARDEN: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
Real Property Act in N.W.T. Amt. B. No. 8
 (Mr. Davin). 1°, 20 (i).
Real Property in the N.W.T. (Chap 51 Rev. Statutes)
Act Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1023;
 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1228 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 30.)
 REBELLION IN N.W.T., CLAIMS PAID AND REJECTED: Ques.
 (Mr. Holton) 1003 (ii).
 ——— SCRIP FOR SERVICES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 16 (i).
 ——— 1837, SWISSER, J., SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Wilson,
Elgin) 365, 368 (i).
 ——— 1837, VOLUNTEERS SERVICES: M. for Ret. (Mr.
Purcell) 366 (i).
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, ESTIMATES, &c.: M. for
 Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 110, 223 (i).
 RECIPROcity TREATY WITH THE U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*)
 669 (ii).
 RED POINT WHARF REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Weisk*) 786 (ii).
Regina and Wood Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No.
37 (Mr. Davin). 1°, 190; 2°, 312 (i); withdn., 707 (ii).
 REGINA TOWN SITE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN C.P.R. AND GOV.:
 M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 803 (ii).
 REGISTERED LETTERS, LOSS AT BEAUHARNOIS P.O.: Ques.
 (Mr. *Holton*) 669 (ii).
 REPAIRS, FURNISHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1184, 1246; conc.,
 1269 (ii).

Representation Act, B.C., Amt. B. No. 50 (Mr.
Baker). 1°, 223 (i).

Representation in House of Commons (Chap. 6
Rev. Statutes) B. No. 140 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 839;
 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1127 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 4.)

REPRESENTATION IN SENATE FOR N.W.T. See B. 17.

REPRINTS. See "COPYRIGHT."

REPS., DEPT., DISTRIBUTION: prop. M. to change Rule (Mr.
Charlton) 144 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

- AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Carling*) 19 (i).
 AUDITOR GENERAL (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
 CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (Mr. *Chapleau*) 44 (i).
 INDIAN AFFAIRS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 13 (i).
 INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 13 (i).
 INTERIOR (Mr. *White*, *Cardwell*) 13 (i).
 JUSTICE, PENITENTIARIES BRANCH (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 15 (i).
 LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
 MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. *Foster*) 13 (i).
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 13 (i).
 MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 784 (ii).
 POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *McLelan*) 13 (i).
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 13 (i).
 PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 13 (i).
 RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Pope*) 15 (i).
 TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 13 (i).

RESIGNATION OF LIEUT.-GOV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Rin-*
fret) 669 (ii).

RESTIGOUCHE, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy, Member deceas-
 ed, 277 (i).

——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 361.

——— Return of Member Elect, 588 (i).

RETURNING OFFICERS. See "SECRETARY OF STATE."

RETURNS: Enquiry for, &c. (Mr. *Perley*, *Assiniboia*) 1249 (ii).

RETURNS OF ELECTIONS OF 1874: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tupper*,
Pictou) 209 (i).

——— VOTES POLLED, 1887: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*, *Both-*
well) 110 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:

- ANIMALS, &c., EXPORTED, VALUES: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 15 (i).
 ANNAPOLIS FORT, SALE OF MILITARY LANDS: Mr. *Jones*, 379 (i).
 ARICHAU, P. O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE, SITE: Mr. *Flynn*, 790 (ii).
 BANFF SPRINGS, REP. ON CLAIMS TO POSSESSION: Mr. *Casey*, 364 (i).
 BOISVERT, L., APPOINTMENT AS LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Mr. *Rinfret*, 803.
 BOOT ISLAND (N.S.) BREAKWATER: Mr. *Borden*, 803 (ii).
 BRIDGE ACROSS THE WELLAND CANAL: Mr. *Blake*, 295 (i).
 BROKOVSKI, ED., EMPLOYÉ INTERIOR DEPT., COR. RESPECTING: Mr.
Mulock, 803 (ii).
 BUTTER IMPORTATION FROM THE U.S.: Mr. *Taylor*, 211 (i).
 CAMPBELL, SIR ALEXANDER, COMMISSION TO: Mr. *Casey*, 150 (i).
 CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See general heading.
 CARBONNEAU, O., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Choquette*, 21 (i).
 CAP ST. IGNAOE, I.O.R. STATION, TENDERS: Mr. *Choquette*, 377 (i).
 ——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 103 (i).
 CAPE BRETON RY. CONSTRUCTION, SURVEYS, &c.: Mr. *Flynn*, 790 (ii).
 CIVIL SERVICE PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS: Mr. *Casey*, 383 (i).
 CIVIL SERVANTS, PERMANENT OR OTHERWISE: Mr. *McMullen*, 383 (i).
 COLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND IMP. GOVTS. &c.:
 Mr. *Edgar*, 219 (i).
 COLONIAL CONFERENCE, CANADA'S REPRESENTATIVES: Mr. *Casey* 150.
 COLLINS, J., M.D., MEDICAL OFFICER AT QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL:
 Mr. *Charlton*, 379 (i).
 CONSOLIDATED FUNDS, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: Sir *Richard Cart-*
wright 15 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

COSTS *re* KAMOURASKA ELECTION* : Mr. Dessaint, 318 (i).
 COPYRIGHT. See "COPYRIGHT."
 CUMMINGTON, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT SAUGHEN : Mr. Somerville, 314 (i).
 CUSTOMS. See general heading.
 DODD, Dr., *re* VACCINATION OF INDIANS : Mr. Charlton, 379 (i).
 DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CLAIMS OF CONTRACTOR* : Mr. Weldon, St. John, 803 (ii).
 DREDGING PINETTE HARBOR, P.E.I. : Mr. Welsh, 146 (i).
 ELECTIONS, GENERAL (1874) RETURNS : Mr. Tupper, Pictou, 209 (i).
 ELGIN JUNIOR COUNTY JUDGE : Mr. Wilson, Elgin, 368 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS* : Sir Richard Cartwright, 15 (i).
 FILE HILL RESERVE, VACCINATION OF INDIANS : Mr. Charlton, 379 (i).
 FINANCES OF NOVA SCOTIA : Mr. Jones, 215 (i).
 FISHING LICENSES ON LAKE ERIE : Mr. Casey, 379 (i).
 FISHING BOUNTIES, APPLICATIONS* : Mr. Barron, 803 (ii).
 FISHING VESSELS BOARDED OR WARNED BY OFFICERS IN PROTECTION SERVICE : Mr. Ellis, 220 (i).
 FISHERIES. See general heading.
 FLOODS AT MONTREAL* : Mr. Rinfret, 803 (ii).
 FORT ANNAPOLIS, SALE OF MILITARY LANDS : Mr. Jones, 379 (i).
 FRANCHISE ACT, COSTS OF VOTERS' LISTS : Mr. Landerkin, 15 (i).
 GAUMONT, E., DISMISSAL : Mr. Choquette, 21 (i).
 GEOGRAPHICAL NOMENCLATURE IN BLUE-BOOKS : Mr. Dawson, 801 (ii).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS AROUND THUNDER BAY : Mr. Dawson, 213 (i).
 GLASSON, N., DISMISSAL : Mr. Doyon, 377 (i).
 GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, DETAILS : Sir Richard Cartwright, 150, 258, 279 (i).
 GRAIN EXPORTS, VALUES* : Sir Richard Cartwright, 15 (i).
 GRAND TRUNK RY. See general heading.
 GRAIN SHIPMENTS OVER I.O.R. : Mr. Ellis, 380 (i).
 GRAY, PETER, COR *re* E. BROKOVSKI* : Mr. Barron, 803 (ii).
 GRONDINES LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER* : Mr. Rinfret, 803 (ii).
 HALDIMAND ELECTION (1877) RETURNING OFFICER'S RET. : Mr. Casey, 372 (i).
 HARVEY, JOHN, CONTRACTS FOR SLIDES, &c.* : Mr. Lister, 803 (ii).
 HERBERT, H., REVISING OFFICER, MONTMAGNY* : Mr. Choquette, 803 (i).
 HIGH COMMISSIONER, RESIGNATION, &c. : Mr. Mills, Bothwell, 376 (i).
 ——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES : Mr. Somerville, 313 (i).
 HORTON LANDING, N.S., BREAKWATER* : Mr. Borden, 803 (ii).
 HOUSE OF COMMONS VENTILATION : Mr. Charlton, 786 (ii).
 HOWE, WM. & G., AMOUNTS PAID FOR PAINTING DEPTL. BUILDINGS : Mr. Holton, 144 (i).
 ICE-BOAT MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. : Mr. Perry, 210 (i).
 ICE-BOATS OWNED BY GOVT. IN P.E.I. : Mr. Perry, 223 (i).
 IMPORTS OF TEA FROM CHINA AND JAPAN* : Mr. Bowman, 23 (i).
 INDIAN ADMINISTRATION IN THE N.W.T.* : Mr. Somerville, 369 (i).
 INDIANS. See general heading.
 INLAND REVENUE. See "CUSTOMS."
 INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS *re* FISHERIES PROTECTION : Mr. Ellis, 221 (i).
 INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.
 "JAMAICA" PULLMAN CAR, EXPENSES : Mr. Somerville, 313 (i).
 JUNIOR COUNTY JUDGE FOR ELGIN : Mr. Wilson, Elgin, 368 (i).
 KAMOURASKA ELECTORAL DISTRICT, COST *re* ELECTION* : Mr. Dessaint, 318 (i).
 KINGSPORT (BASIN OF MINAS) RY., SURVEYS, &c.* : Mr. Borden, 803.
 LABERGE, A., POSTMASTER, STE. LUCE STATION, ENQUIRY AGAINST : Mr. Fiset, 376 (i).
 L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, SURVEYS, &c. : Mr. Flynn, 789 (ii).
 LANDS SOLD BY C.P.R. IN MAN. : Mr. Watson, 222 (i).
 ——— N.W.T. : Mr. Perley, Assiniboia, 317 (i).
 ——— EXPROPRIATED FOR ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY.* : Mr. Guay, 803 (ii).
 LICENSES TO FISH ON LAKE ERIE : Mr. Casey, 379 (i).
 LOBSTER, CLOSE SEASON IN N.S. : Mr. Flynn, 316 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE (WINTER) P.E.I. : Mr. Perry, 210 (i).
 MAIN DUCKS AND WALPOLE ISLANDS LEASE : Mr. Platt, 369 (i).
 MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC* : Sir Donald Smith, 803.
 MEDICAL ATTENDANTS, QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL : Mr. Charlton, 379 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

MERRITT, LIBUT. WM. H., PROMOTION *re* SERVICES : Mr. Barron, 788.
 MILITIA. See general heading.
 MONTREAL COTTON CO.'S IRREGULARITIES. See "CUSTOMS."
 MONTREAL FLOODS. See "FLOODS."
 MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE BUILDING : Mr. Choquette, 151 (i).
 MYRIEK, H., COR. AGAINST SETTING FISH TRAP : Mr. Perry, 788 (ii).
 MOKAY, WM., AMOUNTS PAID FOR PAINTING, &c.* : Mr. Bryson, 369.
 MCDUGALL, MICHAEL, FISHERY WARDEN* : Mr. Barron, 808 (ii).
 150 (i).
 "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND* : Mr. Perry, 153 (i).
 NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, PURCHASE BY G.T.R. : Mr. Gigault, 209 (i).
 "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
 NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RAILWAY SUBSIDY : Mr. Eisenhauer, 214 (i).
 NOVA SCOTIA'S FINANCIAL CONDITION : Mr. Jones, 215 (i).
 O'DONOGHUE, LATE W.B., PROPERTY OF : Mr. Barron, 364 (i).
 OLDEMARGARINE. See "Butter Importations."
 OLIVIER, E., DISMISSAL* : Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).
 PAINTING PARLIAMENTARY AND DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS : Mr. Holton, 144 ; Mr. Bryson, 369 (ii).
 PAQUET, J., APPOINTMENT AS POSTMASTER* : Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).
 PEAROE, W., REP. ON CLAIMANT'S POSSESSION TO BANFF SPRINGS : Mr. Casey, 364 (i).
 PELLETIER, F., DISMISSAL : Mr. Choquette, 21 (i).
 P.E.I. AND PICTOU, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN : Mr. Perry, 150 (i).
 PICTOU AND MILFORD MAIL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST* : Mr. Platt, 803 (ii).
 PINETTE HARBOR, P.E.I., DREDGING : Mr. Welsh, 146 (i).
 POINT DU PERE BREAKWATER* : Mr. Fiset, 803 (ii).
 PORT ROWAN, ONT., HARBOR OF REFUGE* : Mr. Charlton, 318 (i).
 POST OFFICE. See general heading.
 PREVENTIVE OFFICERS APPOINTED ON FRONTIER* : Mr. McMullen, 223.
 PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS, CIVIL SERVICE* : Mr. Casey, 383 (i).
 PULLMAN CAR "JAMAICA," EXPENSES : Mr. Somerville, 313 (i).
 QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL MEDICAL OFFICER : Mr. Charlton, 379.
 QUEBEC MARINE AND IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL* : Sir Donald Smith, 803 (ii).
 RAILWAY CROSSING AT ST. CHARLES DE BELLECHASSE : Mr. Amyot, 152 (i).
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND : Sir Richard Cartwright, 15 (i).
 RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATES* : Sir Richard Cartwright, 110, 223 (i).
 REGINA TOWN SITE, SALE OF LOTS AND RECEIPTS* : Mr. Davin, 803 (ii).
 REPRINTS OF COPYRIGHT WORKS. See "COPYRIGHT."
 RETURNS OF ELECTIONS OF 1874 : Mr. Tupper, Pictou, 209 (i).
 RETURNING OFFICERS AT ELECTIONS OF 1897 : Mr. Somerville, 223 (i).
 RETURNING OFFICER'S RET. *re* HALDIMAND ELECTION : Mr. Casey, 372 (i).
 REVISING BARRISTERS CLAIMS* : Mr. Davess, 803 (ii).
 REVISING OFFICER, MONTMAGNY ELECTORAL DISTRICT* : Mr. Choquette, 803 (ii).
 RIDEAU RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS* : Mr. Robillard, 803 (ii).
 ROBERTSON, REV. J., AND MR. VANROUGHNET, COR. BETWEEN* : Mr. Somerville, 369 (i).
 SALES OF LAND BY C.P.R. IN MAN. : Mr. Watson, 222 (i).
 SAUGHEN INDIAN AGENT : Mr. Somerville, 314 (i).
 SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER* : Mr. Borden, 803 (ii).
 SEIZURES OF TOBACCO THROUGH ILLLEGAL SALES* : Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).
 SETTLERS' CLAIMS IN DISPUTED TERRITORY* : Mr. Dawson, 803 (ii).
 SNEYMOU, M. M., M.D., MEDICAL OFFICER, QU'APPELLE INDIAN SCHOOL : Mr. Charlton, 379 (i).
 SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM OF : Mr. Paterson, Brant, 306 (i).
 SPIRITS, SEIZURE AND CONFISCATION* : Mr. Langelier, Montmorency, 803 (ii).
 STILLS, ILLICIT, SEIZED BY INLAND REV. DEPT. : Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- STRAITS OF NORTHUMBRLAND SURVEY*: Mr. Perry, 803 (ii).
 SUPPLIES FURNISHED I.C.R. AT HALIFAX AND TRURO: Mr. Jones, 210 (i).
 SURVEYS, &c., L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER: Mr. Flynn, 789 (ii).
 SURVEYS, &c., CAPS BRETON RYS.: Mr. Flynn, 790 (i).
 SWISSER, J., SERVICES DURING REBELLION OF 1887: Mr. Wilson, *Elgin*, 365 (i).
 "STE. ANNE" SCHOONER, SEIZURE*: Mr. Langelier, *Montmorency*, 803 (ii).
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY., EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS*: Mr. Guay,
 ST. CHARLES DE BELLECHASSE RY. CROSSING: Mr. Amyot, 152 (i).
 ST. ESPRIT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL*: Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).
 ST. JÉROME DE MATANE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: Mr. Fiset, 788 (ii).
 803 (ii).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS*. See "FLOODS."
 TAYLOR, JUDGE, REP. re HON. J. TRAVIS IN N.-W.*: Mr. Mulock, 803.
 TEA IMPORTS, CHINA AND JAPAN: Mr. Bowman, 23 (i).
 TENDERS FOR CAP ST. IGNACE STATION: Mr. Choquette, 377 (i).
 THUNDER BAY GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Mr. Dawson, 213 (i).
 TIGNISH, P. E. I., FISH TRAP: Mr. Perry, 788 (ii).
 TIMBER AND MINING LICENSES IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: Mr. Dawson, 803 (ii).
 TOBACCO SEIZURES AND ILEGAL SALES*: Mr. Rinfret, 153 (i).
 TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Mr. McMullen, 797 (ii).
 TRACADIE HARBOR, P. E. I.: Mr. Welsh, 213 (i).
 TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF GOVT.: Mr. Somerville, 313 (i).
 TUPPER, SIR CHAS., AND GOVT., COR. BETWEEN WHILE HIGH COMMISSIONER: Mr. Mills, *Bothwell*, 376 (i).
 TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Mr. Somerville, 313 (i).
 VANKOUGHNET, MR., AND REV. J. ROBERTSON, COR. BETWEEN*: Mr. Somerville, 369 (i).
 VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS: Mr. Charlton, 786 (ii).
 VOTES LISTS UNDER FRANCHISE ACT, COST: Mr. Landerkin, 15 (i).
 WARRANTS, GOVERNOR GENERAL'S, DETAILS: Sir Richard Cartwright, 150, 258, 279 (i).
 WELLAND CANAL, BRIDGE ACROSS: Mr. Blake, 295 (i).
 WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE: Mr. Platt, 369 (i).
 WHITE FISH RIVER, INDIAN RESERVE: Mr. Barron, 802, (ii).
 WINTER SERVICE, P. E. I., AND "NORTHERN LIGHT": Mr. Robertson, *King's*, 530 (i).
 WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH GOVT.: Mr. Jones, 147 (i).
 WELBANKS, D., COMPLAINTS AGAINST*: Mr. Platt, 803 (ii).
 YORKSHIRE ISLAND AND MAIN DUCKS, LEASE: Mr. Platt, 369 (i).
 REVISING OFFICERS. See "SECRETARY OF STATE."
 REVISED STATUTES. See "STATUTES."
 REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. Laballe). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 101.)
 RICHELIEU RIVER, &c., BUOYS, CONTRACTS AWARDED: Ques. (Mr. Claves) 321 (i).
 — WHARF: Ques (Mr. Béchard) 321 (i).
 RICHMOND HILL JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1142; in Com., 1259 (ii).
 RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 838; conc., 1268 (ii).
 RIDEAU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 14 (i).
 — OBSTRUCTIONS: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Robillard) 803 (ii).
 RIDDELL, FANNY MARGARET. See "DIVORCE."
 RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 763 (ii).
 RIMOUSKI RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 205 (i).
 RIVETS, &c., IRON OR STEEL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).
 ROBERTSON, REV. JAMES. See "VANKOUGHNET."

- ROBINSON TREATIES, AMOUNTS DUE INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. Dawson) 1199 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park. See "BANFF."
 ROLLING STOCK, C. P. R. (B. C.) VALUATION: M. for Com. of Sup. 1034 (ii).
 Deb. (Mr. Mulock) 1034; (Sir Charles Tupper) 1038; (Mr. Davies) 1040 (Mr. Pope) 1043; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1044; (Mr. Mc Carthy) 1047; (Mr. Jones) 1049; (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) 1051; (Mr. McMullen) 1053; (Mr. Thompson) 1054; (Mr. Mills, *Bothwell*) 1056.
 — I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 823, 1177 (ii).
 ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1275 (ii).
 ROYAL COMMISSION ON RYS.: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
 — ON CANAL LEASES: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 755, 758; conc., 1268 (ii).
 ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1248 (ii).
Royal Victoria Hospital incorp. B. No. 150, (Mr. Curran). 1°* and 2°*, 951; in Com. and 3°*, 1142 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 125.)
 ROY, HONORE, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 143 (i).
 RULES OF THE HOUSE. See "PRIVATE BILLS."
 STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. Watson), 1003 (ii).
 "STE. ANNE", SCHOONER, SEIZURE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Langelier, *Montmorency*) 803 (ii).
 ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1004 (ii).
 STE. ANNE'S CANAL, RESIDENCE AND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 11 (Mr. Bergin). 1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com., and 3°*, 426 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 60.)
 — SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1142 (ii).
 ST. CATHARINES MARINE HOSPITAL: Ques. (Sir Donald Smith) 668 (ii).
 — MILLING AND LUMBER CO., INDEMNITY FOR COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1187 (ii).
 ST. CÉCILE DU BIC WHARF: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 526 (i).
 ST. CHARLES AND ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS STATION HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 101 (i).
 ST. CHARLES, BELLECHASSE, RY. CROSSING: M. for Cor. (Mr. Amyot) 152 (i).
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (ii).
 — EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS, CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Guay) 803 (ii).
 ST. ESPRIT, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
 ST. FRANÇOIS, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF AT: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, *Montmorency*) 21 (i).
 — AND STE. FAMILLE WHARVES: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, *Montmorency*) 526 (i).
St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. Curran). 1°*, 74; 2°*, 153; in Com. and 3°*, 538 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 72.)
 ST. GERMAIN DE RIMOUSKI, CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 278, 321 (i).

- ST. HYACINTHE (84TH) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 1005 (ii).
- ST. JÉROME DE MATANE WHARF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Fiset) 788 (ii).
- ST. JOHN, N.B., RY. ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (ii).
- ST. JOHN, N.B., AND BASIN OF MINAS PORTS: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (ii).
- St. Johns and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. Coursol). 1°*, 638; 2° m., 875; 2°, 876 (ii); withdn.
- ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE AND LOWER LAURENTIAN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1262 (ii).
- CANALS ENLARGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 313 (i).
- FLOODS AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 101 (i).
- ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copies* (Mr. Rinfret) 803 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Curran) 277 (i).
- St. Lawrence River Improvements B. No. 168 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1142; in Com., 1156; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 1159 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 43.)
- STE. LUCE STATION, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1003 (ii).
- ST. MARY'S BAY, STURGEON BAY, & C., WHARVES: Ques. Mr. Robertson, King's) 143 (i).
- St. Martin's and Upham Ry. Co.'s B. No. 134 (Mr. Skinner). 1°*, 782; 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 75.)
- ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (ii).
- ST. ROCH AND STE. LOUISE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1003 (ii).
- SALT, COARSE, & C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 435, 439 (i).
- SALT IN BARRELS, WEIGHT OF: Ques. (Mr. Campbell, Kent) 205 (i).
- Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. Scarth). 1°*, 524 (i); 2°, 680; withdn., 889 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS, COUNTRY: in Com. of Sup., 592 (i).
- SAWDUST IN RIVERS AND STREAMS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 257 (i).
- SAW-LOGS. See "SHINGLE BOLTS."
- SCHOONER OWNED BY R. LINDSAY AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 527 (i).
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (ii).
- SCOTT'S BAY BREAKWATER, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Borden) 803 (ii).
- SCREWS, & C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 507, 522 (i).
- SCRIP FOR SERVICES IN REBELLION, OUTSIDE MILITIA: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 16 (i).
- VETERANS OF 1837: Ques. (Mr. Purcell) 320 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE:
- BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE Co.'s CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 142 (i).
- CHAMBERLIN, MR. B., EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT. See B. 54.
- CIVIL SERVANTS, EXTRA PAY; in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1181 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE—Continued.
- CIVIL SERVANTS, OFFICE HOURS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1129 (ii).
- PERMANENT OR OTHERWISE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 883.
- AND ELECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 660 (ii).
- STAFF, NAMES AND ADDRESSES, & C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 883 (i).
- VACANCIES, SUPERANNUATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 44 (i).
- COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1006 (ii).
- REMARKS ON M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (ii).
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES, PAPERS, & C., RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 143, 154 (i).
- DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i), 1162 (ii).
- DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. Chapleau) 44 (i).
- ELECTORAL LISTS FOR L'ASSOMPTION Co.: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 525.
- FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT REPEAL: Ques. (Mr. De St. Georges) 205.
- FRANCHISE ACT, COSTS OF VOTERS' LISTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 15, 16 (i).
- RECIPROCIITY WITH THE U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 669 (ii).
- RETURNING OFFICER FOR ALGOMA: in Com. of Sup., 1240 (ii).
- HALDIMAND ELECTION, RET. re: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 372.
- OFFICERS' EXPENSES AT ELECTIONS OF 1887: M. for Ret. (Mr. Somerville) 223 (i).
- EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 669 (ii).
- REVISING OFFICERS' CLERKS SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 371 (i).
- PAYMENTS TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davies) 803 (ii).
- ACCOUNTS re KAMOURASKA ELECTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Dessaint) 318 (i).
- OFFICER FOR L'ASSOMPTION: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 1004 (ii).
- MONTMAGNY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Choquette) 803 (ii).
- MONTMORENCY: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 45 (i).
- SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 21 (i); (Mr. Choquette) 671 (ii).
- STATUTES, REVISED, OF CANADA, COMMISSIONERS, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 205 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 668 (ii).
- FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 142 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS IN P.E. COUNTY, COST OF REVISION, & C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 369 (i).
- MONTMORENCY: M. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) to lay on Table, 528 (i).
- REVISION: Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 649 (ii).
- UNDER FRANCHISE ACT: remarks (Mr. Charlton) 805 (i).
- Seduction, & C. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SEIZURE OF BRITISH VESSELS IN BEHRING'S SEA: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 21 (i).
- SEIZURES OF VESSELS IN N.S., & C., FROM 1885 TO 1887: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jones) 110 (i).
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See "COMMITTEES."
- SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 660, 1233; conc., 1267 (ii).
- Senate Representation for the N.W.T. B. No. 17 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°, 74; 2°, 197; in Com., 246, 301; 3°*, 302 (i). (50-51 Vic., c. 3.)
- SERVIS TIE PLATES: in Com. of Sup., 829 (ii).
- SESSIONAL PAPERS, INDEXING: Remarks (Mr. Davies) 1074; (Mr. Bergin) 1074 (ii).
- SETTLEMENT IN N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1002 (ii).
- SEWING MACHINES: conc. in Ways and Means, 434 (i).
- SEWING THREAD, COTTON: conc. in Ways and Means, 427 (i).
- SHELburne HARBOR ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 668 (ii).
- SHEPPARD, E. E., AND TORONTO MAGISTRATES: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 1199 (ii).
- WARRANT FOR ARREST: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 45.

- SHINGLE BOLTS, SAW LOGS, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 510-514 (i).
- Ship Laborers' Protection.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SHIP LABORERS, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1006 (ii).
- SHIPPING NEWS AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 312 (i).
- SHIRTS, COTTON OR LINEN: conc. in Ways and Means, 450-452 (i).
- SHOE AND SHOEMAKERS' INK: conc. in Ways and Means, 426 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY., MATERIALS USED IN CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 383 (i).
— in Com. of Sup., 1179 (ii).
- SHOVELS AND SPADES: conc. in Ways and Means, 463 (i), 965 (ii).
- Sick and Distressed Mariners' B. No. 76** (Mr. Foster). 1°, 360 (i); 2°* and in Com., 643 (ii); 3°*, 644 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 40.)
- SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks on Prorogation (Mr. Mills) 1270 (ii).
- SIX NATION INDIANS. See "INDIANS."
- SIZING-CREAM, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
- SKATES: conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i).
- SLATES, ROOFING: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
— SCHOOL AND WRITING: conc. in Ways and Means, 439 (i).
- SLEDGES, TRACK TOOLS, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 507 (i).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (ii).
- SOCKS AND STOCKINGS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii)
- Solicitor General appointment B. No. 42** (Mr. Thompson). Res. prop. and 1°, 191 (i); 2° m., 889; 2°*, Res. and B. in Com. and 3°*, 1121 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 14.)
- Sorel Harbor Improvements, &c., provision B. No. 148** (Mr. Labelle). 1°*, 925 (ii).
- South-Eastern Ry. Co. (Sale) authorisation B. No. 58** (Mr. Hall). 1°*, 300; M. for 2°, 369; 2°*, 444 (i).
— objection taken to 2° (Mr. Laurier) 369 (ii).
- South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 66** (Mr. Tisdale). 1°, 318; 2°*, 444 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 758 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 86.)
— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1261 (ii).
- South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 86** (Mr. Trow). 1°*, 413; withdn, 601 (i).
- SOUTH VICTORIA, ONT.: Ret. of Member Elect, 277 (i).
- South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80** (Sir Donald Smith). 1°*, 383; 2°* 539 (i).
- SPEAKER, ELECTION OF. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: rep. (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i); Prorogation, 1276 (ii).
- Speedy Trials Act Amt.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SPIRITS EXPORTED AND CORN IMPORTED: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 143 (i).
- SPIRITS SEIZED AND CONFISCATED: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 803 (ii).
- SPRUCE AND ELM LOGS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 966 (ii). See "CUSTOMS."
- "Standard" Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. B. No. 106** (Mr. Small). 1°*, 515 (i); 2°*, 638; in Com. and 3°*, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 123.)
- STATION HOUSE AT CAP ST. IGNAZE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Choquette) 103, 377 (i).
- STATIONERY FOR USE OF PARLT.: Remarks on M. to conc. in Rep. of Printing Com. 951, (ii).
- STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1190 (ii).
- Statutes, Publication (Chap. 2 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 159** (Mr. Chapleau). 1°, 1033; 2°*, 1121; in Com., 1122; 3° on a div., 1124 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 2.)
- STATUTES, REVISED, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 668 (ii).
— COMMISSIONERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 205 (i).
— FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 142 (i).
— SUPPLEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1247 (ii).
- STEAM ENGINES, PORTABLE: conc. in Ways and Means, 505.
- STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (ii).
- STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. See "SUPPLY."
- STEEL. See "IRON INDUSTRY."
- STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Mallory) 669 (ii).
- STILLS, ILLICIT, SEIZURES, &c., 1878 TO 1886: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
- Stores.** See "PUBLIC STORES."
- STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND SURVEYS: M. for copies* (Mr. Perry) 803 (ii).
- STRANGE, GENL, REP. re 9TH AND 65TH BATTALIONS: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 670 (ii).
- Subsidies (land) authorisation B. No. 164** (Mr. White, Cardwell). Res. prop. and in Com., 1117; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1120; in Com. and 3°*, 1221 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 23.)
- Subsidies (land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. No. 161** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1°, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1074 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 22.)
- Subsidies (money) to Rys. authorisation B. No. 170** (Mr. Pope). Res. prop., 1142; in Com., 1249; 1°* and 2°* of B., in Com. and 3°*, 1266 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 170.)
- Subsidy to P.E.I. provision B. No. 139** (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 708; in Com., 814; 1°* of B., 817; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1029 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 8.)
- SUBSIDIES, RAILWAY, LIABILITIES FOR: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 15 (i).
- SUBSIDIES. See
ALBERTA AND ATHABASCA RAILWAY CO. See B. 164.
ATHABASCA AND WOLFE RAILWAY CO.
BEAUBARNOIS JUNCTION RAILWAY CO.
BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY CO.
BRIDGE OVER ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AT OUBAU LANDING.

SUBSIDIES—Continued.

- CARAGUET RAILWAY Co.
 CARILLON AND GREENVILLE RAILWAY Co.
 CHICOUTIMI AND LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY Co.
 CORNWALLIS VALLEY RAILWAY Co.
 CUMBERLAND RAILWAY AND COAL Co.
 DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY Co.
 GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY Co.
 GUELPH JUNCTION RAILWAY Co.
 HARVEY BRANCH RAILWAY Co.
 JACQUES CARTIER UNION RAILWAY Co.
 JOGGINS RAILWAY Co.
 LAKE ERIE, ESSEX AND DETROIT RIVER RAILWAY Co.
 LAKE TÉMISCOMINGUE RAILWAY Co.
 LEAMINGTON AND ST. CLAIRE RAILWAY Co.
 MASSAWIPPI RAILWAY Co.
 MEDICINE HAT RAILWAY AND COAL Co. See B. 161.
 MONCTON AND BUXTON RAILWAY Co.
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RAILWAY Co.
 NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RAILWAY Co.
 NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RAILWAY Co.
 ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RAILWAY Co.
 OSHAWA RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION Co.
 QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND STREAMSHIP Co. See B. 164.
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY Co.
 RICHMOND HILL JUNCTION RAILWAY Co.
 SOUTH NORFOLK RAILWAY Co.
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RAILWAY Co.
 ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVER DU LOUP RAILWAY Co.
 ST. LAWRENCE AND LOWER LAURENTIAN RAILWAY Co.
 TRESWATER AND INVERHURON RAILWAY Co.
 TÉMISCOUATA RAILWAY Co.
 TOBIQUE VALLEY RAILWAY Co.
 VAUDREUIL AND PRESCOTT RAILWAY Co.
 WOODSTOCK, N.B., AND CENTREVILLE.
- SUBWAY FROM P.E.I. TO MAINLAND: Quos. (Mr. Welsh) 142 (i).
- LETTER TO SENATOR HOWLAN: Quos. (Mr. Perry) 527 (i).
- Quos. (Mr. Welsh) 101 (i).
- SUGAR DUTIES: deb. in Ways and Means, 464-472 (i).
- SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
- SUPPLIES TO STR. "LANSDOWNE": in Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).
- Supply B. No. 169 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 1273 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 1).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

- REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM: Revision of Voters' Lists (Mr. Mills) 649; 9th Battalion, Quebec (Mr. Amyot) 708; Commercial Relations with France (Mr. Amyot) 817; Winter port of C.P.R. (Mr. Welsh, St. John) 967; C.P.R. Rolling Stock purchased from Onderdonk & Co (Mr. Mulock) 1034; M. F. O'Donoghue, claim of (Mr. Landerkin) 1077, 1079; Duties on Iron (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1079; Imprisonment for Libel (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1234; 9th Battalion Accounts re Rebellion (Mr. Amyot) 1234 (ii).
- MSs. FROM HIS EX., transmitting Estimates for 1887-88, 318 (i); Suppl. Estimates for 1886-87, 1887-88, 952; Further Suppl., 1886-87, 1152 (ii).
- MS. FOR COM.: 13, 591 (i), 649, 703, 817, 916, 967, 1034, 1077, 1129, 1233 (ii).
- RES. (Sir Charles Tupper) for Com., 13; in Com., 591 (i), 651, 717, 823, 916, 971, 1057, 1081, 1093, 1129, 1237 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

- Agricultural Societies, Aid to, 1240 (ii).
 Archives, Care of, 717, 745 (ii).
 Chipman, C. J., Payment to for Services re Col. Ex., 1166 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, 718 (ii).
 Dominion Exhibition, 718 (ii);
 Experimental Farms, 720 (ii).
 Health Statistics, 718 (ii).
 Imperial Institute, Contribution towards, 728; conc., 1267 (ii).
 Patent Record, 717 (ii).

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

Charges of Management:

- Assistant Receiver General, Halifax, 591 (i).
 Auditor and Receiver General, Winnipeg, 591 (i).
 Brokerage, &c., 4 per cent. Loans, 593 (i).
 Dominion Notes, Printing, 597 (i).
 Financial Commissioner, England, 594 (i).
 Interest on Public Debt, 593 (i).
 Savings Banks (country) N.B., N.S., B.C., 592 (i).

Civil Government:

- Agriculture, Dept. of, 614 (i), 1164 (ii).
 Auditor General's Office, 612 (i).
 Contingencies, Departmental:
 High Commissioner, 651 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., 653 (ii).
 Customs, Dept. of, 613 (i), 1237 (ii).
 Fisheries, Dept. of, 1237 (ii).
 Governor General's Secretary's Office, 596 (i).
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 1237 (ii).
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 612 (i), 1163; conc., 1267 (ii).
 Interior, Dept. of, 1129 (ii).
 Geological Survey, 1162, 1185 (ii).
 Justice, Dept. of, 612 (i), 1162, 1237 (ii).
 Penitentiaries Branch, 1237 (ii).
 Marine, Dept. of, 614 (i).
 Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 612 (i).
 Postmaster General's Dept., 614 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Dept. of, 612 (i).
 Privy Council Office, 597, 601 (i), 1159; conc., 1266 (ii).
 Public Works, Dept. of, 614 (i).
 Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 614 (i).
 Secretary of State, Dept. of, 612 (i), 1162 (ii).

Collection of Revenues:

- Canals:
 Repairs and Working Expenses, 1113 (ii).
 Salaries and Contingencies, canal officers, 1113 (ii).
 Customs, 1129, 1195 (ii).
 Dominion Lands, 1136, 1197 (ii).
 Excise, 1115, 1195 (ii).
 Liquor License Act, 1197 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.**COMMITTEE—Continued.***Collection of Revenues—Continued.*

Post Office, 1135, 1196 (ii).

Public Works :

Agent and Contingencies, B. C., 1114 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B. C., 1114 (ii).

Railways—Repairs, &c. :

Eastern Extension, 1113, 1196 (ii).

Intercolonial, 1113, 1196; conc., 1269.

Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."*Dominion Lands—Capital :*

Surveys, Printing of Plans, &c., 1197 (ii).

Dominion Lands—Income. See "Collection of Revenues."*Excise.* See "Collection of Revenues."*Fisheries :*

Bounties to Fishermen, 1072 (ii).

Deep Sea Exploration, B. C., 1186 (ii).

General Vote, 1069 (ii).

Hatcheries, 1069 (ii).

Protection Steamers and Vessels, 1081 (ii).

Rogers' Fish-way, 1069 (ii).

Geological Survey :

Dawson, Dr., extra services, 1162 (ii).

Mercier, François, payment for collection, 1185 (ii).

Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."*Immigration :*

General Vote, 730; conc., 1267 (ii).

Indians :

Annuities under Robinson Treaty, 1093 (ii).

British Columbia, 1094, 1186 (ii).

Manitoba, 1186 (ii).

North-West Territories, 1099, 1186 (ii).

Nova Scotia, 1094, 1186 (ii).

Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces, 1093 (i).

Survey of Reserves, Ont. and Que., conc., 1270 (ii).

Insurance :

Salary, &c., of Superintendent, 1073 (ii).

Justice, Administration of :

County Courts, N.B., 654 (ii).

General Vote, 654 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts, 654 (ii).

Wood, J. P., County Court Judge, extra services, 1164 (ii).

Legislation :

House of Commons :

Salaries, per Clerk's Estimate, 660, 1164, 1239; conc., 1269 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

Debates, Publication, &c., 667 (ii).

Elections, services of C. S. employés, 1165 (ii).

Franchise Act, expenses under, 667, 1165, 1240; conc., 1269 (ii).

Library of Parliament, salaries, &c., 667; purchase of books, 1165 (ii).

Parliamentary Companion, 1189 (ii).

Senate :

Salaries and contingencies, 660, 1238; conc., 1267.

SUPPLY—Continued.**COMMITTEE—Continued.***Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 1062 (ii).

Guinane, Mrs. E. M., gratuity, 1186 (ii).

Lighthouse and Fog-Alarms, construction, &c., 1067 (ii).

Lights, Fog-Whistles, &c., maintenance, 1065 (ii).

Salaries, &c., Lighthouse-keepers, 1058 (ii).

Liquor License Act. See "Collection of Revenues."*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

Campbellton and Gaspé, 991 (ii).

France and Quebec, 986, 1057; conc., 1269 (ii).

Halifax to Murray Harbor and Charlottetown, 991 (ii).

Liverpool and London and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., 989 (ii).

Port Mulgrave to East Bay, 991 (ii).

St. John and Basin of Minas ports, 1185 (ii).

Marine Hospitals :

General Vote, 1068 (ii).

Meteorological Service. See "Scientific Institutions."*Militia :*

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., 751 (ii).

Baird, Lieut.-Col. W. T., gratuity, 1171 (ii).

Barracks in B. C., 766 (ii).

Batteries, Artillery Schools, &c., 759 (ii).

Bergin, Surgeon General, 1240 (ii).

Campbell, C., précis on Defences of Canada, 1170 (ii).

Contingencies, including Grants, 753 (ii).

Drill Instruction, 753 (ii).

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 763 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff salaries, 748 (ii).

Military Properties, care of, 764 (ii).

Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 763 (ii).

Royal Military College, Kingston, 755, 758; conc., 1268 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

Bartlett's Work on Coal and Iron productions of the Dom., 1247 (ii).

Chamberlin, B., payment for extra services, 1185 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, 1112 (ii).

Cornwall Floods, relief, 1190, 1238 (ii).

Dunscombe, Wm., services *re* seizure of *Atalaya*, 1248 (ii).

Duties, commutation of, 1112 (ii).

Extra Clerks, preparing Returns, 1112 (ii).

Fish and Fish Oil, refund of Duties, 1191 (ii).

Government in Keewatin, expenses, 1112 (ii).

Government in N.W. T., expenses, 1112 (ii).

Hot Springs, Banff, N.W. T., 1189, 1247 (ii).

Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, 1247 (ii).

Hudson's Bay Expedition, 1189 (ii).

Insane Asylum, Man., Grant to, 1247 (ii).

McLean, T. A., indemnity to, 1187 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Miscellaneous—Continued.

- Miomac Dictionary (Dr. Rand's) 1247 (ii).
 Newboro' Post Office, Savings Bank Funds,
 1189 (ii).
 "Parliamentary Companion," 1189 (ii).
 Printing Bureau, Cost of Organisation and Plant,
 1113 (ii).
 Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 1248 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co., Indemnity
 for Costs, 1187 (ii).
 Statutes, Consolidation of, 1190 (ii).
 Statutes, Revised, Supplement, 1247 (ii).

Mounted Police :

- General Vote, 1112 (ii).
 Gratnities, Work, &c., 1186 (ii).

*Observatories. See "Scientific Institutions."**Ocean and River Service :*

- Government Steamers, maintenance, &c., 1057 (ii).
Napoleon III, refund to McPherson, 1185 (ii).
Northern Light, repairs, new boiler, &c., 1247 (ii).
 Prince Edward Island Winter Service, 1058 (ii).
 Rewards for Saving Life, 1057 (ii).

Penitentiaries :

- British Columbia, 660 (ii).
 Dorchester, 659 (ii).
 Kingston, 657 (ii).
 Manitoba, 659 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul, 659, 1159 (ii).

Pensions :

- Rebellion of 1885, on account of, 746 ; conc.,
 1267 (ii).
 Veterans of War of 1812 ; conc., 1267 (ii).

*Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."**Quarantine :*

- General Vote, 743 ; conc., 1267 (ii).
 Pleuro-pneumonia and Slaughter of Cattle, 1170 (ii).

Public Works—Capital :*

- Buildings :
 Library of Parliament, Claim of Farquhar & Co.,
 1242 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Block, 916 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers :
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, 918 (ii).
 Port Arthur Harbor, &c., construction, 916 (ii).

Public Works—Income :

- Buildings :—British Columbia, 977 (ii).
 New Brunswick, 971, 1242 (ii).
 North-West Territories, 977, 1245 (ii).
 Nova Scotia, 918 (ii).
 Ontario, 975, 1183, 1242 (ii).
 Prince Edward Island, 924 (ii).
 Quebec, 971, 1183, 1242 (ii).
 Repairs, Furniture, &c., 1184, 1245 ; conc., 1269.

* See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Public Works—Income—Continued.

- Dredging, 980 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, 982 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers :—British Columbia, 980 (ii).
 Manitoba, 980 (ii).
 New Brunswick, 979, 1184 (ii).
 Nova Scotia, 978, 1245 (ii).
 Ontario, 980, 1184, 1246 ; conc., 1269 (ii).
 Prince Edward Island, 979 (ii).
 Quebec, 980, 1184 (ii).
 Miscellaneous Public Works, 982, 1185 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, 1185 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, 1246 (ii).
 Telegraphs, 982 (ii).

Railways and Canals—Capital :*

Canals :

- Carillon, payment to Valuators, 1179 (ii).
 Cornwall, 832 (ii).
 Culbute, 838 (ii).
 Lachine, 832 (ii).
 Murray, 832 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River and Canals, 832 (ii).
 Tay, 838, 1179 (ii).
 Trent River Navigation, 835 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie, 830 ; conc., 1268 (ii).
 Welland, 835 (ii).
 Williamsburg, 832 (ii).
 Cooper, R. W., services *re* Tay, 1179 (ii).

Railways :

Canadian Pacific :

- British Columbia Section, 1171 (ii).
 General Vote, 766 ; conc., 1267 (ii).
 Jones, L. K., salary as Private Secretary, 766.
 Cape Breton Railway : Construction, 829 (ii).

Intercolonial :

- Halifax, accommodation at, 1241 (ii).
 Halifax Extension, 767 (ii).
 Indiantown Branch, 1174 (ii).
 Moncton, accommodation at, 781 (ii).
 Rolling Stock, 823, 1177 (ii).
 St. Charles Branch, 1176 (ii).
 St. John, accommodation at, 1173 (ii).
 Servis Tie Plates, 829 (ii).

Prince Edward Island Railway :

- Extension to Charlottetown, station-yard, &c.,
 1178 (ii).

Scientific Institutions :

- Meteorological Observatories, 1068 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection :

- General Vote, 1065 (ii).

*Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."**Superannuation :*

- Neville, C. S., gratuity on retiring from C. S.,
 1170 (ii).

* For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

- SUPPLY—Continued.**
COMMITTEE—Continued.
Railways and Canals—Income :
 Canals :
 Beauharnois, 838 (ii).
 Lachine, 838 (ii).
 Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, 1242 (ii).
 Royal Commission on Leases, 1180 (ii).
 Rideau, 838 ; conc., 1268 (ii).
 St. Anne's, Residence and Office, 1180 (ii).
 St. Peter's, Perley, H. F., services, 1180 (ii).
 Williamsburg, 838 (ii).
 Williams, barge, payment on account of sinking
 1182 (ii).
 Railways :
 Royal Commission on Railways, 1179 (ii)
Territorial Accounts :
 General Vote, 1886-87, 1197 ; for 1887-88, 1248.
Unprovided Items :
 General Vote for 1885-86, 1198 (ii).
 CONCURRENCE, 1266-1270 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B.
No. 18 (Mr. Tupper, Pictou). 1°, 74 (i).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (trial of
claims) Amt. B. No. 111 (Mr. Thompson). 1°,
 524 ; prop. Res., 590 (i) ; 2° of B. m., 810 ; 2°, 814 ;
 Res. in Com., 814 ; B. in Com., 873, 876 ; Res. conc. in,
 884 ; B. in Com. and 3° on a div., 890 ; Sen. Amts.
 conc. in, 1222 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 16.)
SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS : in Com. of Sup., 654 (ii).
SURVEY, CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. Doyon)
 1006 (ii).
 — RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN C.B. : M. for copies, &c.
 (Mr. Flynn) 790 (ii).
 — PRINTING OF PLANS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 — STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND : M. for copies* (Mr.
 Perry) 803 (ii).
SWISHER, J., APPLICATION FOR REMUNERATION : Ques. (Mr.
 Wilson, Elgin) 365, 368 (i).
TACKS, BRADS, &c. : conc. in Ways and Means, 516 (i).
TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
TARPAULIN : in Com. on Ways and Means, 523 (i).
TEA IMPORTS FROM CHINA AND JAPAN : M. for Ret. (Mr.
 Bowman) 23 (i).
Teeswater and Inverhuron Ry. Co.'s B No. 130
(Mr. Cargill). 1°, 745 ; 2°, 785 ; in Com., and 3°,
 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 90)
 — SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 ; in Com., 1261.
TELEGRAPH LINES (B.C.) : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE (B.C.) : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 1005 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS : in Com. of Sup., 982 (ii).
TELEGRAPHIC SIGNAL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 102 (i).
Témiscouata Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No.
81 (Mr. Grandbois). 1°, 333 ; 2°, 539 (i) ; in Com.
 and 3°, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 71.)
 — SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143 (ii).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS : in Com. of Sup., 1197, 1248 (ii).
Threats, Intimidations, &c., See "CRIMINAL LAW."
TIMBER CUT ON INDIAN LANDS, COMPENSATION : Ques. (Mr.
 Cook) 1005 (ii).
 — LICENSES AND CROWN TITLES : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
 Dawson) 803 (ii).
TINSMITHS' TOOLS, &c. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 965 (ii).
TOBACCO, ILLEGAL SALES AND SEIZURES : M. for Stmt.*
 Mr. Rinfret) 153 (i).
 — INCREASED DUTY ON : Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 313 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 320 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr.
 Pope) 1143 (ii).
TOMATOES : conc. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).
TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : M. for copies of Rops.
 &c (Mr. McMullen) 797 (ii).
TRACADIE HARBOR, DREDGING : M. for Cor. (Mr. Welsh) 213.
Trade and Commerce Organisation B. No. 7 (Sir
John A. Macdonald). 1°, 20 ; prop. Res., 191 ; 2°, 192 ;
 M. for Com. on Res., 361 (i) ; M. for Com. on B. 862 ;
 in Com., 867 ; Res. in Com., 884 ; B. in Com. and 3°,
 890 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 10.)
TRADE AND NAVIGATION REP. : presented (Mr. Bowell) 13 (i).
TRANSPORT OF VOLUNTEERS TO RIFLE MATCHES : in Com. of
 Sup., 754 (i).
TRAVIS, JEREMIAH, APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE IN N.W.T. :
 Ques. (Mr. Watson) 143 (i).
 — REP. OF JUDGE TAYLOR : M. for copy* (Mr. Mulock)
 803 (ii).
TREATIES. See "COMMERCIAL," "RECIPROCITY."
TRENT RIVER BOOMS AND PIERS : Ques. (Mr. Mallory) 708.
TRENT VALLEY CANAL WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Barron) 669 (ii).
Trial of Claims. See "SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT."
TRUNKS, ALL KINDS : conc. in Ways and Means, 445 (i).
TUBES OR FLUES : conc. in Ways and Means, 506 (i) ; in
 Com., 965 (ii).
UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE AND CONDUCT : Reproofs (Mr.
 Speaker) 66, 110, 180, 298, 333, 353, 374, 619, 704, 705 (ii)
UNPROVIDED ITEMS : in Com. of Sup., 1193 (ii).
UPHILL AND VICTORIA ROAD POSTAL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr.
 Barron) 364 (i).
Upper Columbia River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No.
49 (Mr. Mara). 1°, 223 ; 2°, 320 (i) ; in Com. and
 3°, 850 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 95)
VACANCY, RESTIGOUCHE, NOTIFICATION (Mr. Speaker) 277 (i).
VANKOUGHNET, MR., AND REV. J. ROBERTSON ; Cor. between :
 M. for Ret.* (Mr. Somerville) 369 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND, LIFE-SAVING STATION : Ques. (Mr.
 Shakespeare) 45 (i).
VARNISHES, &c. : conc. in Ways and Means, 439 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND PRESCOTT RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : prop. Res.
 (Mr. Pope) 1142 ; in Com., 1259 (ii).
VEGETABLES : conc. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).
VENEERS, WOOD : conc. in Ways and Means, 452 (i).
VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS : M. for Cor. (Mr.
 Charlton) 786 (ii).
VERMICELLI, &c. : conc. in Ways and Means, 460 (i).
VESSELS BOARDED, &c., BY OFFICERS IN FISHERIES PRO-
TECTION SERVICE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ellis) 220 (i).

VESSELS SEIZED IN N.S., 1885 to 1887 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jones) 110 (i).

VETERANS OF 1837, ISSUE OF SCRIPTO : Ques. (Mr. Purcell) 320.

VETERANS OF WAR OF 1812 : CONC., 1267 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS KIT. See "KIT ALLOWANCE."

VOLUNTEERS SERVICES, REBELLION OF 1837 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Purcell) 366 (i).

VOTE ON DISALLOWANCE : Personal Explanation (Mr. Mitchell) 588 (i), 616 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS. See "SECRETARY OF STATE."

WALBANK, MR., EMPLOYMENT AS SURVEYOR : Ques. (Mr. Doyne) 1006 (ii).

WALL PAPER. See "PAPER HANGINGS."

WAR CLAIMS PAID AND REJECTED : Ques. (Mr. Holton) 1003.

WATCH ACTIONS, &c. : CONC. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).

Waterloo and Magog Ry. Co.'s B. No. 100 (Mr. Kirkpatrick). 1^o*, 515; 2^o*, 601 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 68).

WATTERS, T. J., SUMS PAID AS SEIZING OFFICER : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1002 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS : Ms. (Sir Charles Tupper) for Com., 13, 516 (i); CONC., 413, 441, 480; M. for Com., 954; in Com., 963-967 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES : (advertising pictures) 426 (i), 965 (ii); (agricultural machines) 480-488 (i), 965 (ii); (axes) 461 (i), 965 (ii); (axles and springs) 462; (barrels) 415; (belting) 431; (blacking) 426; (blueing) 426; (boiler tubes) 506 (i); (books) 965 (ii); (braces) 427 (i); (brick, fire) 967 (ii); (British gum dressing) 415; (buggies &c.) 427; (buttons, vegetable and ivory) 427; (carriages) 427 (i); (chromos) 965 (ii); (cigars and cigarettes) 439 (i); (clay tobacco pipes) 965 (ii); (clothes wringers) 523; (clothing) 523 (i), 965 (ii); (collars, cotton or linen) 445; (colored fabrics) 452 (i); (combs, toilet) 964; (comforters, bed) 964 (ii); (cotton fabrics) 428-432; (cuffs, cotton or linen) 445; (cutlery, plated) 435; (dressine) 445 (earthenware and stoneware) 432 (i); (elm logs) 966 (ii); (fabrics) 452; (farm waggon, &c.) 427; (ferro-manganese) 428; (fertiliser) 452-460; (flag-stones) 433; (flasks) 433; (floor oil-cloth) 434, 516; (flax) 506; (free list) 508 (i); (glass) 966 (ii); (glass carboys) 433; (glue) 446; (gold and silver leaf) 434; (hardware) 507-515; (harness, &c.) 426 (i), 965 (ii); (hoes &c.) 462 (i), 965; (hay knives) 965 (ii); (iron industry) 468, 469, 504, 522 (i), 965, 1207 (ii); (iron manufactures) 507 (i); (ivory and horn) 966 (ii); (jeans and coutille) 428; (labels, fruit) 508; (leather, sole) 434 (i), 965 (ii); (lemons) 460; (liquorice root) 431; (linseed oil) 964 (ii); (locomotives) 504; (macaroni, &c.) 460 (i) (marble) 964 (ii); (mattocks) 462; (mowing machines) 479; (nails, &c) 523; (newspapers) 446-449; (nut, &c) 523; (oil-cloth, floor) 434, 516 (i); (oil, linseed) 934; (opium) 964 (ii); (oranges) 460; (paper hangings) 434, 516; (paper, tarred) 461; (phials) 433; (photographic dry plates) 449; (pianofortes) 523; (pickles, bottled) 435; (picks) 462; (pictures, show cards) 426 (i), 965 (ii); (plated cutlery) 435; (plumbago) 435; (pocket books) 415; (potatoes) 440; (printing presses) 508; (purses) 445; (rakes) 462 (i), 965 (ii); (rivets) 523; (salt, coarse) 435-439; (saw-logs) 510 (i), 966 (ii); (screws) 507, 523; (sewing machines) 434; (sewing thread, cotton) 427; (shingle bolts) 510-514; (shirts) 450-452; (shoe and shoemakers' ink) 426; (shovels and spades) 463 (i), 935 (ii); (sizing cream) 445; (skates) 508; (slates) 439 (i), 965; (socks and stockings) 965 (ii); (spikes, &c.) 523 (i); (-pruce logs) 969 (ii); (steam engines) 504, 505; (steel manufactures) 507 (i), 935 (ii); (stoneware) 432; (tarpaulin) 523 (i); (tinmith's tools) 965 (ii); (tomatoes) 440; (track tools) 507; (trunks) 445; (tubes) 506 (i), 965 (ii); (varnishes) 439; (vegetables) 440; (vermicelli, &c.) 460; (veneers, wood) 452; (washers, &c.) 523; (watch actions) 410 (i); (wire, iron and steel) 965 (ii); (woollen fabrics) 440 (i).

Weighers. See "LICENSED."

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES REP. : presented (Mr. Costigan) 19.

WELLAND CANAL BRIDGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).

WELLBANKS, DANL., COMPLAINT AGAINST : M. for copies* (Mr. Platt) 803 (ii).

WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Platt) 369 (i).

Western Assurance Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 60. (Mr. Cockburn). 1^o*, 300; 2^o*, 369 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 850 (ii). (51-51 Vic., c. 102.)

Western Canada Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 128 (Mr. McCarthy). 1^o*, 782; 2^o*, 785; in Com. and 3^o*, 925 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 109.)

Western Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 117 (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). 1^o*, 638; 2^o*, 758; in Com. and 3^o* 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 77.)

Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Confirmation of Agreement B. No. 157 (Mr. Pope). Res. prop. 691 (i); in Com. and 1^o* of B., 1031; 2^o* m., 1127; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1129 (ii). (51-51 Vic. c. 25.)

WEST HEAD HARBOR LIGHT : Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 786 (ii).

WEST INDIA COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. Jones) 278 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Jones) 74 (i).

WESTPOINT, P.E.I., WHARF REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 21.

WHITEFISH RIVER INDIAN RESERVE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 802 (ii).

WHITE MUD RIVER, MAN, IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Watson) 192 (i).

WHITE POPULATION IN MAN. : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 14 (i).

WHISKEY PUT UP AS VINEGAR : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 102 (i).

—— UNLAWFUL MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 20 (i).

"WILLIAMS," BARGE, PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF SINKING: in CJD. of Sup., 1182 (ii).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 838 (ii).

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY. CO., RY. DEPT., &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. Jones) 147 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. Scarth). 1^o*, 383; 2^o*, 601. (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1016 (ii). (50-51 Vic., c. 81.)

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I. See "NORTHERN LIGHT."

WINTER PORT, C.P.R. : on M. for Com. of Sup., 967 (ii).

WIRE, IRON AND STEEL : in Com. on Ways and Means, 65.

WRIT FOR RESTIGOUCHE, ISSUE OF : Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 361 (i).

WOOD, J. P., COUNTY COURT JUDGE, EXTRA SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 1143; in Com., 1265 (ii).

WOOLLEN FABRICS : CONC. in Ways and Means, 440 (i).

YORK AND SIMCOE BATTALION, KIT ALLOWANCE : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 371; (Mr. O'Brien) 525 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 715 (ii).

YORK VILLAGE PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Montague) 1005

YUKON RIVER EXPLORATION : Ques. (Mr. Gordon) 102 (i).